

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN BOB DOLE (R-KANSAS)
1st DISTRICT REPUBLICAN CONVENTION
DODGE CITY, KANSAS, MARCH 14, 1964

First let me state that I am sincerely grateful to Republicans in the "Big First" for the confidence you have expressed in me. We live in a District unequalled in potential anywhere in America and certainly it is a distinct honor and privilege to represent you in Washington.

I have made a number of speeches for Republicans, recently in New York, Michigan, Indiana and Virginia and in the next 3 weeks will visit Ohio, Arizona, California and Colorado and as you might guess find Republicans, and others I might add, think pretty much alike. I really believe that what we need--we already have--the truth.

We cannot and should not win by out "promising" modern day Democrats, for in the first place it is impossible. What we need is what we have already--the truth, but it must be used in exactly the same way modern day Democrats use their whopping big vote-getting prevarication. We need to tell the truth SIMPLY. We need to tell the truth over, and over, and over, AND OVER, again, and again, and AGAIN, until

"or voice"
Independents and some of those Democrats who have no place /in the present day Democrat party will become so angry at themselves they will go out in the middle of a tornado and vote REPUBLICAN. We DON'T need to appeal to poverty or other human weaknesses, as the Democrats do. We can and should use the truth that appeals to the better side of people. How--just convince them of the truth, difficult and as frustrating as this may be.

I never cease to be impressed with the fact that our American patriots and our founding fathers had one over-riding and prevailing concern...and that was the quest for liberty...not peace...but liberty!

These men in their divinely inspired wisdom knew that unless man was free, there could be no peace. They held the idea that all men were endowed by their creator with certain inalienable rights...among which were life and liberty! They also believed that inasmuch as these rights were God-given they were not to be taken away by

man... and that if This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas
http://dolearchives.ku.edu government is to be governed... it was the protection of these rights and liberties. This was their concern and they proceeded to build within the framework of our government body a system of checks and balances designed to protect the citizen against the possibility of a government which might in time grow too centralized and too arbitrary in the use of its power... forgetting its prime responsibility as a protector of the life and liberty of the governed.

Recognizing the importance of liberty... and the thirst for liberty inherent in all men, the cause found many impassioned champions such as Patrick Henry and Tom Paine. But who speaks for liberty today? Not a day goes by but what I read or hear of someone who is speaking of peace...but not so often of liberty. Where today do we find our Patrick Henrys, our Nathan Hales, our Benjamin Franklins, our George Washingtons, our Thomas Paines, our Paul Reveres or our Daniel Websters...all early leaders within whom the flames of freedom burned so brightly.

Well...thank God we do have Americans in growing numbers who are picking up the torch of liberty and holding it aloft so as to inspire others, and I firmly believe Western Kansans are such people.

Now this being a Republican meeting it is certainly proper to discuss the future role of our Party and that of the opposition. What are now and what may be the issues? How can we win? Why must we win?

The primary issue now is "Foreign Policy" or more accurately, the lack of it! Under President Eisenhower and a Republican administration not one inch of territory was lost to Communism and while John Foster Dulles was maligned for "brinkmanship", his stalwart policy of strength and confrontation brought the Soviets, the Red Chinese and the spread of Communism to a dead halt.

With the New Frontier we have the same old words and tired phrases, the "new" Khrushchev, accommodation, trade with the Soviets, Red China in the United Nations, Test Ban Treaty, Disarmament, and all the rest, which add up to "appeasement", "coexistence", and peace at any price.

First came the catastrophe of the Bay of Pigs and despite the great, pre-1962 election confrontation, Cuba is still Communist spraying aggression over the Western Hemisphere and unfortunately, militarily stronger than ever.

We are fighting the enemy, but we are losing American lives, under the same policy of allowing sanctuary to the enemy just over the border. The Secretary of Defense reports on one day we will win by 1965, but almost the next we are losing, and on the following day says he means we were winning but with difficulties and in the interim he flies back and forth trying to get the Administration off the hook.

We forced Laos into neutralization which is Communist controlled. Cambodia has gone to Red China influence after \$300-million of U.S. foreign aid. Zanzibar fell to the Red Chinese, and war and bloodshed have erupted all over east Africa.

Our flag is torn down and spat upon in Ghana and our embassy attacked. In Cyprus our embassy is assaulted and Americans evacuated, the British threaten to pull out, and 10,000 Greek Cypriot students participate in Anti-American demonstrations. Panama wants the Panama Canal, mobs rioted and with Cuban Communists giving directions and arms, attacked the U.S. Zone with resulting bloodshed. Just 4 days ago the U.S. Embassy in Cambodia was sacked, our flag set afire and on the same day the State Department apologized to Russia for shooting down an American plane. Fortunately this time the 3 Americans survived which was not the case on January 28 when 3 officers were killed by a brutal act of communistic violence.

France has recognized Red China, the British are selling buses to Cuba, Spain is about to do business with Castro, Venezuelan Communist attacks on Americans and their property continue and Brazil is on the brink of chaos with Communist infiltration.

What has President Johnson and his administration done about it? Frankly, it appears there has been a "moratorium" on foreign policy. There have been mild protests to Britain, and France, the O.A.S., Ghana, and Russia. We are "discussing" and adjusting with Panama, and offered U.S. Marines in the Cyprus mess--a quarrel between two other countries and both our allies.

What did the President say on February 11, 1964--"If you think U.S. prestige overseas isn't what it should be, or that our country isn't exactly loved and respected" throughout the world, "then you are a "bellyacher". Americans probably were glad to hear from their Chief Executive the facts-- especially from one who should know and be willing to give citizens the picture--that they are "a much beloved people" all over the globe and that "we are respected."

issued during the past 3 years and 2 months of the Democrat Administration.

On February 13, Columnist Walter Lippmann, who customarily comments favorably on Democrat Administration policies, admitted: "Our foreign policy is running into great difficulties, and these failures and frustrations provide plenty of material to complain about." He added that U.S. influence in a number of trouble spots was "far from being decisive," but near the end of his comments he apologized for the Administration by saying it had inherited policies which the Administration is grinding out on unexamined premises.

The U.S. News & World Report of February 10 quoted an observer in Europe as saying: "Every pipsqueak nation seems able to kick the United States and get away with it." (page 48) "DeGaulle has just thumbed his nose at the United States.... Britain is thumbing its nose at the United States by helping Castro in Cuba." (page 49) "All the while, the image in Europe of the new American President is that of a folksy politician with his mind on the forthcoming political campaign..." (page 49) "Now U.S. policy is encouraging natives to force Portugal out of Angola and Mozambique..." (page 49) "Turn to Latin America, and the picture from the U.S. standpoint is described as one of disarray." (page 49) The magazine also pointed out the abuse in various parts of the world of American businessmen, and that in Asia the United States appeared to go from one defeat to another.

The "hair-splitting contest" by spokesmen for the Administration on differences of our trading with communist Russia and other Communist bloc countries and England, Canada, Spain and others trading with communist Cuba is an admission to the world of a confused and muddled policy. The Johnson Administration has literally opened the flood gates around the world. The moment President Johnson succeeded in his Congressional power-play last December and authorization for credit sales of wheat and other commodities to communist countries was approved by the Democrats in Congress the lid was off. We cannot offset this blunder by denouncing those who now trade with communist Cuba for it is a well known fact that Russia is pumping over \$1-million a day into the Cuban economy. I trust most Americans will realize sale of wheat, if we are paid, will not only enhance the stature of Castro but pump up Khrushchev's sagging economy.

It seems high time President Johnson call for free world solidarity, for it was just last December 9 that J. Edgar Hoover stated: "We are at war with Communism and the sooner every red-blooded American realizes this, the safer we will be". I believe it is of paramount importance that this Administration stops talking of "unilateral relaxation" of tensions and begins an inventory of just who and where our friends and enemies are in the world. When we will not stand up for our own rights we are not entitled to respect from other nations. When our great country cannot even stand up to the likes of Panama and Cuba, you--the people--have every right to be concerned and I mean concerned with the future security of our country and not anyone's reelection for this is not a partisan matter.

What do we really know about the wheat deal? Why can't we be given the facts? What is there to hide? Why weren't there concessions exacted from the Russians? Why preferential treatment to an enemy ^{and} windfalls to giant grain exporters? What have we really gained from the entire affair as Americans, and Kansans interested in the sale of wheat? What will Russia do with it? How much will go to Castro directly and indirectly? What is next Mr. President--long term credit? These are questions I demanded answers to unpopular as the cause was, or **may be**, in the largest wheat producing district in America. These questions are still unanswered and we still hear the phoney arguments based on "humanitarianism", "balance of payments" or "relaxation of tensions".

We do know there is no starvation in Russia, very little gold, and frankly I cannot think of many tensions which have been relaxed as a result of communist initiative. Let me say again "I would rather give our surpluses to a friend than sell them to an enemy as it is hardly consistent or fair to our children and grandchildren to fight communism with one hand and feed it with the other--I just cannot and will not hedge on an issue so vital--the gamble is too great--much greater than my political future--for greed will not save the world, the farmer, Administration apologists or those seeking the easy way out.

BAKER - ESTES, et al

Another proper issue will most certainly be morality and integrity, more specifically the Baker, Estes and other cases. On Thursday, March 12, the Washington Evening Star had this to say of the Baker Investigation. "Those who have been

to identify that unless some other floating around the Senate side of the Capitol need go no further. It's whitewash.

"There is every indication that the Senate Rules Committee, under the chairmanship of Senator Jordan of North Carolina, is preparing to give up the ghost in its "investigation" of the Bobby Baker scandal. Apparently the committee, or the controlling members of the committee, have had enough. They don't want to develop the whole truth for the edification of the public.

"The excuse offered is that there are no other useful witnesses who might be called. This is nonsense.

"What about Senators? What about party girls? What about unexplored statements regarding campaign funds? What about Jay McDonnell, who was fired as assistant to Bobby Baker because he didn't agree with all aspects of the Baker method of operation? What about a lobbyist named I. Irving Davidson, who might have some important testimony to give?

"Most important of all, what about Walter Jenkins, long-time aide to Lyndon B. Johnson?

"Senator Williams, Republican of Delaware, has just given the committee an affidavit from Don R. Reynolds, Silver Spring insurance man, which raises grave questions respecting Mr. Jenkins. Shouldn't these be explored--at least to the extent of trying to pin down the truth?

"And what about the deal in which Mr. Reynolds said he bought \$1,280 worth of useless advertising time on the Johnson television station in Texas after he had sold a \$100,000 life insurance policy to Mr. Johnson? Mr. Reynolds has testified under oath that he discussed this advertising project with Mr. Jenkins. Mr. Jenkins has never been called to testify. But he has denied in a sworn statement that he had "any knowledge" of the arrangements between Mr. Reynolds and the station.

"Is this not important? Mr. Jenkins was a Senate employe at the time. Why has he not at least been called as a witness and cross-examined in an effort to clear up this apparent discrepancy? Mr. Reynolds undoubtedly paid for the time. Somebody made the arrangements. Why is the committee so afraid to explore the matter?

"White wash is a useful commodity for sprucing up fences and outbuildings. But it serves only one purpose in this instance--to leave in the public mind a deep and

fully justified suspicion that the Senate Rules Committee is trying to cover up a major scandal with far-reaching ramifications." This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas
http://dolearchives.ku.edu

Scandals in any administration should be uncovered but can they be when a reluctant, foot dragging majority party is in power. Despite Democrat wishful thinking and the apparent success the Secretary of Agriculture had in "whitewashing" the Billie Sol Estes case there will be further revelations about the affairs Billy and Bobby and those involved with them, and before someone cries "politics" let me point out that 2 dedicated U.S.D.A. employees, both Democrats, blew the whistle in the Estes case and that Bobby Bakers buddies--not Republican sniping caused the Baker bubble to burst. Just 2 days ago Senator Mansfield (Democratic Senate Leader) stated the Baker case would be a major campaign issue

AGRICULTURE

Farmers represent the only segment of the American economy which has taken a pay cut in each of the last two years. Virtually every other group--labor, business, professional people and government employees--showed increased earnings over the same period.

The Administration supported, but Congress did not approve a mammoth pay increase for top government officials, federal judges and Members of Congress. I could not understand the kind of economy that calls for saving a few dollars a month by turning off lights at the White House and also calls for \$10,000-a-year pay boosts for Senators and Congressmen, Cabinet Officers and Federal Judges.

In his budget message, President Johnson announced that expenditures by the U.S. Department of Agriculture would be cut by approximately \$1.3 billion in the next fiscal year and while I don't believe this will happen, it is a matter of cold statistics that farm income is dropping and certain to go lower. It was impossible to justify a pay increase of nearly 50 per cent to already highly-paid public officials at the same time that millions of farmers, mainly in the low and middle income groups, are taking what amounts to an actual pay cut. Cattlemen have been especially hard hit, and wheat producers will be next.

Eleven years ago, as a United States Senator from Texas, Lyndon B. Johnson was much more concerned with cattle prices than he seems to be today as President. On May 27, 1953, he placed the following statement in the Congressional Record: Page 7 of 13

"There is growing concern among the cattlemen of Texas over the continuing downward trend of cattle prices. Many of these cattlemen of my state, especially those with relatively small herds and no other source of income, are facing economic ruin. Yet there seems little general recognition of this fact."

The problems confronting the livestock industry today are even more serious. Back in 1953, it was drought which forced heavy marketings of cattle from the range country at depressed prices. Now it is record-breaking importations of beef and veal, coupled with the delayed action results of the government's own corn dumping program of 1961-62, which have wrecked the cattle market.

This week, choice steers brought \$22.75 per hundred pounds in Chicago--\$6 less than in 1961. In recent weeks, heavy prime steers sold at the lowest levels since OPA controls were ended 18 years ago.

Many cattle feeders lost from \$20 to \$50 per head on every steer they marketed in recent months. This, naturally, has sharply depressed prices for feeder cattle. The fall-out is also felt in the dairying areas of the country. Cows which would have been culled and shipped to the packinghouse, if beef prices were favorable, are instead kept in the herd, contributing further to Secretary Orville Freeman's already more than ample supply of dairy products. Many cattle feeders who grow their own corn are preparing to deliver it to the Department of Agriculture under the loan program, rather than utilize it on the farm.

The collapse in cattle prices has been further aggravated by the failure of the Administration to take effective action against mounting imports of foreign beef. In fact, the so-called "voluntary" agreements recently concluded with Australia, New Zealand and Ireland actually insure that by 1966 beef and veal importations will reach a new record high.

Last year about 11 per cent of the beef consumed in the United States was produced abroad. The effects of this are being felt not only by cattle feeders and ranchers but by cash grain growers, as well. It has been estimated that if the meats imported into the United States in 1963 had been produced here instead, about 200 million bushels of our feed grain surplus would have been utilized in the process.

Adding insult to injury, Secretary of Commerce Luther H. Hodges, speaking in Fargo, North Dakota, advised American cattlemen to quit "whining" about beef imports and get to work selling beef to other countries. What the Secretary apparently does not realize is that virtually all of the countries where American beef might be in demand have import levies and quotas designed to protect their own producers from outside competition. There is a strong trend in the Common Market countries, for example, toward tighter restrictions on agricultural imports.

The United States is less protectionist on farm imports than any other major industrial nation. Trade between the nations should be a two-way street, however. It is becoming increasingly evident--as witness the recent meat import agreements--that we are being "out-negotiated" on the agricultural trade front.

The Johnson Administration should be thinking more about the problems confronting American farmers and less about the plight of farmers in other countries. Obviously the tariff negotiators of other nations are thinking of their own producers first.

The cattle industry is the largest single source of U.S. farm income. Today it is a sick industry. Many cattlemen, especially the smaller ones, are in deep financial trouble. Their difficulties may become even worse. None of this had to happen. The problems of American cattlemen have been brought on primarily by the feed grain programs of the Department of Agriculture and the tariff policies of the State Department.

The time has come for Congress to tighten import restrictions on foreign beef and veal. Obviously the Administration will not act to protect the cattle industry, as witness its opposition to including in the pending farm bill an amendment to restrict meat importations.

Last year, I introduced legislation to impose quota and set higher import duties on foreign meats. We couldn't even get a hearing.

Now farm state Democrats are falling over each other to introduce similar bills. Make no mistake, however, this is just window-dressing. This Administration, is not going to support effective import controls, but will keep the cattlemen hoping so until after the November election.

WHEAT

Today we are caught in the dilemma of whether "something is better than nothing" when the "something" has never been explained to the American wheat producer and the

"nothing" is what Secretary Freeman has promised if farmers don't yield. You have

heard a lot about the \$2.00 wheat bill and many have written asking me to vote
it
for/but I cannot because the Administration is not advocating any such measure.

Before the House now is the Senate passed "Wheat-Cotton" package and the Southerners who control the House Agriculture Committee will next Thursday ask fellow Southerner, Judge Howard Smith, Chairman, House Rules Committee to send the bill to the House floor without permitting it to go to the House Agriculture Committee for further study and even the offering of Amendments which would strengthen it. Now this is a bit unusual particularly when we consider that Southern Democrats in the Senate have been objecting for 7 days because the Civil Rights Bill was taken up on the Senate floor without first going to the Judiciary Committee for hearings.

Frankly none I know of support the wheat bill with enthusiasm and many who profess to support it do so by exclaiming what other measures to not do and what Congressmen should do. It is certainly difficult to strengthen any measure when the Administration calls all the signals, when Republicans suggestions are ignored and when steamroller tactics are employed. I still intend to make every effort possible to strengthen the bill and eliminate undesirable features of it-- and you have a right to expect me to.

I do not know what will happen if the bill is defeated but frankly feel chances of enacting wheat legislation and improving the present measure would be better if it was not attached to the monstrous cotton bill which pays millions in subsidies to textile mills. Good wheat legislation is essential to our economy and sometime this afternoon I am hopeful those interested can get together with me for a further discussion of pending legislation and possible amendments which would strengthen it.

WHAT'S AHEAD IN '64?

The Nation's Capital is long accustomed to "Stagecraft in government", and the budget presented by the President should be kept in mind when the "Oscar" nominations are made later this year for the "Best Sound Effects". There were shifts in spending, moving from fiscal '65 to the present year to make the President's new budget seem lower, such as the \$550-million in military purchases.

There was "bubbly" optimism on the federal tax take next year, all based on a business upturn that may fall short of White House expectations, as in the past, and more than a quarter billion dollars anticipated in special federal fees was based on

schemes that are by no means sure of congressional approval. As more experienced colleagues pointed out, too, "Don't forget the 'supplemental appropriation request' which still lies in President Johnson's bag of tricks which would permit him to come back to the Hill for more money." Nevertheless, this political sleight of hand was effective, it apparently impressed the business community, and many wonder with amazement how President Johnson managed to whack a net of \$500-million off President Kennedy's last budget in an era of rising costs. Briefly, the cuts came in Defense (\$1.1-billion), Agriculture (\$1.2-billion), the VA (\$283-million), Post Office (\$71-million), AEC (\$65-million), Housing Agency (\$63-million), and State Department (\$3-million). Most other agencies and departments held even or increased their totals with the Space Agency jumping by a whopping \$590-million to nearly \$5-billion for the coming year. The biggest single item in the budget (\$52.3-billion this year), the defense establishment was the logical target for reductions. Because of a proposed cutback in nuclear weapons production, plus huge spending of the past three years, Secretary McNamara was able to hand the President the \$51.2-billion level he sought.

President Johnson knows the climate of America and that in an election year economy is always a popular plank. The big cut came in Agriculture, but this was also true in fiscal '64 when the budget estimate was \$5.8-billion and actual expenditures were about \$7.3-billion. Just one case in point is the Food Stamp Plan recently passed by the House Agriculture Committee. Lyndon plugged for it in the State of the Union message, but it is necessary to point out it will cost \$100-million the first year if approved; so should have been mentioned in his budget message.

How can there be all the spending cuts and at the same time a massive attack on poverty and an "across-the-board" endorsement of every old--and many new--programs.

Let us not forget LBJ's budget, despite its fiscal magic, tops Eisenhower's last budget by some \$16.4-billion, and also that while his budget of \$97.9-billion purports to be \$500-million less than the current budget in terms of actual spending, it is expected to be \$5.4-billion more.

In his "economy" budget, President Johnson asks for \$103.7-billion in new obligational authority, \$5.4 billion more than the \$98.3 billion Congress approved for the current '64 budget year. Economists say it is the comparison of these

figures which reveals the "moment of truth" in any federal budget. In addition to the \$98.3 billion already approved for this fiscal year, President Johnson has asked for \$4.2 billion in supplemental appropriations which can be spent any time, but are budgeted into the current year's spending in order to hold down the spending authority requests for next year.

While his budget message proclaims that 17,000 civilians are to be slashed from Defense Department employment, the same document also discloses another 15,800 will be added in non-defense jobs; hence the net cut of 1,200 is not really an overwhelming figure. A typical non-defense increase is the 4,730 employees to be added to the Department of HEW. When we consider the total federal employees anticipated by the '65 budget to be 2,511,200, there will be an actual increase of 21,000 more than worked for Uncle Sam in '63; but if non-defense employees alone are totaled, the increase between '63 and '65 is more than 48,000.

STATISTICAL APPENDIX

Since the dawn of the twentieth century--64 years ago--Republican Administrations has occupied the White House for 34 years; Democrats 30. Yet Republicans have accomplished 22 balanced budgets; the Democrats only 3. Democrats have accounted for \$293 billion in cumulative budget deficits; Republicans barely \$14 billion. Republicans accept responsibility for 4.4 percent of our national debt; Democrats must shoulder the blame for 95.6 percent. Average unemployment under Republican Administrations is 5.6 percent; under Democrats, 8.5 percent. Average unemployment under President Eisenhower's Administration was 4.9 percent; unemployment in the three Democrat years since President Eisenhower left office has shot up to 6 percent. Republicans have reduced taxes eight times; Democrats only twice. Republicans have have raised taxes only twice; Democrats have raised taxes 13 times.

Finally, when all the oratory is finished, three major wars have been fought under Democrat Presidents; none under Republicans.

DEMOCRAT RECORDS

"We are willing to submit the record to the people." --Vice President Lyndon B. Johnson, New York Daily News, September 23, 1963

Record High Spending - Each day the Democrats have been in office since President Eisenhower left the White House they have spent \$50 million per day over and above

what Ike spent.

This document is from the collections at the Dole Archives, University of Kansas
<http://dolearchives.ku.edu>

Record Taxes - The Internal Revenue Service announced last October 31 that \$106 billion in taxes was collected in fiscal 1963. "This is the greatest amount ever collected by any country in history," the agency said.

Record High Cost of Living - The Labor Department reported last year the consumer price index had risen well above 107.1, based on the 1957-59 period, thus establishing the highest cost of living in history.

Other new records established by the Democrats as 1964 opened:

Record Lowest Value of the Dollar - (43¢ of the 1937-39 dollar)

Record National Debt Limit - (\$315 billion)

Record Agriculture-control borrowings - (Commodity Credit Corporation borrowings stood at \$14.4 billion in 1963; legal limit is \$14.5 billion)

Record highest peacetime budget - (\$98.7 billion for fiscal 1964)

Record Decline in U.S. gold reserves - (at slightly over \$15 billion, now stand at their lowest point since the 1930's)

Record Increase and Number of Civilian Government Workers - (over 2.5 million, highest ever in peacetime)

Record all-time High Welfare Rolls - (6.7 million Americans were on public welfare rolls in 1962, as reported April 3, 1963, by the Department of HEW. Cost to all levels of government \$4.1 billion)

Record Increase and Number of nonfarm home foreclosures - (in 1963 stood at their highest point since the 1930's).

END