The original documents are located in Box D35, folder "Fifth District Weekly Radio Reports, 1966" of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Digitized from Box D35 of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

5th District radio tape Jan. 26, 1966

[redacted]

Translating the complicated budget into simple terms..... it would mean Americans will pay more for everything. Under the spending program contemplated by the White House, the cost of living would increase two percent.

In its decisions on the budget, Congress must consider the impact of the sharp increase in Federal spending on the economy in which inflationary pressures are already strong.

If the White House will not tackle the problem of higher living costs by restraining federal spending, the Congress must.

I believe Congress must support all necessary funds for national security. At the same time, I believe in setting priorities at home without sacrificing the proven needs of theAmerican people.... all the people.

During the coming weeks, I will have other reports on the federal budget, which should have the strong attention of all Americans.

Thank you for listening. This is your Congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking with you from Washington.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

I find it hard to understand how the national government can ask business and labor to avoid price and wage increases, which are measured in terms of millions of dollars, when it is increasing non-defense spending by many billions of dollars.

I regret that the President did not see fit to indicate in his budget any system of priority to assist Congress in reducing the less essential and less urgent items of expenditures.

Fifth District Radio Talk

(for taping WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 26, 1966)

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington for the first time by radio since the second session of the 89th Congress opened. Thanks to the splendid cooperation of Grand Rapids radio stations in Kent & Ionia Counties in broadcasting these messages as a public service, I can keep you informed on major happenings in the Congress.

A most important topic of conversation is the $112.8 billion-dollar-budget President Johnson sent to the Congress the past week. The financial document should receive careful and critical scrutiny by the Appropriations Committees of the House and Senate...and by the entire Congress.

The enormous + complicated budget sought by the President calls for a sharp increase in military spending, a substantial expansion of federal welfare programs, and a $6.2 billion tax plan to help pay the cost.

The President expressed hope that the record budget will produce sharp domestic growth without inflation. He pledged to seek what he called "appropriate" fiscal measures---presumably higher taxes and a hold-down of domestic spending---- if as he said "unforeseen inflationary pressures develop."

-more-

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Fifth District Radio Message

(for taping Feb. 2, 1966)

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from the Nation's Capitol.

There is much comment here, and I'm certain elsewhere, about the President's recommendation that the term of a Representative in Congress be extended from two to four years.

Most of the arguments [redacted] in favor of the idea stress the convenience it would provide legislators and their families. Some say the longer term would reduce the energy and money spent in campaigning every other year. Others argue that a Representative would become more of an expert in legislative affairs by serving a four-year term.

However, I believe in more solid considerations.

I prefer the two-year term to keep the Congressman close to those who elect him and to all those he represents.

Every two years is not too often for a Congressman to put his record on the line and seek the endorsement of the electorate. It seems to me that a two-year term gives the people an important opportunity to have a more direct and stronger voice in government.

Mr. Johnson's suggestion that all Congressmen be elected with the President and serve during his four-year term is receiving less support. Many writers recognize that the United States does not have a parliamentary form of government as in England where the prime minister as head of government is the leader of the majority party in the House of Commons.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

5th Dist. radio message 2/2/66

Our Constitution separates the legislative and executive powers. It sets up a system of checks and balances. We want our Congress to exercise independent judgment and protect us from one-party or one-man rule. If we are to have the four-year term, at least one-half of the Representatives should be elected every two years.

Another major issue is the President's proposal to alter the present electoral college system. He would simply eliminate electors as such in order to prevent any member of the Electoral College from voting for someone other than the candidate of his political party.

Each state would retain its electoral votes and the candidate who receives the most popular votes would still get all the electoral votes. This fact should disturb those who are devoted to the "one-man, one-vote" theory. But the President ignores it.

It is interesting to note that only six times in our history did an electoral college member exercise his independence and vote differently than he was pledged.

However, In 14 presidential elections since 1824 the winner received less than 50 percent of the popular votes and in three instances the victor obtained fewer votes than his leading opponent. If we are to amend the constitutional provision relative to the electoral system, we ought to meet this more serious problem.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

more

If Mr. Johnson is truly devoted to the principle of "one-man,one-vote," he would advocate the election of the President by direct popular vote with a "run off" if necessary to obtain majority rule.

An alternative proposal calls for proportional representation in the electoral college. If two candidates receive 60 percent and 40 percent of a state's popular vote, they would get 60 and 40 percent respectively of the state's electoral vote. I supported this plan when I first came to Congress and I endorse it today.

Thank you for listening. This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington.

# # #

Fifth District Radio message

(for taping Feb. 7 or 8)

should be taped on Tuesday

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford with a report from Washington.

When President Johnson described his proposed foreign aid program as one---in his words--- "to carry forward the best of what we are now doing in the less-developed world, and to cut out the worst," I believe most agreed with him.

However, the "cuts" mentioned by the President must be genuine, effective and deep.

Our mutual security program---with some exceptions---has served a useful purpose and I have supported its basic principles. But we now have sufficient evidence to show that substantial reductions in spending can be made without materially weakening any good which may be accomplished.

I am certain that the President's request for $3.4 billion can, and should be, cut considerable by the Congress..... especially in view of our war expenditures and Mr. Johnson's insistence on increasing non-defense spending.

I am also pleased to have the President stress in his message to Congress on foreign aid that---in his words--- "we must concentrate on countries not hostile to us that give solid evidence that they are determined to help themselves." ...I emphasize that the burden of proof on cooperation and constructive results must rest with the countries receiving our help.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Our financial aid must go only to those countries not hostile to us. But, the President could have gone further to insist that our tax dollars go only to those nations which are helpful to us in the Vietnamese war. Furthermore, I cannot justify, nor support, any assistance to those nations which in any way help the North Vietnamese aggressors.

Here in Washington, among Congressmen, and all over the nation, the war in Viet Nam is a major topic of thought and conversation.

President Johnson as Commander-in-Chief directs the war, I support his position of strength against Communist aggression. I will oppose those who support a policy of appeasement--- a weakness which led to World War II. But I do not think we should get bogged down in a massive land war in Southeast Asia.

I have long supported bipartisanship in foreign policy. But, bipartisanship is a two-way affair. It does not involve accepting decisions without first participating in full, frank discussion of the facts upon which those decisions are made.

As the late Senator Arthur Vandenberg once said, in reaching a truly acceptable bipartisan policy "total information must be made available to Congress and the country...and Congress must completely explore and approve the measures by which the President's policy is to be implemented."

From the public viewpoint, there has not been this completeness of disclosure during the Viet Nam struggle.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Not until the 1966 State of the Union message was there full, official Presidential indication that the effect ~~shedding of American blood~~ in Viet Nam could well last----in Mr. Johnson's words--- "for years."

Congressional leaders were invited to meet with the President prior to his decision to resume bombing of North Viet Nam. However, there was not the same degree of communication when the President decided to order an extended pause in such bombings.

As Senator Vandenberg said upon another occasion..."we'll stand by you on the crash landings but would like to be consulted at the take-off."

As to the President's recent trip to Hawaii for a meeting with South Vietnamese leaders...I hope this conference will lead to a prompt, honorable and lasting peace--all other Administration efforts having failed thus far.

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from the Nation's Capital. Thanks for listening. Tune in next week, same time, same station, for another report from Washington.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Used 2-15-66

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 5 February 14, 1966

VIETNAM: WHAT'S NEXT?

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

As the seriousness of the war in Vietnam becomes more obvious to everyone, I believe that Americans, more and more, are becoming concerned about the scope of our military effort in that far-off part of the world. At this moment, more than 200,000 American boys are serving in uniform in South Vietnam -- and there is increasing talk here in Washington that this number may reach 400,000 in only a few months.

As I pointed out last week, we must not abandon our commitment in South Vietnam. Yet, as casualty lists grow, questions about the conflict become inevitable. For example:

Why do our United States Government officials -- the ones responsible for conducting the war -- contradict themselves on how we are doing?

Why aren't our so-called allies helping us more?

Why aren't the nations directly affected by the outcome of the war sending men and supplies to bolster our efforts?

The stakes in Southeast Asia are enormous. What would happen if we pulled out of that war-racked area?

First, Malaysia would undoubtedly fall to the Communists, perhaps overnight. This would mean that Red China would dominate the straits of Malacca where more than 12,000 ships a year pass through. Closing the straits could be a fatal blow to India, the Phillppines, and Japan.

Burma would then be a sitting duck for Mao's armies and Indonesian Dictator Sukarno could control the communications lines between the Philippines and Australia. Thailand, already advertised by the Communists as a takeover target, would be next in line.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

These are facts. They are known to all the free world. But are the nations of the free world helping us? Most are not. Many of them are actually giving aid and comfort to our enemies by permitting their ships to transport cargo to the Communists in North Vietnam.

Here is to me a tragic fact: In 1965, there were more free world ships docking at the North Vietnam port of Haiphong than there were Communist ships! We have a huge fleet surrounding North Vietnam yet we let them through without a murmur.

Many of us in Congress have been insisting that the Administration act to prevent this Allied trade with North Vietnam. This week, the State Department took some action--although far short of what is necessary. The Department announced that any ship which carries supplies to North Vietnam will be denied U.S. Government-financed cargoes. But that's all.

We could--and should--do a lot more. For example, why not deny use of United States ports to any ship which carries any kind of cargo to the enemy? There's no question we need some toughness in our policy. American boys are being killed on the battlefield by an enemy being helped by our so-called Allies.

To date, only Australia, New Zealand and South Korea have put troops in the field to help us in Vietnam. Surely, it is past time that we insisted on a showdown--that we demanded that the nations of the free world share in the manpower burden. At the very least, we should tell our so-called Allies that the port of Haiphong is closed and business as usual with the enemy is a thing of the past.

Without question, we must continue to fight Communist aggression ~~wherever it arises~~. But, in the case of Vietnam, must we fight with one arm tied behind our back?

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio).

###

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 5 February 14, 1966

VIETNAM: WHAT'S NEXT?

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

As the seriousness of the war in Vietnam becomes more obvious to everyone, I believe that Americans, more and more, are becoming concerned about the scope of our military effort in that far-off part of the world. At this moment, more than 200,000 American boys are serving in uniform in South Vietnam -- and there is increasing talk here in Washington that this number may reach 400,000 in only a few months.

As I pointed out last week, we must not abandon our commitment in South Vietnam. Yet, as casualty lists grow, questions about the conflict become inevitable. For example:

Why do our United States Government officials -- the ones responsible for conducting the war -- contradict themselves on how we are doing?

Why aren't our so-called allies helping us more?

Why aren't the nations directly affected by the outcome of the war sending men and supplies to bolster our efforts?

The stakes in Southeast Asia are enormous. What would happen if we pulled out of that war-racked area?

First, Malaysia would undoubtedly fall to the Communists, perhaps overnight. This would mean that Red China would dominate the straits of Malacca where more than 12,000 ships a year pass through. Closing the straits could be a fatal blow to India, the Philippines, and Japan.

Burma would then be a sitting duck for Mao's armies and Indonesian Dictator Sukarno could control the communications lines between the Philippines and Australia. Thailand, already advertised by the Communists as a takeover target, would be next in line.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

These are facts. They are known to all the free world. But are the nations of the free world helping us? Most are not. Many of them are actually giving aid and comfort to our enemies by permitting their ships to transport cargo to the Communists in North Vietnam.

Here is to me a tragic fact: In 1965, there were more free world ships docking at the North Vietnam port of Haiphong than there were Communist ships! We have a huge fleet surrounding North Vietnam yet we let them through without a murmur.

Many of us in Congress have been insisting that the Administration act to prevent this Allied trade with North Vietnam. This week, the State Department took some action--although far short of what is necessary. The Department announced that any ship which carries supplies to North Vietnam will be denied U.S. Government-financed cargoes. But that's all.

We could--and should--do a lot more. For example, why not deny use of United States ports to any ship which carries any kind of cargo to the enemy? There's no question we need some toughness in our policy. American boys are being killed on the battlefield by an enemy being helped by our so-called Allies.

To date, only Australia, New Zealand and South Korea have put troops in the field to help us in Vietnam. Surely, it is past time that we insisted on a showdown--that we demanded that the nations of the free world share in the manpower burden. At the very least, we should tell our so-called Allies that the port of Haiphong is closed and business as usual with the enemy is a thing of the past.

Without question, we must continue to fight Communist aggression wherever it arises. But, in the case of Vietnam, must we fight with one arm tied behind our back?

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio).

###

Used 2-23-66

5th District Radio
today

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 6 February 21, 1966

A LITTLE INFLATION?

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

Today, I want to discuss with you one of the [redacted]-political gimmicks of our time. ~~It was dreamed up, I suppose, by some Federal public relations expert.~~ It is a gimmick that has cost the American people plenty.

The gimmick is this: When some branch of the Federal Government--or some policy of the Federal Government--is likely to prove unpopular, it can be made palatable by giving it a respectable-sounding, fancy, technical label or name. For instance, the old-fashioned and unpopular title, "tax-collector"--unpopular since the day that Caesar Augustus sent out a decree that we, the world, should be taxed--has been changed to the rather awe-inspiring "Internal Revenue Agent." But don't let that fool you. He's still the tax-collector--and he still collects and collects and collects.

A policy that has cost the American people plenty--one which has been made somewhat acceptable and almost respectable by a technical label--is the policy of creeping inflation. It was sold to the American people by the slogan "a little inflation won't hurt you."

For a moment, let us consider the words "a little inflation" and ask ourselves how little is little? Consider these figures:

Between December, 1961, and December, 1965, the cost of such household staples as tomatoes rose 50 per cent. Pork chops rose 23 per cent. These are national averages, by the way, in many parts of the country prices increased even more. The price of potatoes rose 21 per cent. Coffee rose 15 per cent, eggs slightly over 10 per cent. Non-food household necessities and services also took a sharp rise. The price of men's shoes jumped 12 per cent. The dry-cleaning bill for a man's suit increased by eight per cent. A man's hair cut, a woman's permanent wave increased in price by 11 per cent. Cigarette prices also rose 11 per cent and adult movie admissions 17 per cent.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

The trouble with a little inflation is that it never stays little. Once it is accepted as a national way of life, it gets out of hand. Unless the Federal Government takes definite steps to contain it, it hurts those who can least afford to be hurt--people in a law income group and our older people who have to rely on a fixed income.

Inflation, in short, is "legalized robbery." It steals from a man's or woman's pocketbook just as blatantly as any professional pick-pocket. Every day, inflation steals a sizable percentage of all a man earns. Remember the figures I quoted--tomatoes up 50 per cent, pork chops up 23 per cent, potatoes up 21 per cent and on and on.

And we're in for even more trouble ahead. The wholesale price index, which reflects prices retailers pay before adding on potential profit, jumped 3.6 percent last year and another one-half of one percent in the first six weeks of this year alone--forecasting even more rapidly-rising consumer prices to come in 196. What is so shocking about this increase is that over the seven-year period from 1958 to 1965 this index rose only one percent!

The causes of inflation are only too well-known--Federal extravagance, Federal deficits, Federal borrowing, and Federal spending, just to mention a few. The Administration is coolly ignoring this fact. Embarked on a policy of "spend now, pay later," it is shutting its eyes to the robbery technique inflation has developed.

There is no greater thief than inflation. The man who put aside some money for a rainy day or for retirement, for example, found his savings had lost two percent of their purchasing power last year alone.

If inflation continues at that rate for 20 years, one dollar in every three saved would simply vanish.

Why? One reason is that we haven't had a balanced Federal budget since 1961. With a war on in Vietnam we must now, more than ever, cut back on unnecessary spending. We must make sure that our policies abroad are not undermined here at home by inflation.

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio).

###

Fifth District Radio script

for taping March 2, 1966

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington.

After weeks of public debate, Congress has overwhelmingly approved an emergency $4.8 billion bill to finance the Viet Nam War. I voted for this spending because I believe in a policy of firmness against Communist aggression. However, I believe Congress must keep a close watch on the way the money is used under the direction of President Johnson, the Commander-in-Chief ~~the commandxz~~ conducting this war. We did NOT give him a blank check, but we did reaffirm our support of the fighting men in Vet Nam.

I emphasize that I oppose a blind escalation of force that may pull us toward a wider war. The goal of the United States, as I see it it, is two-fold---- we must prevent the success of aggression and the forceful conquest of South Viet Nam by a tough, well-trained, determined Communist enemy.

In voting for the emergency spending bill, I did so believing that the people of South Viet Nam should have an opportunity to live their lives in peace under a government of their own choice--free from Communistist aggression.

I am deeply disturbed with the deep division with the party of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration at this crucial time in our history. The bickering and political brawling is prolonging the war...this type of conduct denies essential support to our fighting men, delays the time when we can bring our troops home, and encourages the enemy.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

must be disavowed by

I believe the President ~~should~~ ~~disavow~~ those within his party who would

The Democratic party

divide this country asthey have divided his ~~own political empire~~ at

a time when national unity is so desperately needed.

America and the world await decisive action by the President to take

command of the situation, Until he regains control of his own party

the confusion will grow and a peaceful solution will elude us.

Although I voted in favor of expanding financial support of our military

efforts in Viet Nam, I insist on cutting corners at home....non-essential

spending must be stopped.

For example, I am disturbed to see such a strong move to build or buy

a second White House---an executive mansion----for the Vice President

when the Nation is called upon to make sacrifices in support of the

Johnson-Humphrey Administration's war effort. There is official talk of

using up to a million dollars of hard-earned taxpayer's money to provide

an elaborate mansion for the Vice President. I see no need to rush into

this kind of spending at this time.

Also, it is somewhat appalling to learn that the President plans to

spend a large amount of public money to refurbish and spruce up

two luxury yachts for cruising on the Potomac River. There is also a

another economy

provision in the Commander-in-Chief's budget for an expensive private

airplane for his personal use..... I believe that ~~economy~~ in government

should start in the White House to set an example for the vast jungle

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

of bureaucratic agencies..... buying an executive mansion for the Vice President, providing luxurious ~~xxxxxx~~ yachts, and ~~a private airplane~~ another for the President fails to set this kind of economic cut-back.

Americans are starting to pay their income taxes to the federal government. They are learning that Washington-generated spending is cutting into their savings and ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ forcing them to reduce their buying of the necessities of life.

As the Viet Nam war continues, ~~xxxxx~~ with the President commanding our part in it, we may be called upon to make more personal sacrifices. Therefore, I believe non-essential spending in government must be curtailed and in many instances stopped. The leadership for this kind of common-sense economy should come from the White House.

This is your congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington. Thanks for listening.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

5th District Radio Tape March 9th

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 8 March 7, 1966

DIVISION OVER VIETNAM

This is your Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington.

Without question, the war in Vietnam concerns--and is of concern--to every American. I doubt if there is a family in the country today that isn't discussing, with deep concern, our involvement there. The questions they are asking themselves are these: Are we really fighting to win over there? Why are members of the President's own party so deeply divided over his Vietnam policies? And why is our own government telling us one thing one day and something else the next?

The country is bewildered and alarmed by the contradictions and confusions that seem to have become an integral part of the Vietnamese war. I do not think I am exaggerating when I say that it has reached the point where every official Administration statement on the war is regarded with suspicion.

Let me remind you of some of these "official statements."

In the Spring of 1963, Secretary of Defense McNamara, returning from a visit to South Vietnam, said--quote--"Every quantative measurement that we have shows that we are winning the war."

In his 1963 State of the Union message, President Kennedy said--quote--"The spear-point of aggression has been blunted in South Vietnam."

In October of 1963, Secretary McNamara said that a thousand of the 16,000 American troops then in South Vietnam would be brought home by the end of that year and the major part of the military job would be finished by 1965.

How wrong can these men be? And they are the men responsible for conducting the war. Finished by 1965? By Christmas of 1965 more than 200,000 American soldiers were fighting in the swamps, rice-paddies and jungles of South Vietnam.

And to make the confusion worse, a Democratic Senator, who is a former member of President Johnson's own Cabinet, has suggested that we give the Communists some power and responsibility in a coalition government in South Vietnam. What's more, an advisor to the President,

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

who is our former Ambassador to Saigon, seemed to agree with the Senator's suggestion.

How short a memory these men must have! Don't they remember what happened to those countries after World War II where Communists were admitted to a share of responsibility and power? To Poland, to Rumania, to Bulgaria, to Czechoslovakia? The Communists, having gained a foothold, seized power in every single one of them.

We have only to look at Laos, which borders Vietnam, to see the havoc that such a coalition can produce. For, our Government engineered a coalition government involving the Communists in that country in 1962. Today, Laos is in turmoil and the North Vietnamese move supplies and men into South Vietnam along the Ho Chi Minh Trail, which cuts through Laos.

Let me quote to you a statement adopted the other day by the House Republican Policy Committee--a statement to which I fully subscribe, by the way--about the feuding in the Democratic Party and the effect it is having on the country. Quote--"The deep division within the Democratic Party over American policy in Vietnam is prolonging the war, undermining the morale of our fighting men and encouraging the Communist aggressor. It has...led North Vietnam to believe that in time we may falter, that we do not have the necessary will or determination to win. As a result, the peace that this nation and the free world seeks has been delayed, the fighting intensified, the threat of a major war deepened." Unquote.

Strong words? Yes. But only too true.

I think it is high time that the President clear the air over the Vietnam controversy by disavowing the divided elements in his own party. I believe it is time for him to clarify for the American people just what are the Administration's goals and policies in Southeast Asia. In short, where are we headed, Mr. President?

This is Congressman Jerry Ford reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 9 March 14, 1966

THOMAS JEFFERSON'S LEGACY

(Note: The following script may provide material for a radio or TV report to your District during the week of Jefferson's birthday which falls on April 13).

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

As we observe the two-hundred and twenty-third anniversary of Thomas Jefferson's birth this year--on April 13th--I consider it strange that the present national Administration in Washington is making claim to the squire of Monticello as one of its own. For, it seems to me, there is something ironic in a situation where a man of Jefferson's political and economic beliefs should be considered one of the patron political saints of an Administration that has gone into debt with such carefree abandon.

I wonder, for example, how comfortable Jefferson would have felt at one of today's Cabinet meetings. I have an idea that he would have been distinctly at odds with the elite of the so-called Great Society.

His speeches and writings are--to put it mildly--an indication that he wouldn't have been altogether happy with such expensive frills as a Vice-Presidential palace costing three quarters of a billion dollars.

In a letter written in 1799, Jefferson said--quote--"I am for a government rigorously frugal and simple, applying all the possible savings of the public revenue to the discharge of the national debt; and not for a multiplication of officers and salaries merely to make partisans, and not for increasing, by every device, the public debt, on the principle of its being a public blessing."

That's the end of the quote--but let me repeat those last words--"not for increasing the public debt on the principle of its being a public blessing." Shades of the Great Society which is rooted in debt and whose soil is fertilized with deficit spending!

And again Jefferson said--and I quote--"I place economy among the first and most important virtues, and public debt as the greatest of dangers to be faced. To preserve our independence, we must not let our rulers load us with perpetual debt. We must make our choice between

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

economy and liberty or profusion and servitude." Unquote.

"But times have changed" is the excuse the big spenders use to justify their tax increases and their big Federal budgets. I agree that times have changed, but I do not agree that the fundamentals of sound and honest government have changed. I do not believe that the times have transmuted debt from a burden into a panacea for every human ill. I honor Jefferson for expounding some of the soundest views on public policy ever set forth by a public figure. I especially honor him for these two forthright and courageous statements--quote--"When all government, domestic and foreign, in little as in great things, shall be drawn to Washington as the center of all power, it will...become as venal and oppressive as the government from which we separated."

And for this one--quote--"I think we have more machinery of government than is necessary, too many parasites living on the labor of the industrious."

Jefferson's belief in what he called "The Holy Cause of Freedom" was deep and sincere. He brought all his wisdom and political experience to the cause of maintaining freedom and to expounding the dangers that freedom faced. The author of our Declaration of Independence had lived under tyranny. He knew that unless the great American experiment of democracy succeeded the cause of freedom around the world would suffer a death blow. Again and again, he warned against excessive central government. Again and again, he warned against debt. Changing times cannot affect the basic political truths that Jefferson laid down.

Debts, at certain times and certain financial crises, are unavoidable. But living in debt as a national way of life, as though debt were a "public blessing," is like building a house on the banks of a river noted for its floods. It is courting the danger of complete collapse.

While the President's party may claim Thomas Jefferson, there are many today who would find Jefferson's membership in such free-wheeling company hard to believe. In fact, I feel that the party of the Great Society has left Thomas Jefferson and the principles for which he stood. And I would like to welcome him into the ranks of the GOP.

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

###

RADIO SCRIPT FOR FIFTH DISTRICT STATIONS

for taping March 15, 1966

My friends of the fifth congressional district. This is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

I'd like to talk with you today about a speech that Treasury Secretary Fowler made the other day in Detroit.

Mr. Fowler said, in effect: "Inflation is not here; prices are just rising."

Well, now, that's an interesting way to put it. But you and I know that inflation is here because we see it spelled out in ~~capital letters~~ the price tags every time we go to the grocery store.

Whatever Mr. Fowler calls it--whether or not he uses the nasty word--inflation is inflation. Nobody likes it--least of all Republicans. We do not feel, as some liberals do, that "a little inflation is a good thing."

It's easy to understand why Mr. Fowler spoke as he did in Detroit. He doesn't want anybody to get excited about inflation. Neither do we, unless there's good reason to be excited--and we believe there is, because the American people are getting hurt.

There are two ways to look at inflation. Either you're an apologist or a realist.

Mr. Fowler is an apologist for inflation, and this is natural. He is a high official in the Johnson administration--the administration that is doing too little, too late about rising prices. These are price increases that are nibbling away at your pay check until all the nibbles add up to a great big bite.

(MORE)

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

You and I know why the ~~x~~ Johnson administration is doing too little about inflation. The president is trying to satisfy the big spenders and at the same time avoid ~~xxxxx~~ getting the taxpayers sore. After all, there's an election coming up this fall.

It wouldn't do the party in power any good ~~xxxxx~~ at the polls to ask Congress~~xx~~ for an income tax increase before the election--especially when Congress at the ~~xx~~ President's urging has just approved ~~a xxxxx xxxx~~ a $5.7 billion tax bill.

Only $1.2 billion of that tax bill is in new taxes. The rest is just faster collection--from you and from ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ business.

But you're going ~~xx~~to have less money to spend beginning May 1. That's when your employer will withhold more of your pay ~~xx~~ for ~~xxxx~~ income tax purposes in line with the new tax ~~xxx~~ bill.

So the Administration is cranking this and other curbs against inflation into the economy. But many of the smartest economists in the country don't think these restraints will halt the price climb.

If anything, prices are going to rise faster~~xx~~ than they have in the past year.

Prices will go up faster after the middle of the year than they have in the last few months.

Businessmen are planning to raise prices because their costs are going up, and the atmosphere of price hold-down that the Johnson administration has tried to maintain is evaporating.

~~There are two [illegible] effective ways to stop inflation. One is to~~

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

force a cutback in
Two effective ways to halt inflation are to ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ consumer spending or hold down government spending. The Johnson administration is pretending to do both but is ~~xx~~ not doing a good job on either one.

President Johnson is ~~xxxxx~~ playing games with the fiscal 1967 budget.

We have to spend billions more for the Viet Nam war, so to try to make the administration look good he ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ makes ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ phony recommendations to Congress for ~~xxxxxxx~~ cuts in ~~xxxxx~~certain existing programs.

The requested ~~xxxxx~~ cuts are phony because they involve such things as the school milk ~~xxxxxx~~ program which he knows full well Congress won't reduce.

It's a ~~xxxxxx~~ good bet the budget will~~xx~~ wind up ~~x~~ 'way out of whack despite the best efforts of Republicans to trim spending.

This, again, will feed the inflation that Mr. Fowler refuses to admit to but that ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~you and I are fully aware of every day.##

--end script

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

STATEMENT FOR RADIO TAPE FOR 5TH DISTRICT STATIONS
TO BE MADE MARCH 23, 1966.

This is your Congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

I want to talk with you today about a subject which some people are inclined to dismiss as not very important but which I think demands quick action by the Congress. It's child safety--protection for our little children from dangers they sometimes are exposed to in the home toy box and medicine chest.

President Johnson this week sent Congress a message outlining a proposed Child Safety Act to provide safeguards against accidental injury or death for our children from a variety of causes, like an overdose of aspirin tablets.

This is one time when I am delighted to support an Administration proposal. The President has acted none too soon. In fact, I cannot understand why he has waited this long to move on this problem.

The bill we're talking about would do a number of things to keep our very small yougsters out of harm's way in the home.

It would limit the number of candy-flavored children's aspirin in a single bottle to 15 or 20.

It would stop the sale in interstate commerce of children's toys that contain dangerous substances.

It would require special safety caps for closing the containers of certain patent drugs which are attractive to children.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

RADIO TAPE - MARCH 23, 1966

It would ban from commerce those household substances that are so hazardous that warning labels on them are just not enough to prevent possible serious injury.

Why are these things important?

Each year, the Food and Drug Administration tells us, more than 500,000 children swallow poisons accidentally. Nearly 500 children under the age of 5 were among the 2,100 Americans who died in 1964 from taking poison by accident.

Between 125 and 150 children die and thousands of others get mighty sick each year from innocently eating large quantities of aspirin they manage to get hold of.

Kids are kids, and sometimes they just have to be protected from themselves.

Now...kids get a terrific kick out of toys, and no child should be without them. But some toys pack a wallop that nobody would wish on his own worst enemy. Some toys are made so they contain dangerous substances.

For instance, there are toys made with such things as jequirity beans as decoration.

Federal officials say that chewing and swallowing just one of these beans can cause death.

These beans, which grow in the Caribbean area, are sometimes used to represent the eyes on stuffed animal toys.

When the Administration's Child Safety Act comes to Congress and is sent to committee for study, it may be some of the provisions will need revising.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

But the basic idea of the proposed law is excellent.

It immediately caught my attention in the President's Consumer Interests message received by Congress this week.

Some other parts of the message were controversial. One of these dealt with the Truth-in-Packaging bill sponsored by Senator Philip Hart of Michigan. Here, again, I agree with the goals of the proposed legislation. But in this case, there is a danger that federal regulation of this type would boost costs to the consumer, and that is not good. Senator Hart himself will admit that during the two years that Senate hearings have been conducted on his bill, most of the practices complained about have been voluntarily corrected by the producers and packagers. Where such action has not already been taken, the Federal Trade Commission is moving in.

The truth about the Truth-in-Packaging bill is that it just isn't needed--so why add another law to those already crammed into the lawbooks?

Where I see a problem that demands federal action--as in the case of the accidental poisoning of our children--I am among the first to urge enactment of a new law. But where problems can be solved either voluntarily or at the state or local level, I am opposed to having the federal government move in, with all its controls and inevitable red tape.

This is your Congressman, Jerry Ford, signing off until next week at this time, same station.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Radio Tape for Fifth District Stations--March 30, 1966 Not Used?

My friends of the Fifth Congressional District, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

It is often said that the voters are fuzzy about the issues when they go to the polls in this country. In the coming congressional elections, voters throughout the country will have a clear choice--a choice between the Democrats' insistence on launching expensive new domestic programs while our nation is fighting a multi-billion-dollar war in Vietnam, and the Republican belief that non-military spending should be reduced to halt inflation and stave off income tax increases.

This week marked the first real test in the House on this issue. Liberal Democrats prevailed when we Republicans sought to knock costly new programs out of a bill providing $2.5 billion more for the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to spend before June 30 of this year.

We Republicans concentrated our fire on the Rent Supplements and Teacher Corps programs.

The initial amounts recommended for these programs by the House Appropriations Committee were relatively small--$12 million to start the rent subsidies program and $10 million for the federal government to train and assign teachers to schools in poverty areas.

The point that many people miss is that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the Democrats in Congress are cranking some very costly programs into the federal spending mill by attaching small price tags to them initially. This is downright deception. They are trying to fool you, the people. [illegible]

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

2. radio tape for 5th district stations--

The facts are that a program like rent subsidies may start out with $12 million but it ultimately costs what amounts to a fortune even in the eyes of big spenders of the taxpayer's dollar--in this case, an estimated $6 billion.

There are some liberal Democrats in the House who are afraid of what voting for a start on programs like this will do to them at the polls on Nov. 8. So on a roll call, they voted with Republicans and some Southern Democrats for our amendment to knock out the rent subsidies money. But you can guess how these liberal Democrats voted earlier when there was a non-record vote and the Republican move to eliminate rent subsidy funds lost 185 to 153.

I threw some consternation into the ranks of the Democrats in the midst of the debate by announcing to them that President Johnson had just said he was considering a 5 to 7 per cent increase in income taxes to keep the

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

RADIO TAPE FOR FIFTH DISTRICT STATIONS, MARCH 30, 1966.

My friends of the fifth congressional district, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

As you know, I have requested a congressional investigation of unidentified flying objects, UFO's, as they are called.

I am most serious about this; but, of course, this is the kind of subject that lends itself to some flak, a little criticism, and a shower of compliments.

One day this week, I felt an unidentified flying object whiz past my ear--my right ear, naturally. Upon close inspection, I had no more trouble identifying this particular UFO than the Air Force did in telling the people of Michigan they have been seeing swamp gas.

The UFO I encountered was a brickbat tossed by an irate gentleman who believes Congress could use its time to much better advantage than in investigating what he calls "UFO hysteria."

But this was one of the few criticisms I encountered in the more than 50 letters I have received since first proposing that UFO's be investigated by either the House Armed Services Committee or the House Science and Astronautics Committee.

Many of the letters I have received are from Michigan--from Grand Rapids, Ann Arbor, Kalamazoo, Lansing, Algonac, Petoskey, Port Huron, Utica, Grosse Pointe, Bay City, and other points.

But there is interest all over the country, and everyone but the wielder of the aforementioned brickbat is urging that I follow up on my proposal that there be a congressional investigation of UFO's. I fully intend to do so.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

RADIO TAPE FOR 5TH DISTRICT STATIONS

A few of the letters were a bit far out--like the one which suggested that UFO's caused the failure of the Gemini 8 spaceship, the electric power blackout last November in the East, and the recent Boeing 727 airplane accidents.

This letter writer informed me that planet people are piloting the UFO's, have superior abilities, have the anti-gravity secret, and fly about in spaceships that travel 50,000 miles an hour or better. He wants a Minute Man alert whenever UFO's are sighted anywhere in the country.

Another gentlemen sent me a copy of a letter he had dispatched to a friend of his in the Central Intelligence Agency.

He wrote: "Well, the Air Force has done it. By its ridiculous 'solving' of the UFO's in Michigan in a day or two, they may have doomed the Air Force. Brilliant, Absolutely brilliant. They (the planet people) were trying to establish their reality...for it must be done, if they are to help us. Now they are angry at being called 'marsh gas' and are going on record that they are going to harass the Air Force just as they have been doing to NASA. Knowing what I do, if I were the Air Force, I would be scared witless. But, of course, who ever heard of marsh gas being dangerous? To make it clear, the SI's (Saucer Intelligences) are now going to teach the Air Force a lesson it will never forget. They are turning their attention to harassment of the Air Force in a big way."

Now, Dr. Hynek and the Air Force may not be disturbed by that letter, but they'd better beware of some astronomers in the nation. A chap in Seattle, Wash., says he has absolute proof that the Air Force was dead wrong in

(MORE)

describing Michigan pictures of an alleged UFO as "the rising crescent moon and the planet Venus."

Well, happy landings to the Air Force. And I do think the American people want a better explanation of UFO's than they have been getting. If my mail is any indication, there are many, many people who find it extremely difficult to believe some of the stories put out by the government on this and other subjects.

This is your congressman, Jerry Ford, saying--So-long for now, and I'll see you next week at this same time, same station.

# # #

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 12 April 4, 1966

A NEW CLASS OF POOR

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

Has Johnson inflation created a new class of poor across the country while Johnson's poverty programs have barely dented the old?

That's a view expressed the other day by former Vice President Richard M. Nixon to which I fully subscribe. There is a new class of poor created since the Democratic Administration took office--the hundreds of thousands of Americans who live on fixed incomes and pensions. Every day that passes, the elderly find something else they cannot afford, something else they have to do without.

I consider it shameful that these people who have worked hard, lived pleasantly and saved for their old age should--now that old age is here--have to struggle to make both ends meet. But that's exactly what is happening to millions of our senior citizens.

The problem of soaring living costs is not limited to our older citizens. It affects all Americans--and something must be done about it. It is high time for the President to cut out the glowing promises and get down to performance. It is time he declared all-out war on the poverty-creating element called inflation.

The Republican Coordinating Committee issued a report the other day on the fiscal policies of the Federal Government. Entitled, "The Rising Cost of Living," it outlined a series of reforms that could halt price increases and bring an abrupt end to sweeping inflation. It could do this without a tax boost.

I have not time today to list in full all the suggested reforms, but here are some of the major ones.

First and foremost, the Administration must and without delay, submit to the Congress a new budget for fiscal 1967. This budget must show a real surplus--not a paper one. This surplus can well be achieved by cutting out or postponing a number of non-defense, non-essential expenditures. Certain domestic programs must be postponed or at least considerably reduced in size. Increasing taxes is not the answer; the answer is decreased Federal spending. We cannot go on any longer living in our present dream world of synthetically-created good times, cutting out

(more)

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

too little of the frills too late.

The Administration must stop pursuing will o' the wisp fiscal fantasies and return to sane, proven, down-to-earth monetary and fiscal policies. "Voluntary" wage and price "guideposts" become an absurdity when the very reason for them is the Administration's own foolish lack of monetary common sense. If the Administration would cut out the obvious causes of inflation, the so-called "guideposts" would be unnecessary.

The Administration must respect and defend the role of the Federal Reserve System as an independent agency within the government. To the layman, the importance of this is not perhaps at once obvious. But I can assure you that if the Federal Reserve System ever loses its political independence we will be at the mercy of the wild spenders and their wildest dreams. There will be no independent agency to warn or to curb.

The Administration must attack residual unemployment with real weapons rather than with promises, press releases and propaganda. It must emphasize selective programs of job-training, counseling and placement as provided in the Republican-sponsored Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962.

The Republican Coordinating Committee also urged that the Administration consolidate or eliminate overlapping Federal programs and, where possible, turn their administration over to State and local governments.

Last week, the President noted that living costs are soaring and he asked the Nation's housewives to hold down their spending. What the President must be told--and accept--is that the Government must get about the business of putting its own house in order before handing out advice.

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

# # #

RADIO TAPE FOR FIFTH DISTRICT STATIONS

FOR TAPING APRIL 6, 1966

My friends of the fifth congressional district, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

Let's talk today about you and your money, particularly about how much money you've got to spend, how much you send to Washington and how Washington spends your money. When I say "Washington," I mean, of course, President Johnson and the 2-to-1 Democratic majorities in Congress. Let's face it; it isn't Republicans who are determining where your dollars go.

Right now, this nation is caught up in an inflationary spiral because of heavy Administration spending of your tax money. Mr. Johnson and Democrats in Congress are intent on spending more money than they take in; they're fixing it so your dollar buys less by constantly feeding the fires of inflation.

Mr. Johnson is a colorful fellow, and he likes to talk. And he's finally acting worried about inflation. So last week he talked with you and asked you to spend less; he talked with governors of the states and asked them to spend less; he talked with big businessmen and asked them to cut back on their expansion plans.

Then we Republicans pointed out something that apparently hadn't occurred to Mr. Johnson. He was asking everybody else to reduce spending but wasn't doing a thing about tightening the federal pursestrings,

Mr. Johnson quickly held a meeting with his cabinet. He told them he wanted them to save $1.1 billion the last three months of this fiscal year, April, May, and June.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

We Republicans were happy to hear this. Mr. Johnson was finally admitting that what we have been urging for months is right--the federal government should cut spending.

Let's carry this thing a step further. If the Administration can cut spending $1 billion during the last three months of this fiscal year, why can't non-military federal spending be reduced by $4 billion for the full 12 months of the next fiscal year? But the talkative Mr. Johnson is not talking about this.

This is simple arithmetic, and it's what I've been urging for months.

Let's cut non-military federal spending by $4 billion or more in fiscal 1967 and thus avoid the increase in income taxes that Mr. Johnson keeps talking about.

Mr. Johnson has been talking about the prospect of an income tax increase so much you'd think he was paving the way for it--you know, getting you accustomed to the idea so it won't shock you so much when it comes.

I feel sure of this much--an income tax increase will come if the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and Democrats in Congress persist in their traditional role of big spenders.

Last week marked the first real test in the House on the spending issue. We Republicans tried to knock the potentially costly Rent Supplements and Teacher Corps programs out of a bill providing $2.5 billion more for the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to spend by July 1 of this year.

The initial amounts recommended for these programs by the House Appropriations Committee were small by Washington standards--$12 million to start the Rent

RADIO TAPE - APRIL 6, 1966

Subsidies program and $10 million for the federal government to begin training teachers for assignment to slum area schools.

The point that many people miss is that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and the Democrats in Congress are feeding some very costly new programs into the federal spending mill by attaching small price tags to them initially. This is downright deception. They are trying to fool you, the people.

[redacted]

Even some of the Democrats were leery of the rent subsidies idea [redacted] so 65 of them joined 125 Republicans in voting to block funds for the program. But we lost when 192 Democrats and six Republicans gave Mr. Johnson an eight-vote victory margin.

After the vote, the big spenders told newsmen the worst of their legislative troubles were over now that money has been voted for the Rent Subsidies program. I think the voters will give some of them trouble [redacted] in November.

This is your congressman, Jerry Ford, saying so-long for now. See you next week; same time, same station.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 13 April 11, 1966

CANNONS OR CAVIAR

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

President Johnson hinted rather strongly the other day that he might have to ask Congress for a tax increase to curb rising prices.

I want to go on record just as strongly that I am against a tax boost at this time because I do not believe that's the answer to the inflation that is plaguing America's housewives and making a mockery out of family budgets.

I would also like to say that I was amused by the President's suggestion that housewives buy only the moderately-priced cuts of meat and so force prices down. If the President is able to find some moderately-priced cuts, I wish he would let me know.

The great majority of Americans, I am proud to note, are hard-headed, down-to-earth people. They face up to facts. They don't order sirloin steaks when their pocketbook says hamburger. In short, they don't like to live beyond their incomes.

If the present Administration really wants to curb rising prices, it might well follow the example that is being set by the mothers and wives of America. It might well cut out the luxury items in the national budget and settle for lesser-priced Federal fare. That is the answer to checking the soaring rate of inflation.

So far this year, the taxpayers' burden has already been increased by higher Social Security taxes, by higher excise taxes, by advanced withholding and by general tax rises by State and local governments. All these increases combined are reliably estimated to run about 8 to 10 billion dollars.

On top of this, more Federal taxes? I'm against it--mainly because I am not at all convinced that the higher taxes will achieve the desired end. They will not bring down the prices of meats and vegetables, of clothes, shoes and services, for example.

I recently read that a newly-installed computer in the Internal Revenue Service discovered what IRS called the "astonishing" fact that Americans as a whole figured out their taxes carefully, honestly and accurately. I think this care and honesty on the part of the taxpayer [illegible]

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(more)

deserves corresponding care and honesty in the Federal spending of those same taxes. For instance, I don't believe in this time of financial crisis we should build a palace costing more than three quarters of a million dollars to house the Vice President.

Another reason I am against a tax increase is that it will give the President more money to spend. If we are to judge by his spending habits to date, it will be spent with the usual reckless abandon. I cannot believe that the additional funds will be used simply to make ends meet. To the contrary. The President, will dream up, I am sure, some new boondoggle or other--which will add to the present inflationary trend, not take away from it.

In closing, I would like to return to the somewhat time-worn phrase "guns and butter." If it were only a butter bill that the administration wanted the taxpayer to foot, I might be persuaded to go along. But I am afraid Federal spending has long passed the "butter" stage. It has reached the point where we must make a choice between cannons and caviar.

This is Congressman _____ reporting from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

# # #

Fifth District Radio Script

For Taping April 13, 1966

My friends of the Fifth Congressional District, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital. I'm going to talk with you today about the subject that's on everybody's mind and everybody's tongue--the street demonstrations in Vietnam and the political trouble there.

It's difficult for any of us to know exactly what's happening in a situation like that, of course. But one thing seems clear to me from the news reports out of Saigon.

All of the current trouble dates back to last February in Honolulu when President Johnson staged a big conference with Southvietnamese Premier Ky (pronounced KEY).

When Mr. Johnson made such a fuss over Ky, this triggered all sorts of political rivalry in Vietnam.

The demonstrations started when Ky got rid of the general who was the 1st Corps commander in Danang. That gave the Buddhists an excuse to step in and make trouble for Premier Ky.

We can only hope that the political situation in Vietnam improves as a result of all the civil turmoil. But there is danger, of course, that just the opposite will happen.

The most deplorable fact about all of this political trouble in Vietnam is that it interferes with the objective of stopping Communist aggression there.

As the Vietnam war now shapes up, there are two alternatives if we are to force a halt in the fighting and bring about a permanent peace settlement.

We must make more effective use of our air and sea power or we will find the Johnson-Humphrey Administration increasing our troop strength in Vietnam--maybe doubling it.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Republicans don't want to see the United States drawn into a huge land war in Asia. But that is what threatens us if we keep on sending more and more men to Vietnam. At the same time we must persevere in our effort to thwart Communist aggression there.

My answer is that we should not send any more of our boys to Vietnam without first seeing whether the Republican alternative will work.

Under current strategy the Vietnam war looks like a war without end. And that's what the Communists want. They figure eventually we'll get tired and frustrated and just give up.

Republicans offer their alternative--more air and sea power instead of more men--in the hope of ending the Vietnam war and achieving an honorable and lasting peace.

I also urge that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration move more quickly and effectively on the social and economic front in Vietnam because the Viet Cong will never be destroyed until the Vietnamese peasant wants it destroyed.

We must win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese peasant if we are to gain a meaningful peace in his unfortunate land.

The program of pacification set up by Mr. Johnson at the Honolulu conference was splendid, but I doubt it can be carried out as long as the Viet Cong control so many of the Vietnam villages by night.

It's difficult to see how our 40,000 technicians can accomplish much if they must retreat to military compounds at night while the Viet Cong take over possession of the villages.

Despite all obstacles, we must be firm in the right--determined to stop Communist aggression in Vietnam. If we do not falter, we can achieve peace there.

###

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

FIFTH DISTRICT RADIO SCRIPT FOR TAPING APRIL 20, 1966.

My friends of the Fifth Congressional District, this is your Congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

One of the nation's leading lending institutions the other day issued its bimonthly report on the state of business. Here's what it found--and I quote: "Unless action is taken to check demand, the Nation faces an inflationary gap that could amount to the order of $30 billion. That would point to an implicit rise in the general price level of as much as four to five per cent."

The report goes on to say: "While it is argued in some quarters that it is as important to continue the war on poverty at home as it is to sustain the military effort in Vietnam, the fact is that the Nation lacks the resources to do both this year."

These two quotations from the Chase Manhattan Bank of New York cannot be carelessly brushed aside as partisan pessimism nor can they be ignored as lacking authority.

I have said it before and I repeat it now--it's high time we faced up to the economic facts of life in this country and cut out unnecessary domestic spending when we're engaged in a war that is costing us a billion dollars a month.

These warnings by myself and others have been consistently ignored by the Administration. Government spending has continued unchecked. Now the piper must be paid--by you and by me. Inflation is here. The cost of living is rising steadily.

In November, you will go to the polls. When you vote, you should ask yourself: "Who is really responsible for the fact that there are so many things I can't afford these days?"

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

At the moment, there are 293 Democrats in the House compared with 140 Republicans. That is a two-to-one Democratic majority with several votes to spare. In the Senate, there are 68 Democrats and 32 Republicans. Again a two-to-one Democratic majority with votes to spare.

This overwhelming voting edge gives the Democrats in this Congress absolute power over all legislation. It gives them a blank check where spending is concerned. It makes them responsible for the Federal deficits which contribute to the inflation we're so concerned about.

Here is the record on non-defense spending: On six key measures to come before the House so far this year, an average of 82 per cent of the Democrats have voted for higher spending. This inevitably means higher taxes and higher prices.

On the same six roll calls, an average of 93 per cent of my Republican colleagues stood for economy in government. They did this because they hoped to curb big spending and the resulting inflation to follow. They did this because they hope to avoid an increase in your income taxes.

Here are the facts on the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's inflation:

1. The overall cost of living went up more than 2 per cent last year, the biggest increase in seven years. Many economists predict it will go up by 3 to 4 per cent this year; some are estimating even more.

2. Big spending by the Democrats is primarily responsible for inflation. The federal budget has not been balanced since 1960, when Ike was in the White House. Since then, Democratic administrations have produced deficits totalling $34 billion. There will be another big deficit in fiscal 1967.

(MORE)

3. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has wasted your tax money both at home and abroad by disorganized, ill-managed programs of government spending. Don't let Lyndon Johnson's economy talk fool you.

4. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration has mortgaged your future and that of the Nation with a host of "legislate now, pay later" spending programs which are adding to present inflationary pressures.

As more big-spending Johnson-Humphrey legislation comes before the House this year, we Republicans intend to stand up and be counted for economy.

When November 8 arrives, you voters will know who worked for lower taxes and lower prices and which party brought on higher taxes and higher prices.

This is Congressman Jerry Ford saying so long for now; see you next week, same time, same station.

# # #

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 15 April 26, 1966

OUR SINKING MERCHANT FLEET

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

Four years ago, Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara decided that the role played by ships in our defense picture could and should be very considerably reduced. Military supplies, he decided, could very well be transported by air. That decision, plus the Administration's maritime policy in general, has relegated our huge merchant marine fleet to horse and buggy status, allowing it to become out-dated and dilapidated.

This determination is all too clear.

At the close of World War II, the U.S. had a merchant marine fleet of over 3,500 vessels. By 1951, there were 1,955 active U.S. flagships. Today, there are only 1,000, including those reactivated for the Vietnam war, and most of these are over 20 years old and near the end of their economic life.

It wasn't long before Secretary McNamara's policy of air-transport for military supplies was put to the acid test. With the accelerated pace of the Vietnamese war, efficient transport of military supplies became of crucial importance.

But were these vital supplies transported by air? They were not. Two out of every three soldiers in Vietnam had to be transported by ships and, as of January of this year, 98 per cent of the supplies for war went in by ship. Secretary McNamara had made a disastrous management decision. The fact is that it takes 260 C5A planes to carry the load of a single ship and air transportation costs five or six times as much per ton mile. And what have other nations--both friend and foe--been doing while America has allowed its merchant marine to sink into a crisis of major proportions?

In Soviet Russia, for example, orders for new ships rose from 225 in 1962 to 673 in 1964. Japan has 199 ships under construction, Great Britain 184 vessels, West Germany 176.

And how many ships has the United States under construction? On January 1, 1966, the United States had only 45 ships under construction. And President Johnson's budget for fiscal 1967 provides only 85 million dollars for merchant marine construction. This represents a cut of 47 million dollars from the current year. It could permit construction of only a paltry dozen or so new ships.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

- more -

In all, the United States has dropped to 12th place among the world's shipbuilding nations. Russia, on the other hand, has jumped from 12th to seventh place. She openly admits that she intends to use her growing merchant marine--which now numbers almost 1,500 vessels--as an instrument of foreign policy.

The importance of all this to the United States is only too clear, particularly as the expanding war in Vietnam puts more pressure on our merchant marine. Shipping volume to Vietnam has leaped from 300,000 tons a month to 800,000 tons per month.

The poor state of our merchant marine, much of it due to Defense Secretary McNamara's bad planning, is so acute that we have had to call on foreign flag vessels to help us supply our troops and supplies to Vietnam.

It is past time that our merchant marine shipbuilding be increased. Unless we do, our defense commitments throughout the world will be in jeopardy.

If the Administration sticks to its bankrupt maritime policy, this country--which once boasted the greatest merchant fleet in the world--will be left on history's shore waiting for ships that never come in.

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

STATEMENT FOR RADIO TAPE FOR 5TH DISTRICT STATIONS

FOR TAPING WEDNESDAY, APRIL 27, 1966

My friends of the Fifth Congressional District, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

Inevitably, whenever a member of the minority party criticizes those in power, the question that comes flying back at him is: "Well, how would you do it?"

My answer first of all is that all of the criticism I have voiced concerning the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's handling of our foreign and domestic affairs carries with it the implicit statement that if the minority were to become the majority things would be run better. I firmly believe that.

So let's take a look at the Vietnam War and talk about what we, the minority, would do if we were in a position of responsibility. In some cases, we'll have to talk about what we would have done because certain mistakes can never be remedied.

We would have handled the Vietnam situation in a positive, decisive manner early enough to have confronted the enemy in force before the North Vietnamese had infiltrated South Vietnam in such great numbers that our entire operation became more or less a numbers matching game.

In this connection, it should be remembered that we now have more than 240,000 ground troops in South Vietnam, as compared with only 25,000 when Lyndon Johnson became president in November, 1963.....and only 25,000 last year at this time.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

5TH DISTRICT RADIO TAPE

It also should be remembered that North Vietnamese soldiers are slipping into South Vietnam at the rate of 4,500 a month.

Mark this well! President Johnson did not begin to cope with the Vietnam situation until February, 1965, when all of Southeast Asia was about to go down the drain.

It will be said that hindsight is always better than foresight, and this I must agree with. It is easy to say that we should have acted more quickly and decisively to meet the Vietnam situation.

That brings up the question: What do we do now?

I do not like second-guessing the President on day-to-day military decisions. He has all possible information at his disposal; I do not.

Our top Air Force men have publicly said they could end the Vietnam war in ~~six~~ 3 weeks if the President would allow them to carry out attacks on all significant military targets in North Vietnam, would let them knock out Vietnam's war-making potential, would let them pull the teeth of the tiger.

I don't know if this is so, but I do feel we should not be sending any more of our men to Vietnam. We must find another way to bring to an honorable conclusion a war that under present strategy gives the appearance of dragging on for years and years.

The Administration reportedly is prepared to send as many men to South Vietnam as it had in Korea at the peak of the war there. The Korean figure was in excess of 470,000 men, including support troops in Japan. Counting the 60,000 support troops in our offshore forces, the comparable Vietnam figure currently is about 300,000.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

5TH DISTRICT RADIO TAPE

The Administration has not waged peace in South Vietnam as effectively as we would hope ~~as we have ought to--once President Johnson~~ decided to make an all-out commitment. The decision by the President to seek help from the United Nations several months ago was honorably conceived & regrettably unsuccessful.

We should even now be working through United Nations Secretary General U Thant of Burma to set up ~~a Vietnam peace conference in Asia~~ active Vietnam peace negotiations in Southeast Asia, Geneva or anywhere else. ~~maybe in Burma or Japan.~~ We should not have made our latest peace proposal through a high-ranking Democratic politician, Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana.

And while diligently pursuing peace through the proper diplomatic channels we should be doing everything possible to cut off the shipping of military supplies to North Vietnam. The Administration has finally blacklisted such vessels flying the flags of the Free World but only after being pushed into it by months and months of Republican protest.

What would we Republicans do in the Vietnam situation? We would doggedly use every proper means, military economic and diplomatic, to achieve a prompt, just, and secure peace.

This is Jerry Ford, your congressman, signing off until next week, same time, same station.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 16 May 2, 1966

THE RIGHT TO KNOW

This is Congressman _____ reporting to you from Washington.

When the House Government Operations Committee approved the so-called Freedom of Information bill the other day, it marked another important step in the battle to return to every American citizen a right which has been morally his since the founding of this country--the right to examine records of the Federal Government.

I believe the Freedom of Information bill is one of the most important pieces of legislation to be considered by Congress in years. I support its enactment one hundred per cent.

This legislation would require Federal agencies to "make all records promptly available" to the public, with the exception, of course, of certain specified categories, such as those involving the country's National security. And--this is most important--it provides, for the first time, court action to guarantee such a right. The bill has already been passed by the Senate and will come before the House shortly.

The present Administration's manipulation of news is only too well known to all Americans. Defense Secretary McNamara's informational acrobatics, for instance, his now-you-see victory, now-you-don't political sleight-of-hand has awakened the country to the increasing aura of secrecy in its government's operations. Americans are beginning to realize how little they really know of what goes on behind the scenes.

Take a case in point. The Post Office Department refused to disclose the names of hundreds of part-time employees it hired last summer. This certainly wasn't sensitive information. It was information that the general public had every right to know. After all, their tax money was paying the employees' salaries. Why, then, were the names withheld? For one main reason: to keep from the press and the public the "pork-barrel politics" involved in these appointments--to hide the fact that friends and relatives of the high-ranking Democrats had been added onto the Government's payroll.

There is a law which has been on the books for some time that deals with the right of the public to obtain information. This law limits information which government agencies can release "to persons properly and directly concerned." Why all Americans aren't considered persons properly and directly concerned, it is hard to say. But this piece of technical phrasing has been

- more -

used by bureaucrats to legally withhold information which could expose their political shenanigans. When asked for information, they can say, "We are sorry we cannot give it to you. You are not 'properly and directly concerned!'"

The new Freedom of Information bill, which the House will soon take up, would certainly make officials of the Executive Branch think twice before deliberately exaggerating or falsifying figures, just to make their department look good. It would make them think twice before blatantly withholding information which should properly be the right of the public to know.

An example of deliberate exaggeration was the Area Redevelopment Administration's figures on the number of new jobs created by Federal public works projects. The official figure was more than twice too many. It over-claimed by about 128 per cent.

Such slanting of the news to fit the political scene has, of recent years, become a fine art. The present Administration has been responsible for several masterpieces of misinformation. It has led The New York Times to editorialize--and I quote--"The credibility of the United States government is a precious thing. It has been sacrificed too often in the name of expediency." Unquote.

Of course, misinformation, slanted information, withheld information are to a great extent a matter of political morality. An Administration that has none, can usually get away with all three.

This is Congressman _____ reporting from Washington.

(A copy of this script is available on Teleprompter in the House TV Studio)

# # #

SCRIPT FOR FIFTH DISTRICT RADIO STATIONS, FOR TAPING MAY 11, 1966.

My friends of the Fifth Congressional District, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

This week we read some significant headlines. One announced to the world that Red China had conducted its third atomic bomb test. Another let everyone know that the Johnson-Humphrey Administration is engaged in a reappraisal of United States policy toward Red China.

These two headlines are fraught with great meaning.

In both cases, we know but little of what is happening. We don't really know how much progress Red China is making in striving for nuclear capability. We don't really know what new policy line may result from the Administration's meditations on what its official attitude toward Red China should be.

But change is in the wind. As the atom cloud from Red China's nuclear explosions mushrooms skyward, we know that Red China is moving closer to the day--perhaps still a decade away--when she will be capable of launching a nuclear attack against any continent including north America. erasing most of this continent from the face of the earth.

The views of the American people on Red China are changing, too. Oh, no, the people do not for a minute believe that the Red Chinese have suddenly become peace-loving and that we should welcome them with open arms into the United Nations or accord them diplomatic recognition.

But at the same time, the American people wish desperately that it would be possible to teach peace to this gigantic Communist nation.

Is it possible to achieve such a miracle? Perhaps that is the only word that can be used to describe such a development, and yet I along with all

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(More)

peace-loving Americans am hopeful. I am hopeful because I, like all of you, do not want to see the world turned into a burnt cinder by the horror of nuclear war.

We all know that Red China has engaged in aggressive acts for 18 years.

The war in Malaya, begun in 1948, was financed by Red China. Chinese Communist soldiers took part in many of its campaigans.

Chinese troops poured into Korea and slaughtered American soldiers fighting in defense of Korean independence.

Chinese Communists supplied the weapons and training that drove the French out of Indochina.

And it is this country, with this history of aggression that--in my opinion -- we will soon be asked to recognize, to seat in the U.N. In spite of the fact that the U.N. is dedicated to do all it can to prevent aggression!

The campaign to seat Red China in the U.N. was launched when Senator Fulbright, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, held public hearings on the question recently--and when Administration spokesmen like Vice President Humphrey suggested that American policy toward Mainland China might be one of "containment without necessarily isolation." U.N. Ambassador Goldberg has admitted that the issue is being--and I quote--"intensively reviewed by the American government." Unquote. After Secretary of State Dean Rusk's testimoney to Congress, a Washington newspaper headlined: "Rusk softens policy toward China."

We were told once by some so-called Chinese experts that the Red Chinese weren't really Communists, they were agrarian reformers. But we know that Mao is as much a Communist as Stalin ever was. He is just as opposed to freedom

and free institutions. He is just as expansionist, as aggressive and as willing to use force to overthrow free governments. Only this week, Red China exploded its third nuclear device.

United States diplomatic recognition of Communist China and a seat in the United Nations would not alter these tendencies one bit. In fact, Red Chinese subversion and aggression would be made easier.

In short, I believe such a move by the country would be a mistake--certainly at this time--certainly until Red China changes its aggressive course.

This is Jerry Ford, your congressman. I'll be back next week at the same time.

# # #

RADIO SCRIPT FOR FIFTH DISTRICT STATIONS - TO BE TAPED MAY 18, 1966

My friends of the fifth district, this is your congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

It may never have occurred to you how extremely difficult it is for the Loyal Opposition in this country to get its views on the issues of the day across to the American people.

One issue which I do not believe has been adequately explained to the public is that of rent subsidies--the new Great Society program which will have the taxpayers paying a big chunk of the rent of other families.

This program is highly controversial, so much so that it is barely squeaking through the lopsided Democratic-controlled Congress.

Congress in shaky fashion has made money available to launch the rent subsidy program between now and July 1, the beginning of the new fiscal year. Funds to carry it forward beyond July 1 have been approved by the House; the Senate still must act.

I firmly believe that despite the great public relations machine the White House has at its disposal, most of the American poeple are opposed to this revolutionary new idea of rent subsidies.

I think more of the people would be opposed to rent subsidies and would act to choke off the program in the United States Senate if they truly understood what it means.

Rent subsidies mean that a low-income family could rent a new or rehabilitated apartment and pay just 25 per cent of its income toward the rent. The taxpayers would pay the rest.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

(MORE)

5TH DISTRICT RADIO TAPE - MAY 18, 1966

For example, a family with an income of $250 a month could live in a $100-a-month apartment and pay just $62.50 a month on the rent. You and I would pick up the tab for the remaining $37.50. Or let's say the family rented a $200-a-month apartment. They would pay $62.50 toward the rent; and we would pay $137.50.

Robert Weaver, secretary of the Housing and Urban Development Department, says he would like to see the program expanded to include middle income families.

He said this recently despite the fact the House last year refused to make funds available to start the program until FHA changed the regulations to make sure the subsidies would go only to low-income families.

Now, what's wrong with the rent subsidies program? Shouldn't the affluent help the poor?

The thing that's wrong with a rent subsidy is that it runs contrary to everything this country has ever stood for--individual pride, thrift and initiative, and the desire of every American to some day own a home of his own. And supporters of this scheme agree that tax subsidies will be going to middle-income families, not just to the poor.

What incentive will a family have to save money and buy a home if all it has to do is set aside 25 per cent of the monthly income for rent and let the taxpayers pay the rest of the shot on a nice apartment?

And the taxpayers should ask themselves not only that question but still others: What sense does it make to launch a big-spending program that could cost up to $20 billion over the next 40 years? Why should this nation plunge into a rent subsidy scheme at a time when it is spending a billion dollars a month on the Vietnam War?

5TH DISTRICT RADIO TAPE - MAY 18, 1966

The U. S. House of Representatives recently voted 192 to 188 to provide $20 million to finance the rent subsidy program during the new fiscal year beginning July 1.

Some newsmen made much of the fact that six out of the 125 Republicans present voted for rent subsidies and pointed to this as more than the margin of victory.

A more accurate version was given in other news accounts which pointed out that Democrats voted for the program, 186 to 69, and Republicans voted against it, 119 to 6.

As a matter offact, four Democrats came forward and changed their votes to make victory possible for President Johnson on the rent subsidy issue.

When it appeared initally that a tie vote had doomed the new program, four Democrats asked that their votes against rent subsidies be changed. This gave the Administration a 192 to 188 victory.

With the record made straight, I'm content to let the American people judge who's right on the rent subsidy issue.

This is your congressman, Jerry Ford, saying so-long for now. See you next week, same time, same station.

# # #

IPT FOR FIFTH DISTRICT RADIO STATIONS, FOR TAPING MAY 25, 1966

My friends of the fifth ~~congressional~~ district ~~of Michigan~~, this is your Congressman, Jerry Ford, speaking to you from the nation's capital.

On May 30, Memorial Day, we will pay special tribute to our honored war dead. This year, Memorial Day finds our nation still at war. ~~More than 3,000~~ They have been ~~of our men have been killed in Vietnam~~, and the casualty list grows longer every day.

This is a sad and anxious time for many Americans. The end of the fighting according to the President in Vietnam is not in sight.

~~For the mothers, fathers, wives and sweethearts of our men in Vietnam this is a time of fearful waiting and a time to remember all the glad times that went before.~~

It is a strange war that haunts our thoughts as we mark this Memorial Day. It is so very different from the two world wars and even the Korean War.

The First World War was fought, we were told, "to save the world for democracy." Americans were fighting for a victory, swift and complete.

The Second World War was fought to crush fascism and make possible the four freedoms. Again, Americans were fighting for a victory, speedy and final.

The Korean War introduced us to a new kind of war--a war against Communist aggression, a war that broke the old mold.

But even in Korea there was hope for a kind of victory, a victory that might have been attained had we spelled out our objectives clearly and moved swiftly toward them.

On Memorial Day, 1966, the American people are confused. They are confused

(More)

GERALD R. FORD L

because we are fighting a war in which victory does not seem to be our aim, a war in which our objective is a stalemate and even this seems elusive.

Our avowed purpose in Vietnam is to help the South Vietnamese halt Communist aggression.

We provided the South Vietnamese with the finest American weapons. They were to use them to fight the Communist aggressor. In recent weeks they have been shooting at each other--and at some Americans, too.

This has been terribly disturbing to Americans back home.

It has been disturbing to them, too, that for the third week this year American casualties as a result of contact with the enemy have exceeded those of the South Vietnamese.

When the South Vietnamese fight among themselves and our casualty list becomes longer than theirs, their war in a sense becomes our war.

This is wrong. It is wrong not only because their ground forces are nearly three times as large as ours, but because we are in Vietnam simply to help the South Vietnamese and not to take over all the fighting.

I want desperately to see a ~~legitimate~~ stable government ~~come to power~~ in Vietnam, a government which has the support of the people. ~~Unless this comes to pass, the fighting in Vietnam will become meaningless and~~ The great sacrifices the United States has made there ~~will all go~~ can be must not be for naught.

~~It would be tragic, indeed, if all the American blood shed in Vietnam shall have been shed in vain.~~

It is not enough to speak about the American commitment in Vietnam.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

5TH DISTRICT RADIO TAPE--MAY 25, 1966

Americans must know for what they are fighting. They must feel that what they are doing is worthwhile. ~~They must believe that the lives of their men and their nation's subetance are not being thrown away in a cause not worth the price.~~

Asia seems terribly far away. We are told we must play the same role there that we did in Europe after World War II. We are told we must contain Communist imperialism there or the free world will be gobbled up in bits and pieces until our own security is in imminent danger.

This is a sad thing to think about. The Vietnam War is a sad war, as all wars are sad.

I hope with all my heart that civil order can prevail in Vietnam, and that constitutional government can become a reality there.

The Vietnam War must again become <u>their</u> war, not <u>our</u> war.

I hope, too, thatall the black marketeering, the profiteering and the corruption that are making the Vietnam War such a dirty mess can be wiped out and a semblance of decency restored to the war effort.

An American newsman in Saigon recently charged that the Vietcong was getting more of its supplies from the black market and other South Vietnam sources than through the famous Ho Chi Minh Trail. To me that is tragic and almost incredible.

We need strong action in Vietnam ~~if we are going to straighten out the mess~~ by the Viet Namese themselves in the first instance and then with our help the communist oppression + terror is to be stopped there. ~~And~~ our men in Vietnam desperately need your prayers on this Memorial Day, 1966. This is Jerry Ford, your congressman.

# # #

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

CLOSE FOR RADIO SCRIPT - JUNE 1, 1966

My friends, this broadcast closes out my series of radio chats with you for this year. This week I filed my nominating petitions to become a candidate for reelection to the House of Representatives. Under the rules of the Federal Communications Commission, equal time must be given to all candidates. We are therefore discontinuing this public service program.

It has been a genuine pleasure for me to have visited with you each week at this time. I hope you have found it equally enjoyable. The greatest satisfaction in holding public office is to serve others. Please let me know whenever I can be of service to you.

This is your congressman, Jerry Ford, saying so long until the 1966 campaign is over and I can again return to chat with you each week over your favorite radio station. Thank you for listening.

# # #



Radio-Television Script

NATIONAL REPUBLICAN CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEE • 312 CONGRESSIONAL HOTEL • WASHINGTON 3, D. C. • LINCOLN 4-3010

Script No. 36 September 19, 1966

AFTER NOVEMBER 8th -- WHAT?

What is going to happen after November 8th? What post-election plans for the country does the Administration have? Are we getting the dynamic leadership that the present confused state of the world calls for? How big will the Vietnam war get? Can inflation be stopped?

These are some of the questions that the American voter must answer before the morning of November 8 dawns.

The polls show that the American people are confused, uncertain and concerned. They don't know where they are being taken by their own government. They are bewildered by the seemingly unbridgeable gap that lies between the Administration's promises and the Administration's performances.

Americans have reached the state of mind where they can no longer condone the Administration's long list of failures by saying, "They mean well." Moreover, the members of the Administration's party seeking office will be called to account on those issues come November 8th.

The Vietnam war, of course, is an overriding issue. Our forces have been doubled and doubled again until they are now well over the three hundred thousand mark--despite earlier Administration efforts to conceal the extent of our involvement. Now the country is very naturally apprehensive as to what further acceleration lies ahead. The bombing of North Vietnam has been accelerated. The Administration must have foreseen that this would be necessary --but said nothing, wasting valuable time before it took this necessary step.

In our domestic affairs, there has been the same bewildering uncertainty. The Administration laid out a wonderful blueprint of the years ahead. It can be summed up by the phrase "more of everything for everybody--with lower taxes and a balanced budget." And it promised there would be no inflation, no rise in living costs, no waste and wild spending of the taxpayers' money. To dramatize this promise, the President plunged the White House into semi-darkness to cut his electric bill.

GERALD R. FORD LIBRARY

As a result, the country relaxed and in 1964 voted LBJ in by a landslide.

-more -

Then came the gradual realization that the wonderful blueprint was not being followed, that government by consensus was being replaced by government by acceleration--accelerated spending, accelerated debt, accelerated living costs.

Americans have begun to feel uneasy. What are the Administration's real aims? Does it have any intention of fulfilling its promises? Are these promises just the camouflage painted on a monstrous pork barrel?

One thing has become very apparent. The Administration has not made good on its promises to the American people. So, of course, the American people are apprehensive of the future, are wondering what will happen after November 8th.

The Administration isn't answering some important questions, but there are strong rumors in Washington that President Johnson has something up his sleeve.

Will taxes be raised after November 8th? This question is being asked frequently.

Will there be price and wage controls? A Democratic Senate leader recently urged that such standby controls be given the President.

Is the war on poverty going to be downgraded and perhaps its warriors disbanded? That is another frequent question in the Capital.

Will the war in Vietnam grow more and more costly with no foreseeable victory? That, I am afraid, is the most disturbing question of all.

Americans cannot long endure such uncertainties. They cannot live nor work effectively without the trust and confidence of their government. In my judgment, the November election results will make it quite clear that Americans believe the Administration has failed to provide that trust.

# # #