Republicans celebrate another Lincoln Day at a fateful time in American history.

We do so with humble recognition of our responsibility to measure up to the high standards of courage, wisdom and integrity which marked the actions of the Republican Party's first and most revered President.

I would admonish you that he who would travel the hard road of integrity -- whether it be in politics or anything else -- will suffer setbacks even as Lincoln did. But truth always rises to the surface, and right prevails when freedom such as ours is the heritage of all the people.

I am sure that if Lincoln were alive today he would warn that the United States cannot maintain its position as a symbol of hope for all mankind if only lip service is paid to the grand design for progress drafted by the founding fathers.

I am sure he would remind Republicans that our strength in the future, our growing appeal to the voters, will depend to a great degree on steadfastness to party policies which Americans have endorsed on behalf of 15 Republican Presidents since the Republic was established.

These policies are based on unequivocal dedication to individual freedoms and faith in the people to generate the nation's steady growth, security and mental and moral well-being. Stemming from the basic concepts of the Constitution, they are so flexible to the will of self-governing people that they have been proven equal to whatever challenges have arisen.

Lincoln Day marks a time when healthy doses of fundamental truths must break through the fog of uncertainty which is the end product of
two years of the present administration.

It must be emphasized that sterile social theories and economic judgments repeating past mistakes can serve no useful purpose as the country tackles mounting problems in the restive sixties.

We Republicans must speak out against fiscal irresponsibility wherever and whenever we see it. We must hammer home the truth we know to be self-evident -- that progress and solvency cannot be achieved by mortgaging the future of our children.

We must in the Lincoln tradition keep reiterating the theme that freedoms whittled away by an all-powerful central government are seldom regained. And as each one is lost or watered down, lost with it is a part of a brighter hope for life, liberty and pursuit of happiness that dawned when America tore loose from tyranny near two centuries ago.

We are called upon to speak for nearly half the voters. We are commanded to do battle with the opposition when their programs fail to meet the high standards by which American progress is measured.

It is becoming increasingly apparent that the hallmark of the present Democratic administration is deceit.

Some may prefer the more polite term, "managing the news". I don't. When spokesmen for the Administration repeatedly and deliberately lie to the press and the public -- when in fact they uphold their right to lie-- I don't think "managing the news" is very descriptive. It's like saying a bank bandit is guilty of trespassing.
The people of this country have a right to know what is going on within the government for which they are paying through the nose.

Obviously, military security is exempt from this concept. In these perilous times we have been forced to accept the censorship which goes along with war -- hot or cold.

At the same time, we are by now well aware that national security can be used as a cloak to hide inefficiency, political aspiration or even corruption.

Listen to this significant statement. "I think the inherent right of a government to lie to save itself when faced with nuclear disaster is basic". Arthur Sylvester, the Pentagon press agent, said that in a New York speech last December 6th. It was a follow-up to his much more widely publicized comments back in October, when he said the generation of news by the government is a weapon. Strangely enough, his December speech was never distributed to the press, as is customary.

Now it's even questionable in my mind whether the government has an inherent right to lie to the people under any circumstances. If it can't tell the truth without endangering our security, perhaps it should remain silent.

But where I really become alarmed is when I find my government lying, not to save itself from nuclear disaster, but to save itself from defeat in an election.

I cite as one shameful instance the statement issued six days before the last Congressional elections by the Secretary of Labor. He issued a report showing that under President Kennedy, employment had risen by 4 1/2 million jobs, while at the same time, unemployment had
dropped by more than 2 million. Obviously, the statement received nation-
wide play. You can't persuade me it didn't have an impact on the voters.
Now, Secretary Wirtz is an old hand at the Labor Department. Employment
statistics are no mystery to him. Nor can he be unfamiliar with their
political effect. But it was not until after the election was over that
he confessed under questioning these figures were completely invalid.
That's the very word he used -- invalid. It's a synonym for "phony".

In his so-called preliminary report preceding the election he had
failed to make the seasonal adjustments which must always be made to
constitute a proper yardstick. He also failed to mention that in the
preceding months, in a sharp reverse, the employment trend had fallen off
by half a million.

In the final analysis, Mr. Wirtz had exaggerated by well over 3
million the number of new jobs which had opened up during the Kennedy
years, and he had claimed credit for a non-existent decline of better than
1 million in the unemployment figure.

This is not managing the news. It is out and out falsehood. Not
to save the country -- to save the Democratic Party.

Of course, the way the news was manipulated during and after the
Cuban crisis would have caused raised eyebrows in Josef Goebbels' office.

The Democrats rose to power through a missile gap in 1960. This
non-existent gap closed as soon as they got in. But the Russian missiles
which loomed so formidable back before the '60 elections, way off there
in the Soviet Union, couldn't even be seen by the Kennedy higher-ups
when they were moved in right under our noses, in Cuba. Or so they said.
While Republicans, armed with the most reliable information, nearly wore out their voices warning of the Cuban missiles buildup, the Administration, which had the same information and more, denied and denied again -- even after October 14, when the revealing air photos were taken--that there were any medium or long range missiles on Cuban soil.

This was called "managing the news". That's about as far as the newspaper publishers dared to go with an Administration known to be capable of slapping unfriendly papers with anti-trust suits and threatening reporters who don't knuckle under with income tax investigation.

Thanks to a flair for the dramatic and a considerable amount of luck, the President, on the eve of the last elections, turned Cuba from a grave Democratic liability into a campaign asset.

We estimate the Democrats saved 20 Congressional seats because of the Cuban crisis, and the polls showed the President's flagging popularity had bounced back sharply.

How John F. Kennedy did it is a tribute to his ability to manipulate the news and hypnotize the uninformed.

Before the crisis of the fall of 1962 took shape, there were no Russian troops in Cuba. Today there are an estimated 16,000 crack Russian soldiers, fully equipped with the latest heavy weapons, concentrated there. It's assumed their mission is to prevent a popular uprising against the Communists.

The on-the-spot inspection of the missile sites which was laid down as a condition for relaxing our precautions goes un-performed. There is small expectation it will ever be performed -- at least under President Kennedy. His brave ultimatum to the Soviets has had a tendency to melt
away at the edges. First, he decided it would be all right if the United Nations did the on-site inspecting; when Castro objected to that, our President was ready to place our vital interests in the hands of the International Red Cross, an organization with no more experience in missile technology than the Girl Scouts. Finally the President told us, a camera is our best inspector anyway.

Uncontradicted news dispatches tell of vast quantities of conventional weapons pouring into Havana since the lifting of the blockade. What is their purpose? Is it not true that the Cubans themselves were fully armed a long time ago? Can there be any other reason for these shipments than a plan to smuggle them to Castro Communists in other Latin American countries?

Yet, with all this, Mr. Kennedy has somehow managed to convince large numbers of people that we won a great victory in Cuba.
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Blackmail is an ugly word, and it should not be tossed around indiscriminately.

Yet, it is hard to find an alternate description of the tactics used by this Administration to raise money for the ransoming of the Bay of Pigs survivors last Christmastime.

Naturally, every American had heartfelt sympathy for these men and recognized the President's moral obligation to obtain their freedom. After all, he himself admitted that it was his own blundering which caused the collapse of the invasion attempt.
But instead of drawing a check against his own bulging bank account, Mr. Kennedy put the squeeze on the industrial community. The manufacturers of drugs and food products were invited to contribute to the ransom fund with the clear warning that they could expect further harassment from the federal regulatory agencies and the anti-trust division if they refused. The rail lines, the airlines and the shipping companies were called upon to provide free transportation services in connection with the ransom deal. And being fully aware of the type of punitive action which would follow a refusal, they surrendered without a struggle.

What the public in general never realized was this: That in the last analysis, the greater part of the nearly $55 million Castro received in exchange for the prisoners was paid by the taxpayers. It was government money, just as the money spent on missiles and highways and the salaries of FBI agents, for the companies which contributed were allowed to take tax deductions which to a great extent covered their costs.

The Administration thus executed an end play which robbed the Congress of its constitutional responsibility. Under our system, Congress is supposed to decide how much money shall be spent for what purpose. This is the system of checks and balances carefully contrived by the writers of the Constitution. But the Kennedy system of concentrating all power of government in the White House rejects this time-tested formula. By subterfuge, if necessary, the President will decide how the people's money will be disposed of.

Whether the public, dazzled by the artfully-timed return of the Cuban prisoners, will ultimately wake up to the realities of the case, depends on us.
We say and say again that this prisoner deal sets a dangerous precedent. Any two-bit dictator now has an open invitation to kidnap American personnel and hold them for the payoff. "Not one cent for tribute" has gone out of style, along with the Monroe Doctrine.

We emphasize again and again that Castro has been given a new lease on life. His regime was tottering, the Cuban people on the point of desperation because of shortages of vital goods. The millions of dollars worth of goods and cold cash he received in the ransom deal are bound to prolong his dictatorship.

It was profitless to criticize the Administration's handling of the Cuban prisoner ransom at the time -- to point out the bad precedent being set, the covering-up of the true facts and the arm-twisting which raised the needed funds. It was the holiday season, and the people's hearts were going out to the prisoners, who had maintained their spirit of freedom and defiance under the barbaric treatment of Castro's jailers. Because of the humanitarian aspects, the President's public relations position was virtually impregnable. He's rather good at that sort of thing.

But the fact remains, we cannot permit even sentimental considerations to tear holes in our Constitution. And that is just what happened when the President and his brother bypassed the Constitutional machinery in order to enhance their images as great humanitarians -- at our expense.

Reference news item to Federal Judge in Miami.
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In conclusion, one final observation: There has arisen in America a cult which believes that the "spirit" of the Constitution is more important than the letter of the document...

Principles of law do not change with the times. The basis of American Constitutional law is the English Common Law. In defining the Rights of Man, our concepts of justice go back through the centuries.... Principles of justice are immutable, as are the Ten Commandments.

The Constitutional provisions guaranteeing freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of worship were not written for an entirely different period in our nation's history. They were written for all times......but the Constitution today is being downgraded on the very ground that the "spirit" rather than the letter of the document should be followed. Lincoln held fast to personal conviction and to the letter of the Constitution. We do ourselves proud in honoring his memory tonight.