

May 7, 1973

#### ADMINISTRATION URGES TAX BREAK FOR ELDERLY

The Administration last week unveiled its <u>tax reform proposals</u>, including an income tax break for the elderly.

Under the Administration plan, taxpayers over 65 would get a Federal tax credit for local property tax payments over and above 5 per cent of their income-up to a maximum of \$500. The credit would decline for those with income over \$15,000 and would phase out at \$25,000.

Elderly renters would get similar tax credits for 15 per cent of their rent.

The Administration also has proposed <u>tax credits</u> for parents sending their children to <u>nonprofit nonpublic elementary and secondary schools</u>. This proposal is virtually identical with <u>a bill I introduced</u> last Jan. 3, the opening day of the 93rd Congress. It would give parents who earn up to \$18,000 <u>a tax credit of 50 per cent</u> for nonpublic school tuition--up to a limit of \$200 per child. Credits would decline \$1 for every \$20 a family's income exceeded \$18,000.

The House Ways and Means Committee <u>approved a similar bill</u> late last year, but Congress adjourned without acting on it.

I think the <u>chances for passage</u> of nonpublic school tuition tax credit legislation this year or next are <u>fairly good</u>, particularly since the bill has the backing of Ways and Means Chairman Wilbur Mills.

Another Administration tax reform proposal would make it <u>virtually impossible</u> for the wealthy to <u>escape</u> paying income taxes. It would reduce to "<u>close to zero</u>" the number of wealthy individuals who use tax shelters to avoid paying any income tax.

The new system would replace the minimum income tax enacted in 1969 with a minimum taxable income plan providing a limitation on artificial accounting losses.

The Administration plan would require that everyone be taxed at normal, graduated rates on at least one-half of his income, regardless of its source.

# SIMPLIFIED FORM OFFERED

The Treasury Department also has come up with a new simplified tax form, 1040-S. This form involves changes that would make it easier for millions of people to figure out their income taxes in the future.

The new form would be longer than the present so-called "short form," but <u>shorter</u> and <u>less</u> <u>complicated</u> than the regular Form 1040. About 20 million taxpayers could shift to the new simple Form 1040-S.

If the proposed simplified form is adopted, it will affect the regulations on <u>medical</u> <u>expenses</u>, casualty losses, retirement income, <u>sick pay</u>, child care expenses, the \$100 stock dividend exclusion, <u>the deduction for state gasoline taxes</u>, and miscellaneous deductions.

Medical expenses and casualty losses would be <u>lumped together</u> and would be deductible to the extent they exceeded 1 per cent of income. This would be a much <u>simpler</u> calculation than the present one.

All of us who have <u>struggled</u> with the present long income tax form would really welcome a form that simplifies the job. Some people would <u>come out ahead</u> on the deal dollar-wise, too. The proposed simplification of the tax form would cost \$400 million a year.

The Ways and Means Committee has been holding <u>hearings</u> on the tax code, and Chairman Mills has said a bill will be <u>on the House floor</u> by the end of this year.

I have long favored tax reform, with emphasis on a tightening up of the code so that the very wealthy cannot use tax shelters to escape paying any income tax.

I am <u>very pleased</u> that the Administration has proposed <u>property tax relief for the elderly</u> and tax relief for elderly renters, and has again endorsed <u>tax credits</u> for parents sending their children to nonprofit nonpublic elementary or secondary schools.

# SOME GOOD NEWS

There was some good news in Washington last week. Treasury Secretary George Shultz announced that tax revenues are running higher than expected, and this will reduce the estimated deficits for fiscal 1973 and 1974.

Shultz figured this fiscal year's revenue will go \$5 billion higher and thus cut the estimated deficit from \$24.8 billion to \$19.8 billion. For fiscal 1974 the increase in revenues will reduce the anticipated deficit from \$12.7 billion to \$5.7 billion, a drop of \$7 billion.

This assumes that total Federal outlays stay beneath the ceilings of \$250 billion set by President Nixon for fiscal 1973 and \$268.7 billion for fiscal 1974.

My position on the spending holdback is that <u>I endorse the overall objective</u> although I may not agree with the individual budget actions taken by the President. We must <u>hold the</u> <u>line</u> and guard against excessive Federal spending.

# HOPE FOR CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET CONTROL

111343 221 (4)13

a the set of the state

I want to <u>commend the Congressional Study Committee</u> on Budget Control for submitting recommendations to <u>control Federal spending</u> and to assure Congressional budget responsibility.

The committee has endorsed <u>a series of reform proposals</u> that would require Congress to fix an annual spending ceiling, levy a Federal income tax surcharge should spending exceed that limitation, and set the maximum budget outlays for both appropriations and legislative committees.

The plan would establish budget committees in both houses of Congress which would be authorized to propose at the start of each session the overall spending limitation, allocate the amounts to be spent for each government program, and <u>fix the necessary levels</u> of taxes and/or borrowing necessary to provide the revenues.

I hope the study committee's recommendations are given <u>quick consideration</u>. I have been in favor of this kind of <u>Congressional budgeting</u> ever since the Congress failed last year to accept a spending ceiling.

As it is now, the Congress appropriates funds without any regard for what the sum total of Federal spending may be. That is no way to conduct the people's business.

# WAGE-PRICE CONTROL AUTHORITY EXTENDED

Congress last Monday extended the President's authority to <u>control prices</u> and wages six hours before the old control law was <u>due to expire</u>-and the President signed the new legislation into law two hours before expiration time.

The legislation extended the President's wage-price authority for 12 months, until April 30, 1974. The vote in the House was 267 to 115. <u>I voted for the bill</u>.

Several weeks ago I urged the Administration to tighten Phase III price controls. Last Wednesday, the President placed <u>new controls</u> on the nation's largest business firms. He ordered some 600 companies to give the government <u>30 days notice</u> of any price increases that would have the effect of boosting the firm's average prices by <u>1.5 per cent</u> over those prevailing on Jan. 10. The order also requires <u>full and detailed reports</u> from these companies on any price increases since Jan. 10.

I applaud this shift to tighter controls. While a free market is healthiest for the economy generally, inflationary pressures make it too early to move further in that direction.



June 4, 1973

wink he often bas

And the the state of the

## A DO-LITTLE CONGRESS

It has been <u>so long</u> since I have sent out <u>a newsletter</u> (four weeks) that some of my constituents have written me asking if they have been <u>dropped</u> from my mailing list. I have <u>had to</u> <u>explain</u> that my newsletter is devoted <u>primarily to a discussion of legislation</u> and that the House has been <u>doing very little</u> legislating of any consequence <u>thus far</u> this session.

I am <u>dismayed</u>, for instance, that the House has passed but <u>a single appropriations bill</u>-the one financing <u>legislative activities</u>-with the start of <u>the new fiscal year</u> less than <u>a</u> <u>month away</u>. There is <u>talk about paralysis</u> in the Federal Government because of Watergate, but I think if there is <u>any slowdown</u> in the government right now it is <u>in the Congress</u>. Fortunately, the pace is quickening.

# ELECTION REFORM NEEDED

Shocking abuses of the electoral process during the 1972 presidential campaign point to a clear-cut need for meaningful federal election reforms.

For that reason I have introduced <u>House Joint Resolution 559</u>, which calls for <u>a sweeping</u> study by a nonpartisan commission on political campaign reform.

Under my resolution, <u>a 17-member commission</u> would conduct a broad study and come up with specific legislative recommendations by next Dec. 1.

The commission would be authorized to:

- \* Examine the <u>costs and financing</u> of federal campaigns and look into the <u>various ways</u> in which costs can be <u>kept down</u> and improper influence or <u>influence-seeking</u> through large campaign contributions <u>can be ended</u>.
- \* Consider <u>limitations</u> on the total amounts candidates can <u>spend</u>, recognizing both the <u>potential for abuse</u> and the heavy burden that <u>high campaign costs</u> impose on both parties.
- \* Look into the laws governing <u>disclosure of campaign funds</u> and how they are spent, and how both <u>those laws</u> and their enforcement might be <u>improved</u>.
- \* Review the tax laws as they relate to the financing of political campaigns.
- \* Look into the question of possible public funding of campaigns.
- \* Explore the possibility of <u>eliminating</u> from our campaigns <u>violence</u> and the threat of violence; intimidation; <u>frauds in the casting and counting of ballots</u>; the making of misleading or <u>malicious charges</u>; sabotage and <u>espionage</u> and other infringements on the <u>rights of privacy</u>; and any and all other improper campaign practices.
- \* Consider the establishment of <u>an independent Federal Elections Commission</u> armed with enforcement powers.
- \* Look into limitations on contributions or other aid that can be given by business, labor, or professional organizations.

The time has come to take a good, hard look at how our campaigns are financed and conducted. There is no question in my mind that <u>far-reaching changes are needed</u> if we are to restore the faith of the American people in <u>our political processes</u>. I think the first step toward doing that would be the establishment of the proposed <u>nonpartisan</u> campaign study commission. The House last Thursday voted <u>372 to 1</u> to extend for one year <u>12 health programs</u>, including five which the Administration wants to end. <u>I voted for the bill</u>.

The programs the Administration has proposed <u>terminating</u> are Public Health Training, <u>Hill-Burton</u> Health Facilities Construction, Allied Health Training, <u>Regional Medical Programs</u>, and <u>Community Mental Health Centers</u>. The others <u>extended under the House-passed bill--programs</u> the Administration would continue--are <u>Health Research and Development</u>, Health Statistics, Migrant Health, <u>Comprehensive Health Planning and Services</u>, Medical Libraries and Developmental Disabilities.

House Commerce Committee Chairman Harley Staggers, D-W.Va., told the House the committee may not want to continue all 12 of the programs indefinitely but <u>needs the year's extension</u> to study them and make an informed judgment.

I have no assurances that the President will sign the bill but I hope he does.

The bill contains what is called a "<u>conscience amendment</u>," a provision which would prohibit a court or public official from using a <u>cutoff of Federal funds</u> to force an individual or institution to <u>perform or assist</u> in the performance of sterilization procedures or abortions.

The House also overwhelmingly <u>approved an amendment</u> which states that no "entity" receiving funds under the Public Health Service Act, the Community Mental Health Centers Act, or the Developmental Disabilities and Facilities Construction Act may <u>discriminate</u> against any physician or other health care personnel for performing or assisting in, or <u>refusing to perform</u> or assist in, a <u>lawful sterilization procedure or abortion</u> on religious grounds or from moral convictions.

The House further approved, 354 to 9, a ban on the use of living human fetuses in medical research.

I voted for both the conscience and fetus amendments.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COMPROMISE READIED

As I have <u>predicted</u>, Congress is moving <u>to pass</u> a vocational rehabilitation bill which will be <u>acceptable</u> to the President. The House Education and Labor Committee last week <u>approved</u> a bill authorizing the spending of <u>\$1.3 billion</u> over a two-year period for vocational "rehab." President Nixon has twice vetoed more ambitious and more expensive proposals. The committee-approved bill would authorize <u>\$660 million for fiscal 1974</u> and <u>\$690 million for fiscal 1975</u>. I hope the House <u>acts quickly</u> on this most-needed measure.



INDUSTRIOUS INTERNS -- These four interns pictured with me have done fine work in my Washington office. From left, they are Paul Kim, University of Michigan sophomore; Laura Miller, U. of M. senior; Janet Lovell, Western Michigan University graduate student; and Theodore Wietke, WMU senior. Janet is from Sparta; the rest, from Grand Rapids. Janet, Ted and Paul interned during the month of May. Laura started May 15, will finish June 15.

## DISTRICT VISITS

My <u>district assistant</u>, Gordon Vander Till, has scheduled <u>a series</u> <u>of visits</u> to communities in the Fifth District, where he will answer questions <u>on my behalf</u>. Hours are from 2:30 to 5 p.m. The schedule is as follows: <u>Lowell</u>, June 4, City Council Room; <u>Lake</u> <u>Odessa</u>, June 11, Village Hall Council Room; <u>Cedar Springs</u>, June 18, City Hall; <u>Rockford</u>, June 25, City Hall; <u>Portland</u>, July 9, City Council Room; <u>Sparta</u>, July 16, Village Hall; and <u>Belding</u>, July 23, City Hall.

## MICHIGAN HOT DOGS

Other members of the <u>Michigan con-</u> <u>gressional delegation</u> and I have sponsored legislation aimed at <u>reversing a court ruling</u> striking down the state's high standards for <u>hot dogs</u>, sausages and other processed meats. Last week we urged the House Agriculture Committee to <u>hold hearings on the proposals</u>.



June 11, 1973

## HOUSE APPROVES SWIFT MINIMUM WAGE RISE; ENACTMENT WOULD INCREASE INFLATIONARY PRESSURES

The House last Wednesday approved <u>a swift and sharp rise</u> in minimum wage rates, a move that will <u>increase inflationary pressures</u> if enacted into law.

Before sending the bill to the Senate by a vote of 287 to 130, the House rejected a more moderate bipartisan substitute, 218 to 199. I voted for the substitute and against the bill brought to the House floor by the Education and Labor Committee majority. I did so because I favored a more gradual increase in the minimum wage and felt the committee bill went too far too fast. I also favored a broader youth differential.

The committee bill would raise minimum wages precipitously--for nonfarm workers covered by the Fair Labor Standards Act prior to 1966, from \$1.60 to \$2.20 an hour in one year; and for those covered for the first time by the 1966 Amendments, from \$1.60 to \$2.20 within two years.

The substitute would have put these increases into effect over <u>a three-year period</u> for the first group of workers, and over <u>a four-year period</u> for the second. Most covered workers--34.7 million--are included in the first group. There are 10.6 million in the second.

The committee bill would increase the minimum for farm workers from \$1.30 to \$1.60 immediately, and to \$2.20 by July 1, 1976, in three annual steps.

The substitute would have raised farm workers to \$1.50 immediately, and then to \$2 by 1976, in three steps.

It is time we increased our minimum wage rates but I am also concerned about inflation. I do not believe our economy can absorb the kind of increases called for in the committee bill (H.R. 7935) without inflationary damage.

H.R. 7935 would have its severest impact on retail prices and health care costs. It would



FIRST GIRL GOP HOUSE PAGE -- Kathy Siddall, 17, of East Grand Rapids, is the first Republican girl page in the U.S. House of Representatives. I was delighted to appoint her.

<u>retail prices</u> and <u>health care costs</u>. It would affect 567,000 retail workers. This would cost

our economy \$850 million annually. This increase would have to be reflected in the prices charged by retailers.

There is, further, no question that H.R. 7935 would exert <u>inflationary pressure</u> on health care costs.

# YOUTH DIFFERENTIAL NEEDS BROADENING

H.R. 7935 <u>jeopardizes youth employment</u> by providing minimum wage differentials only for fulltime students performing part-time work.

I supported a Republican amendment which would have permitted employers to pay workers <u>under</u> <u>the age of 18</u> at a \$1.60 hourly rate. But the House rejected this move 215 to 199.

I felt this differential was necessary to provide jobs for young people, especially young Blacks, whose unemployment rate is far above the national average of 5 per cent. By a vote of 281 to 130, the House Thursday in effect endorsed the President's plans to create a new Drug Enforcement Administration within the Department of Justice.

The Democratic majority on the House Government Operations Committee had brought to the House floor a resolution (H. Res. 382) calling for rejection of the President's reorganization plan. The House turned down the resolution.

The need for <u>centralizing drug enforcement activities</u> in a single Federal agency became clear during the floor debate. I <u>strongly support</u> the establishment of this new agency.

In the past few years Federal activities aimed at stronger drug enforcement have increased sharply. At the same time, the stepup in these activities has generated serious operational difficulties and jurisdictional conflicts.

To erase these difficulties and conflicts, the President last March 28 proposed the <u>consolidation</u> of the present functions of the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs with those of the Office of Drug Abuse Law Enforcement, the Office of National Narcotics Intelligence, and those Bureau of Customs activities involving <u>drug investigations and intelligence</u>. Drug law enforcement research currently funded by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration and other agencies also would be transferred to the <u>new agency</u>.

Major responsibilities of the new Drug Enforcement Administration will be:

- \* Developing overall Federal drug law enforcement strategy and programs.
- \* Investigating persons suspected of violating Federal drug trafficking laws and those connected with illicit drugs seized at U.S. ports-of-entry and international borders.
   \* Conducting all relations with drug law enforcement officials of foreign governments.
- \* Cooperating with State and local law enforcement officials on joint drug enforcement efforts.
- \* Regulating the legal manufacture of drugs and other Federally controlled substances.

## APOLLO 17 FILM AVAILABLE

With all of the interest in space travel generated by Skylab, this seems an appropriate time to announce that a NASA film on the Apollo 17 flight is available to public service groups through my district office. This is a 16 mm. color film and lasts 28 minutes. The film is entitled, "On the Shoulder Of Giants." Arrangements for use of the film can be made by calling 456-9607.

#### VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION COMPROMISE PASSED

The House last Tuesday passed and sent to the Senate a <u>compromise</u> vocational rehabilitation bill which I believe will be approved by the President.

The authorization figures in this bill--\$660 million for fiscal 1974 and \$690 million for fiscal 1975--represent sharp reductions from the authorizations in the \$3.4 billion bill the President vetoed in 1972 and the \$2.4 billion measure he vetoed earlier this year. On the other hand, the House bill provides annual increases in federal support for vocational rehabilitation.

The bill approved by the House last week is <u>excellent legislation</u> which will continue grants to the states over the next two fiscal years to carry out <u>job training programs</u> for the physically handicapped. The Senate has not yet acted on its version but it plans to proceed promptly.

#### BETTER WHITE HOUSE-CONGRESSIONAL RELATIONS LOOM

The President's appointment of former defense secretary and ex-congressman Melvin Laird of Wisconsin as his chief domestic adviser promises <u>better relations</u> between the White House and Congress and should prove good for the country.

The President could have made <u>no better choice</u> to fill this post on the White House staff. I served with Mel Laird during his <u>16 years in the House</u> and found him to be knowledgeable, <u>capable and congenial</u>. As a member of the House Appropriations Committee, he became keenly conversant with health, education and welfare matters. He was an outstanding member of the House. He also was a great secretary of defense, directing the phaseout of our involvement in Vietnam, presiding over a 1-million-man cut in our armed forces, and overseeing the end of the draft and the formation of an all-volunteer Army.

Incidentally, Senate Republican Leader Hugh Scott and I now are privileged to attend White House cabinet meetings. We attended our first such session last Thursday morning.

# # #

All make in the U.S. House of Repues-

From delighted to appoint has.



# June 25, 1973

## NEARLY 28,000 ANSWER MY QUESTIONNAIRE

I received <u>27,770 responses</u> to my 1973 questionnaire--nearly one-third again as many as last year. This is a testament to the <u>keen interest</u> taken by <u>Fifth District residents</u> in national issues.

To sum up the results, those of my constituents responding to the questionnaire <u>divided</u> <u>narrowly</u> on the question of <u>amnesty</u> for deserters and draft-dodgers, <u>disapproved</u> of the <u>Supreme</u> <u>Court decision</u> legalizing <u>abortion</u>, overwhelmingly <u>rejected</u> the idea of extending <u>economic aid</u> <u>to North Vietnam</u>, heavily <u>favored</u> restoring the <u>death penalty</u> for certain crimes, <u>favored</u> <u>Federal income tax credits</u> for part of the cost of sending children to nonprofit nonpublic elementary and secondary schools, <u>favored</u> protecting the right of newsmen <u>not to reveal the</u> <u>identity of news sources</u>, heavily <u>rejected</u> the use of <u>Highway Trust Fund</u> monies for <u>mass transit</u>, <u>endorsed</u> giving the President the <u>power to raise or lower tariffs</u>, and strongly <u>favored</u> having <u>Congress</u> adopt <u>an annual spending ceiling</u> even at the expense of existing programs.

# DISTRICT SPLIT ON AMNESTY QUESTION

While only <u>10 per cent</u> of the questionnaire respondents favored <u>unconditional amnesty</u>, <u>37 per cent</u> would grant amnesty to those draft-dodgers and deserters willing to serve <u>two or</u> three years in some kind of government service.

That adds up to 47 per cent for amnesty of a sort, while 49 per cent of my respondents were opposed to amnesty under any conditions.

The numbers on this and other questions asked of my constituents <u>do not total 100</u> per cent because some people did not answer certain questions. And the numbers are rounded off.

#### THUMBS DOWN ON ABORTION RULING

Offered three choices, only <u>31 per cent</u> of my respondents said they favor allowing the Supreme Court ruling on abortion to stand.

Nearly half of the respondents-45 per cent-want a constitutional amendment which would prohibit abortions in all but extreme circumstances (such as saving the mother's life), while 18 per cent favor a constitutional amendment which would restore to the states the power to regulate abortions. The combined vote for constitutional amendments which would reverse the Supreme Court decision is 63 per cent.

### DISTRICT OVERWHELMINGLY REJECTS AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

In the <u>Paris Peace Agreement</u>, the United States agreed to contribute to the <u>postwar recon-</u> <u>struction of North Vietnam</u>. Asked if they agreed with this treaty provision, fully <u>80 per cent</u> of the Fifth District residents responding to my questions said "<u>no</u>." Many respondents noted that North Vietnam is continuing to <u>violate terms</u> of the ceasefire agreement.

Only 16 per cent endorsed the aid-to-North-Vietnam agreement. This is pretty conclusive proof that the Fifth District frowns on providing North Vietnam with any economic assistance, at least under present circumstances.

The Administration has not submitted any aid proposal to Congress.

Balloting on the question of <u>restoring the death penalty</u> indicated that Fifth District residents believe capital punishment is <u>a deterrent to crime</u>.

Nearly four out of five--76 per cent--voted in favor of restoring the death penalty for such crimes as premeditated murder, wartime treason, and skyjacking and kidnapping which result in death. Only 20 per cent were opposed.

The Administration has proposed a revision of Federal criminal laws which provides for the imposition of the death penalty under certain conditions. I have introduced that bill.

#### MY VOTE REFLECTS DISTRICT POSITION ON HIGHWAY FUNDS

It so happened that the House vote on the question of diverting Highway Trust Fund money for mass transit use occurred before my questionnaire results were recorded.

I was very pleased, therefore, when it turned out that 67 per cent of those responding to my questionnaire voted against using Highway Trust Fund monies for mass transit--because that is the way I voted on the issue. Only 26 per cent favored diversion.

Incidentally, the House last Wednesday approved a \$2.8 billion Department of Transportation appropriation bill which included \$980 million for mass transit. I voted for the bill. These funds <u>do not come out</u> of the Highway Trust Fund, which is built up with revenue from <u>highway</u> <u>user taxes</u> and is used for <u>highway construction only</u>. I firmly believe that as long as we have <u>killer highways like US-131</u> we should be using Highway Trust Fund money solely to build roads.

### DISTRICT ENDORSES TAX CREDITS FOR NONPUBLIC SCHOOL TUITION

As most of my constituents know, I <u>last January introduced a bill</u> providing a Federal income tax credit of <u>up to \$200 per child</u> for parents who send their children to nonprofit nonpublic elementary and secondary schools.

My questionnaire showed 56 per cent backing of my position on this legislation, with 41 per cent opposed.

House Ways and Means Committee Chairman Wilbur Mills recently stated that the omnibus tax reform bill which his committee will prepare will "<u>undoubtedly</u>" include my tax credit proposal. This means my legislation will <u>pass the House</u>. I can make no predictions about what will happen to it <u>in the Senate</u>.

#### YOUTH VOTES MUCH LIKE ELDERS

As will be seen from the complete questionnaire results listed in percentages below, the young people responding to my questionnaire (18 through 20 years old) voted <u>substan-</u> tially the same on the questions as their elders <u>except on amnesty</u>. A majority of the young people favored either conditional or unconditional amnesty. The combined vote was 60 per cent.

# **JERRY FORD 1973 QUESTIONNAIRE**

at the product of the series of the series of		18-20 Yr. Old		all	18-20	20 Overall
a a light and him the first distribution of	Yes	No	Yes	No	MULTIPLE CHOICE Yr. Old	Total
<ol> <li>Do you favor having Congress adopt an annual spending ceiling even if it means cutting existing programs?</li> </ol>		29	78	16	<ol> <li>On abortion, which do you favor?</li> <li>A. A constitutional amendment to</li> </ol>	
<ol><li>Should Congress give the President the power to raise or lower tariffs as a weapon in trade negotiations with other countries?</li></ol>	44	47	58	36	prohibit abortions in all but ex- treme circumstances	45
<ol> <li>Congress now appropriates nearly \$1 billion annually for moss transit. Should Congress, in addition, allow the use of Highway Trust Fund monies for mass transit?</li> </ol>	1.	58	26	67	B. A constitutional amendment re- storing to the states the power to regulate abortions.	18
4. Should Congress poss a law protecting the claimed right of news- men not to reveal the identity of news sources?	55	37	53	42	C. Allowing the Supreme Court decision on abortion to stand	31
5. Do you favor Federal tax credits to defray part of the cost of tuition paid by parents to send their children to nonprofit nanpublic elementary and secondary schools?	48	46	56	41	<ol> <li>How do you feel about amnesty for deserters and draft-dadgers?</li> </ol>	DH
6. Should the death penalty be restored nationally for such crimer		40	)0	410	A. I am opposed to amnesty, 30	49
as premeditated murder, wartime treason, and skyjacking and kid- napping which result in death?		40	76	20	B. I favor amnesty	10
7. According to the recently signed peace agreement, the United	e Dette	11.0.	10	Lo.	C. I favor amnesty for those will- ing to serve two or three years	H*
States agreed to contribute to the post-war reconstruction of North Vietnam. Do you agree with this provision?		71	16	80	in some sort of government 39	37



July 2, 1973

## PRESIDENT, CONGRESS COMPROMISE ON CAMBODIA

Locked for days in an <u>impasse</u> over U.S. policy in <u>Cambodia</u>, the President and Congress last weekend reached a fair and constructive solution to a crisis situation.

The impasse ended when the President accepted a legal deadline, August 15, for ending U.S. military involvement in Indochina and pledged that he would come to Congress and ask for specific authority to continue U.S. air action in Cambodia if that proves necessary after mid-August.

The Federal Government was tottering on the brink of a fiscal shutdown when I relayed to the House the President's commitment concerning Cambodia. Both the House and the Senate had tacked bombing halt provisions onto a bill providing \$3.3 billion in <u>supplemental appropriations</u> for fiscal 1973 and a resolution providing for the <u>continued funding of federal agencies</u> until regular appropriations are approved for fiscal 1974.

The House and Senate sent the supplemental appropriation bill to the President with a flat ban on bombing in Cambodia written into it. The President vetoed that bill last Wednesday, and that same day House Democratic leaders sought to have the President's veto overridden. The House upheld the President's veto by a vote of 241 to 173--35 votes short of the two-thirds necessary to override. Since the end-the-bombing forces clearly did not have the votes to override Presidential vetoes on this issue, it became apparent that compromise was the only solution.

FORCED CAMBODIA BOMBING HALT COULD WRECK INDOCHINA PEACE CHANCES

In his <u>message to Congress</u> explaining his <u>veto</u> of the Second Supplemental Appropriation Bill, the President <u>clearly spelled out</u> why he felt it would be <u>disastrous for Free World</u> interests to halt the bombing in Cambodia in support of government forces there.



CAMBODIA WAS THE TOPIC -- Presidential National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger, third from left, recently briefed members of Congress on the Cambodian situation. Shown here, left to right, are: House Majority Leader Thomas P. O'Neill Jr., House Foreign Affairs Committee Chairman Thomas E. Morgan, Kissinger, House Speaker Carl Albert, myself, and Foreign Affairs Committee senior Republican William S. Mailliard. Said the President:

\* "We should all recognize what the full impact would be if we call a total halt to U.S. air operations in Cambodia. A total halt would virtually remove Communist incentive to negotiate and would thus seriously undercut ongoing diplomatic efforts to achieve a ceasefire in Cambodia. It would effectively reverse the momentum towards lasting peace in Indochina set in motion last January and renewed in the four-party communique signed in Paris on June 13.

\* "The proposed halt would also gravely jeopardize the ability of the Cambodian armed forces to prevent a Communist military victory achieved with the assistance of outside forces and the installation of a Hanoi-controlled government in Phnom Penh."

I felt the Administration should be given more time to negotiate.

## The President further noted that:

- \* "A Communist victory in Cambodia, in turn, would threaten the fragile balance of negotiated agreements, political alignments and military capabilities upon which the overall peace in Southeast Asia depends and on which my assessment of the acceptability of the Vietnam agreements was based.
- \* "Finally, and with even more serious global implications, the legislatively imposed acceptance of the United States to Communist violations of the Paris agreement and the conquest of Cambodia by Communist forces would call into question our national commitment not only to the Vietnam settlement but to many other settlements or agreements we have reached or seek to reach with other nations. A serious blow to America's international credibility would have been struck -- a blow that would be felt far beyond. Indochina."

## DEADLOCK ENDS QUICKLY

Within two hours of my telephone conversation with the President in which he told me of his accepting the August 15 deadline on an end to U.S. air action over Cambodia, the House began voting to throw out legislation cutting off all funds immediately for the bombing of Communist forces in Cambodia.

Allowing the Administration to exert pressure on the Communists in Cambodia at least until August 15 may make it possible to achieve a ceasefire there and to bring Cambodia into a general Indochina peace settlement.

I supported the President on this issue because I firmly believe it is in the best interests of the U.S. and the Free World to prevent a Communist takeover in Cambodia by military means. 19 Jack 1991 (pers 17 mm

# CONGRESS VOTES SOCIAL SECURITY INCREASE and Said 1811 Last an and

II an boostine in Conductive unitation

Some 30 million Social Security beneficiaries will get a 5.6 per cent increase in benefits beginning July 3, 1974.

The House last Saturday approved the increase by a 327 to 9 rollcall vote and the Senate passed the legislation by voice vote.

Final action came after the House Friday night rejected, by a 190 to 185 vote, legislation which would have made the benefits increase effective next <u>April 1</u>. The House took this action because making the rise in benefits effective in April instead of July would have thrown the Social Security Trust Fund out of balance and added to the fiscal 1974 deficit.

The legislation approved Saturday night does more than simply raise Social Security benefits. It also:

- \* Raises the maximum a Social Security recipient can earn without loss of benefits from \$2,100 a year to \$2,400, effective next Jan. 1.
- \* Raises the Social Security taxable wage base to \$12,600 next Jan. 1 to help pay for the new benefits, thus boosting the maximum tax in 1974 from \$702 to \$738.
- \* Raises Federal welfare guarantees for the aged, blind and disabled from \$130 to \$140 a month for single persons and from \$195 a month to \$210 for couples, effective next July 1, and requires the states to make up the difference if their welfare payments are higher than the Federal guarantees.
- \* Suspends for four months--until Oct. 30, 1973--proposed new social services regulations for the poor but lets them go into effect before that if the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee are satisfied that the Administration has "softened" them. NEW TIA DESCRIPTION

Discover Maria and Milling and and and and

"ON THE JOB" - and handloop in her handloop and has been been

the factoding areas formed by

this twell + to mand a tear

I would like to report to you on my attendance record thus far in this first session of the 93rd Congress, on the contract hand a will bene, heft to night, and thouse the interview lander

Through July 2 there were 323 votes and quorum calls. Of that number, I missed 25, for a percentage score of 92.3. My attendance percentage on yea and nay votes was 93.4. On quorum calls, it was 89.6 per cent.



# HOUSE PASSES FARM BILL WITH TARGET PRICE ESCALATOR

After working on the legislation off and on for two weeks and agonizing over innumerable amendments, the House Thursday night passed a four-year omnibus farm bill that contains an escalator clause to cover farm production cost increases. The final vote was 226 to 182.

The House refused to remove the escalator clause from the bill despite my warning that the President undoubtedly would veto the legislation because of it. On an initial vote on the issue, the House voted 240 to 174 to retain the escalator. A last-minute attempt to "recommit" the bill with instructions to drop the escalator clause failed, 225 to 182.

Both the House bill and a Senate farm measure passed earlier this year set target prices for wheat, feed grains and cotton. These target prices are actually price guarantees. The aim is to give farmers some price insurance and thus give them an incentive to produce. However, the Administration has estimated that over the four-year life of the House farm bill, the target prices could cost the taxpayers \$9 billion. If market prices stayed above the target prices, there would be no subsidy payments. But if they fell below these prices, farmers would be paid the difference between the market price and the target price. The target prices in the Senate bill are higher than those in the House bill. The Administration believes both are too high.

At one point in consideration of the House farm bill, an amendment was offered to employ the target price concept for just one year and then phase out farm price supports over the remaining three years. I supported that amendment. I felt that when the House and Senate compromised over the differing farm bills, this amendment would give the conferees a <u>wide latitude</u> for a solution ranging from one year of supports to the high target prices in the Senate bill. This amendment was <u>rejected</u> 184 to 220.

As passed, the House farm bill:

- \* Limits the amount of subsidies that can be paid each farmer to \$20,000; also puts a \$20,000 limit on payments to farmers for idling their land and forbids farmers to lease their land or sell cotton allotments to avoid the subsidy limit. I favored this.
- \* Bans the use of food stamps by strikers under an amendment approved twice by the House--213 to 203 and 208 to 207. I supported the ban.
- \* Allows the Secretary of Agriculture to force the President to increase food prices if it appears that a price freeze will cause a shortage of a particular food. I favored this.
- \* Allows the Department of Labor to set regulations governing when farm workers may return to fields that have been sprayed with pesticides. I supported shifting this to the Department of Agriculture.

# HOUSE LIMITS PRESIDENTIAL POWER TO WAGE UNDECLARED WARS

The House last Wednesday night approved, 244 to 170, a bill which sharply limits presidential power to wage undeclared wars.

The House measure declares that the President must halt any commitment of U.S. armed forces to combat outside the United States at the end of 120 days if Congress takes no action on his move. I favored requiring Congress to take an up-or-down vote on approving the troop use but a vote on this amendment failed, 211 to 201.

The President is <u>certain to veto this legislation</u>. In a telegram to me which I read to the House, the President said: "I want you to know of my strong opposition to this measure. I am unalterably opposed to and must veto any bill containing the <u>dangerous and unconstitutional</u> re-strictions found in Sections 4 (b) and 4 (c) of this bill. However, I fully support the desire of members to assure Congress its proper role in national decisions of war and peace, and I would welcome appropriate legislation providing for an effective contribution by the Congress."

#### BILLS I HAVE SPONSORED THIS YEAR

Bills and resolutions I have <u>sponsored</u> or <u>cosponsored</u> this year include legislation that would do the following:

- \* Amend the U.S. Constitution to <u>restore</u> to the states the power to <u>prohibit or regulate</u> abortions.
- \* Allow a Federal income tax credit of up to \$200 for each child to parents sending their children to elementary and secondary nonprofit nonpublic schools.
- \* Amend the Federal Food, Drug and Cosmetic Act so as to <u>prevent</u> the Food and Drug Administration from requiring a prescription for the <u>purchase</u> of vitamins.
- \* Establish a Federal program to encourage the voluntary donation of pure and safe blood, and set up a national registry of blood donors.
- \* Require that all school <u>buses</u> be equipped with <u>seatbelts for passengers</u> and seat backs sufficiently high to prevent injury to passengers.
- \* Direct the Interstate Commerce Commission to require that certain railroad vehicles be equipped with reflectors or luminous strips on the sides so they can readily be seen at night.
- \* Extend and improve the Nation's unemployment compensation program.
- \* Expand the authority of the National Institute of Arthritis, Metabolism and Digestive Diseases in order to advance the national attack on diabetes.
- \* Provide for the <u>continuation</u> of programs authorized under the <u>Vocational Rehabilitation</u> Act. (Bill with a different number, but basically the same, passed the House June 5.)
- \* Reemphasize the intent of the House to prohibit forced busing for purposes of racial balance.
  - \* Develop a comprehensive program of temporary housing, psychiatric, medical and counseling help for runaway children on an interstate basis.
    - \* Provide that States may have stricter standards than the Federal Government for hot dogs, sausages, and other such meat products.



SUMMER ASSISTANCE -- These people shown with me assisted my regular staff in my Washington office this summer. Left to right, they are: Charles Strikwerda of Grand Rapids, who has completed two years toward a Ph.D. in political science at the University of Kentucky; Joseph A.A. Graf, political science instructor at Grand Rapids Junior College; Esther Byle, Kent City High School senior; Mary Kurjian of Grand Rapids, sophomore at the University of Michigan; and David Pickering of East Grand Rapids, a Grand Rapids JC graduate who will be a college junior this fall. Still other bills I have sponsored would accomplish the following:

Establish a nonpartisan commission on political campaign reform.

Allow a State to use the dual signature method of making welfare payments without losing Federal aid.

Create a National <u>Bargaining</u> Board for farmers.

Provide for the continued supply of petroleum products to independent oil marketers.

Allow a State using equalized property valuations to <u>take millage</u> rates into account in determining how much local units of government will receive under Revenue Sharing.

Provide for the enforcement of child support orders in Federal courts and make it a crime for a father to skip the state to avoid paying child support.

Establish rational criteria for <u>man-</u> <u>datory</u> imposition of the <u>death</u> <u>penalty</u>.

Assure the imposition of appropriate penalties on persons convicted of offenses involving heroin and morphine.



July 30, 1973

# MY MOBILE OFFICE DISTRICT TOUR SET

I will be visiting <u>19 locations in the Fifth District</u> during the <u>August recess</u> of Congress, touring the area in a <u>mobile office</u>. This will give me an opportunity to <u>meet first-hand</u> with my constituents and learn of their problems and concerns.

My visits are scheduled for the periods <u>August 6-8</u> and <u>August 23-September 1</u>. At the same time I will be meeting with various groups and making a number of speaking appearances throughout the district. <u>The complete schedule for my mobile office tour</u> of the district is as follows:

	a seed, and the off	
- Further	<u>9:00 to 11:30 a.m.</u>	2:30 to 5:00 p.m.
Mon., Aug. 6		BELDING (City Hall)
Tues., Aug. 7	PORTLAND (City Parking Lot side of Kent)	LAKE ODESSA (BraDee's Drugs parking)
Wed., Aug. 8	LOWELL (City Parking Lot on Main Street)	ADA (Union Bank p <b>ark</b> ing lot)
Thurs., Aug. 23	KENT CITY (Township Hall)	
Fri., Aug. 24	FOWLER (Southwest corner of Second & Main)	
Sat., Aug. 25	MIDDLEVILLE (Northeast corner of High & Main)	
Mon., Aug. 27	BYRON CENTER (Byron Center Shoprite)	ROCKFORD (Main Street by Don's Pharmacy)
Tues., Aug. 28	CALEDONIA (Main Street by Lake Avenue)	<u>SPARTA</u> (Main Street)
Wed., Aug. 29	IONIA (Front of Ionia County Bank)	<u>SARANAC</u> (Front of McCarty Advertising)
Thurs., Aug. 30	CEDAR SPRINGS (Northwest corner Ash & Main)	STANDALE (Plaza)
Fri., Aug. 31	COMSTOCK PARK (Lamoreaux Drugs parking lot)	ROGERS PLAZA (Schensul's sign)
Sat., Sept. 1	GRANDVILLE (City Hall parking lot)	10.7

Still intent on <u>confrontation with the President</u>, the House last Wednesday passed a bill limiting the President's power to refuse to spend funds appropriated by the Congress. The vote was 254 to 164. <u>I voted against the bill</u> because a better solution would be for Congress to establish Congressional budgetary control procedures as unanimously recommended by a House-Senate Study Committee.

The measure passed by the House requires the President to notify Congress within 10 days that he has impounded appropriated funds. Either the House or the Senate then could <u>force</u> the President to <u>spend the impounded money</u> by disapproving the impoundment within 60 days.

I am most anxious that Congress get a handle on the problem of how best to manage Federal funds. <u>The solution I favor</u> is one which is now pending in the Congress—the establishment of <u>a Budget Committee</u> in both the House and the Senate with the power to keep Congress within a budgetary ceiling.

Instead of bringing this <u>Legislative Budgetary Control Act</u> to the floor, the House Democratic Leadership has allowed it to languish in the House Rules Committee for three months. Rather than choose this responsible course, the House Democratic Leadership elected to force action on an anti-impoundment bill which the President is certain to veto.

The Senate also has passed an anti-impoundment bill, a measure which would order an end to a Presidential impoundment of funds unless both houses of Congress approved of the President's action within 60 days.

The House bill applies only to fiscal 1974; the Senate bill is permanent legislation. The House bill sets a spending ceiling of \$267.1 billion for fiscal 1974; the Senate bill, \$268 billion. The President has sent Congress a \$268.7 billion budget for this fiscal year.

The House bill provides that if the Congress exceeds the spending ceiling set in the antiimpoundment legislation the President must make "proportional" cuts in all programs except for certain categories that are exempt. These include <u>social insurance</u> payments, <u>veterans benefits</u>, public assistance maintenance grants under Title IV of the Social Security Act, food stamps, military retirement pay, <u>Medicaid</u>, judicial salaries, and interest on the national debt.

Republican after Republican rose on the floor of the House to protest that the only responsible remedy for excessive Federal spending is the proposed Legislative Budgetary Control <u>Act</u> and not the anti-impoundment legislation drafted by the Democrats.

Although Democratic floor managers insisted the bill was nonpartisan, the vote on final passage ran pretty much along party lines with 218 Democrats and 36 Republicans voting for it and 14 Democrats joining 150 Republicans in opposition to it.

Republicans moved to require disapproval of an impoundment by both houses of Congress before it could be halted but this was defeated twice--by votes of 206 to 205 and 212 to 208.



IONIA COUNTY 4-H GROUP VISITS WASHINGTON--Fourteen Ionia County 4-H members visited Washington recently to attend a citizenship short course at the National 4-H Center. Here they are shown with me and 4-H leaders Mr. and Mrs. Arthur Raffler of Lake Odessa Rte. 2 on the steps of the U.S. Capitol. A Republican attempt to lower the spending ceiling to \$263.3 billion also was defeated, 206 to 205.

# IMPOUNDMENT NOT NEW

There is a long history of impoundment of Federal funds by American Presidents.

In 1941, as world war approached, <u>Franklin D</u>. <u>Roosevelt</u> deferred public works and highway projects and diverted the money into defense.

In 1949, <u>Harry Truman impounded money</u> appropriated by Congress to increase the number of Air Force Groups from 48 to 58.

In 1950, Truman cancelled construction of the supercarrier U.S.S. United States.

In 1958, 1959 and 1960, Dwight D. Eisenhower impounded <u>development funds</u> for the Nike-Zeus ABM system.

In 1961, John F. Kennedy impounded \$180 million appropriated by Congress to speed development of the B-70 bomber.

In 1967, Lyndon B. Johnson impounded over \$5 billion from domestic and non-Vietnam programs.