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FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT

Mr. Speaker: I was most pleased to see the President make an interim report to the American people last night on the results of the Cambodian operation.

I was personally impressed by that report and I feel certain that most other Americans were also. It seemed to me that President Nixon's presentation could not help but reassure the Nation regarding the Cambodian Operation.

The President's report was a dramatic outline of the facts surrounding events in Cambodia. I agree with the President that the Cambodian Operation must be described as the most successful military mission we have ever undertaken in the Vietnam War.

I was glad the President reviewed the reasons for our attack on the Communist sanctuaries in Cambodia. Americans now recognize the necessity for the Cambodian Operation since, as the President explained last night, the Communists were making the entire 600-mile Cambodian-South Vietnamese border a launching area for attacks on American and allied forces in Vietnam.

There is no question but that we have achieved the basic objectives of the Cambodian Operation. And those Americans concerned about a widening of the war should be reassured by the President's promise that the only U.S. activity in Cambodia after July 1 will be air missions to interdict the movement of enemy troops and materiel. They should also be reassured by the President's statement that the door to a negotiated peace is "wide open."

Mr. Speaker, the President deserves the broadest possible public support for his continuing efforts to win a just peace in Vietnam. I believe his report to the Nation last night will earn him support except from those persons and groups who would be satisfied with nothing less than immediate withdrawal from Vietnam, regardless of the consequences.

President Nixon has kept his word to the American people. He has demonstrated himself to be a strong leader, a man the people can look to for strong decision-making, a man they can trust, a man in whom they can believe. The American people should give peace a chance by giving the President a chance.

# # #
Sex doesn't make much difference at Ottawa Hills High School—when it comes to views on leading issues of the day.

That sums up the results of a recent "His" and "Hers" poll at the school, with about 1,200 students casting votes on questions posed in Congressman Gerald R. Ford's 1970 congressional questionnaire. Whether it was a boy or a girl who was balloting, there was surprisingly little difference in the answers.

The girls split 50-50 on putting the Post Office Department on a pay-as-you-go basis; the boys favored it 51 to 49.

Both boys and girls felt the United States could not rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union but should gradually expand its diplomatic and trade relations with Red China.

Students of both sexes overwhelmingly endorsed President Nixon's $10 billion program of Federal, state and local expenditures to fight water pollution.

With the girls more heavily on the side of law enforcement authorities, the students favored allowing federal officers with a warrant to enter private premises without knocking in search of illegal drugs and permitting a judge to hold a criminal defendant in jail if his record indicated he might commit serious crimes while released on bond.

By identical scores of 86 to 14 the boys and girls opposed busing school children out of their neighborhood school areas to achieve better racial balance in classrooms.

Very heavily and by nearly identical showings, the boys and girls favored continued draft deferments for college students and giving special priority to balancing the budget while inflation remains a problem.

On the question of what is the single most important problem in the country today, the boys rated air and water pollution first (50 per cent), as did the girls (33 per cent); the Vietnam War second (boys and girls, both 31); the boys crime and violence third (10 per cent) while the girls picked inflation (23); the boys inflation fourth (9), and the girls, crime and violence (13).

The boys and girls also parted company on farm legislation, with 70 per cent of the girls for continuing the farm program as is, and only 40 per cent of the boys favoring this course. In other results, 34 per cent of the boys favored reducing farm subsidies, with 10 per cent of the girls for this; 26 per cent of the boys wanted to phase out the farm program, and 20 per cent of the girls wanted this.

# # #
Congressman Gerald R. Ford today proposed a program of $25,000 cash awards from the Federal Government as an incentive to individual Americans to develop solutions to critical national problems.

Ford said: "I have long felt that someone should create an atmosphere of incentive for Americans at the grass roots level to come up with answers to some of our most pressing problems—like maybe a fellow in his home garage devising an effective but inexpensive device for controlling air pollution. I would like to enlist all of our citizens in a campaign to lick our national problems. And so I have introduced a bill which I think will provide the incentive."

The Ford bill would have the Federal Government offer as many as four prizes of $25,000 each to be awarded, possibly annually, to Americans who make outstanding contributions toward solving any of our national problems. No prize would be awarded in years when no such contribution had been made.

"My point," Ford said, "is that it is in the national interest to create this atmosphere of promoting individual solutions to our national problems by recognizing and rewarding citizens who deserve such awards."

Ford calls his bill the Distinguished Citizen Awards Act. He said it is patterned after the annual awarding of Nobel Prizes except that it would be presented only to U.S. citizens and only for contributions to the solution of the problems of this country.

"While the individual who wins one of these awards would truly be a distinguished citizen, he would also be representative of Middle America," Ford said. "What I want to do is bring the man on the street—the farmer, the factory worker, the small businessman—into the solution of our national problems."

Ford said his proposal does not overlap the cash awards offered to employees by various U.S. Government departments because the scope of it goes far beyond such programs.

Ford said: "I believe a program of the kind I am proposing would accelerate our progress in solving national problems and would enhance the wellbeing and the happiness of our people. I therefore feel we should establish a system of Distinguished Citizen Awards as a matter of national policy."

Ford's bill would create a Presidential commission of five members who would meet annually to consider whether any American citizen had so contributed to the solution of a national problem as to be deserving of a $25,000 Distinguished Citizen Award. The commission could decide to award no prizes or as many as four. The group would meet in April of each year in Washington, D.C., or at some other location of the commission's choosing. A three-man majority would have to agree on the awards.

To be chosen for the award a citizen would have to have achieved "an established, working solution to a national problem," Ford said. The "solution" could not simply be an idea or suggestion.

###

Mr. Speaker: President Nixon has laid it on the line in the battle against inflation. He has--to the benefit of the Nation--told the American people just what the situation is and what he will do to deal with it and, just as importantly, what he will not do. This is the kind of guidance the country needs at what I consider to be a most crucial juncture in our fight against inflation.

I am pleased that the President will appoint a National Commission on Productivity and that he has directed the Council of Economic Advisers to prepare a periodic Inflation Alert. This becomes the key to achieving price stability. It focuses attention on the area which is central to progress toward price stability--improvements in productivity. We cannot lick inflation of the cost-push variety without gains in productivity. So this problem is paramount at this time.

The President has also laid it on the line in urging the Congress not to grant him powers he has said he will not use but to move ahead quickly to pass constructive, meaningful legislation sorely needed in this time of economic transition.

Congress should act with purposeful determination to give the President the program he has requested--stronger unemployment insurance, the Manpower Training Act, a $50 million supplemental appropriation to provide summer jobs for students, insurance to protect small investors against brokerage house failures, a cost-of-living tie with Social Security, the Emergency Home Finance Act, the means to stimulate loans to small businesses at lower interest rates, and emergency assistance to financially-distressed railroads.

As the President so plainly and pertinently said, this is no time to play politics with the economy of this country. It is a time that demands the utmost display of responsibility on the part of business, labor and government. Above all, it is a time for affirmative action--action of the kind described by the President, action that will move this country toward a genuine prosperity based on a peacetime economy and the price stability that keeps more dollars in the pockets of the American working man.

I commend the President for his most timely statement and urge that the Congress join with him in successfully moving this country from a wartime to a peacetime economy. The problems are big enough for all of us to have a piece of the action.

###
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# # #
Kent and Ionia County residents view crime and violence as our nation's greatest problem, the response to Congressman Gerald R. Ford's 1970 questionnaire indicates.

Asked to single out what they considered to be the most important among four major problems facing the country today, 45.5 per cent of Fifth Congressional District residents responding picked crime and violence.

Of the rest, 24.7 per cent chose the Vietnam War; 12.8 per cent picked inflation; and 9.4 per cent singled out air and water pollution.

Ford sent out 156,040 copies of his questionnaire, blanketing the entire district. He received 34,517 responses—an impressive 22 per cent.

"I am terribly pleased by the number of responses to my questionnaire," Ford said. "This tells me that the people of my congressional district are very much interested in public affairs and very much concerned about the issues."

Ford learned that 52.4 per cent of those responding are opposed to draft deferments for undergraduate college students, while 43 per cent favor continued deferments and 4.6 per cent are undecided.

President Nixon has asked Congress to end college deferments. Ford has reserved judgment on the question until all the facts have been presented to the Congress.

Strong feelings in the Fifth District about crime and violence apparently were reflected in balloting on two other questions. Nearly 80 per cent of those voting (79.2) favored allowing Federal officers armed with a Federal warrant to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed. Slightly more than 90 per cent favored allowing a judge to keep a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" if his record indicated he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial.

At a time when the Congress is acting on postal reform, 73 per cent of district residents responding said they favor putting the Post Office Department on a pay-as-you-go basis. Legislation now before the Congress calls for this to be done in stages by 1978. The House of Representatives, with Congressman Ford's strong support, approved a postal reform bill last Thursday.

(more)
Congress currently is also working on general farm legislation. On this subject, 70.2 per cent of district residents responding want the farm program phased out within five years; 8.9 per cent want it continued as is; and 8.9 per cent favor making it permanent but with subsidies reduced.

Evidencing their concern about inflation, 81.7 per cent of those answering the poll would emphasize balancing the Federal budget rather than spend more on government programs in a time of inflationary pressures.

There is no question where Fifth District residents stand on busing school children out of their neighborhood school areas to achieve better racial balance in classrooms. Of those balloting, 91.2 per cent opposed busing while 7 per cent favored it and 1.8 per cent ventured no opinion.

District residents made clear their deep concern about water pollution. Of those voting, 80 per cent said they favor President Nixon's $10 billion Federal-state-local program aimed at water pollution control. Only 15.1 per cent opposed it, and 4.9 per cent registered no opinion.

District residents do not trust the Soviet Union but two out of five would gradually expand our relations with Red China.

Asked if we could rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union, 75 per cent said "no;" 20.2 per cent said "yes;" and 4.8 per cent said "don't know."

On the question of expanding our diplomatic and trade relations with Red China, 50.6 per cent were opposed. Of the rest, 40.7 per cent were in favor and 8.7 per cent had no opinion.

Ford said he will place the results of his poll in the Congressional Record and also will send them to President Nixon.

The poll results were processed by a computer firm, at no expense to the taxpayer, Ford noted.
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###
Tabulation of his 1970 questionnaire results has begun but there is still time for Kent and Ionia County residents to turn in their cards, Congressman Gerald R. Ford announced today.

Ford said: "We have begun the processing of our questionnaire returns, which have flooded in by the thousands. We have to establish a cutoff point somewhere, so I am expecting at this time to finish turning the returns over to the tabulators on Saturday, June 6. This will mean I have allowed roughly a month for all of the questionnaires to be returned."

Ford already has one set of results from the questionnaire—the outcome of balloting by the 54 seniors in instructor Jack E. Butterworth's government class at Saranac High School. He is wondering whether voting by the general public will parallel the opinions registered by the Saranac seniors.

Singling out the one most important problem in the country today, 60 per cent of the Saranac seniors picked the Vietnam War; 20 per cent, air and water pollution; 13 per cent, inflation; and 7 per cent, crime and violence.

On the question of busing school children out of their neighborhoods to achieve better racial balance, 78 per cent opposed such busing while 22 per cent approved it.

On the draft, 78 per cent of the seniors favored temporary deferments for college undergraduates, with 22 per cent opposed.

Although 76 per cent favored "preventive detention" for criminal defendants who might commit serious crimes if freed on bond, only 57 per cent favored allowing Federal officers with a search warrant to enter private premises without knocking on the basis that illegal drugs might otherwise be disposed of.

In other results of the questionnaire balloting, the Saranac seniors opposed placing the Post Office Department on pay-as-you-go (57 per cent to 43); said the U.S. can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union (65 to 35); opposed gradual expansion of U.S. trade and diplomatic relations with Red China (65 to 35); favored President Nixon's $10 billion program to fight water pollution (96 to 4); favored giving greater priority to budget-balancing during the fight against inflation (69 to 31); favored continuing the Federal farm program as it presently exists (77 per cent).

On the farm program question, 17 per cent favored a reduction in subsidies and only 6 per cent were for phasing the program out.

# # #
I am deeply grateful to the 34,500 folks in Kent and Ionia Counties who answered my annual questionnaire which was sent to all postal patrons in both counties. The response was significantly above the average on similar questionnaires distributed by other Congressmen. This indicates the deep concern our citizens have for current issues. These responses are extremely helpful to me in analyzing and voting on legislation. I'm sure you will be interested in the results which follow:

1. Should the Post Office Department be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis?  
   - Yes: 73%
   - No: 16%
   - Unanswered: 11%

2. Do you believe the U.S. can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union?  
   - Yes: 20
   - No: 75
   - Unanswered: 5

3. Should the U.S. gradually expand its diplomatic and trade relations with Red China?  
   - Yes: 41
   - No: 50
   - Unanswered: 9

4. Do you favor President Nixon's multi-billion-dollar program to fight water pollution?  
   - Yes: 80
   - No: 15
   - Unanswered: 5

5. President Nixon has recommended strong anti-crime legislation. Do you favor:  
   a. Allowing federal officers with a warrant issued by a federal court to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed?  
      - Yes: 79
      - No: 19
      - Unanswered: 2
   b. Keeping a criminal defendant in "preventive detention" if his record indicates he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial?  
      - Yes: 90
      - No: 8
      - Unanswered: 2

6. Do you favor busing school children out of their neighborhood school areas to achieve better racial balance in classrooms?  
   - Yes: 7
   - No: 91
   - Unanswered: 2

7. Should balancing the federal budget to curb inflation be given priority over greater spending on government programs?  
   - Yes: 82
   - No: 12
   - Unanswered: 6

8. Should undergraduate college students be given temporary draft deferments?  
   - Yes: 43
   - No: 52
   - Unanswered: 5

9. Federal farm controls and subsidies should be:  
   a. Phased out within five years, or  
      - Yes: 70%
   b. Continued as is, or  
      - Yes: 9
   c. Made permanent, with the subsidies reduced  
      - Yes: 9
   d. Others  
      - Yes: 12

10. What is the single most important problem in the country today? Pick one.  
    a. Air and water pollution  
       - Yes: 9
    b. Crime and violence  
       - Yes: 45
    c. The Vietnam War  
       - Yes: 25
    d. Inflation (rise in the cost of living)  
       - Yes: 13
    e. Others  
       - Yes: 8
GOLDEN EAGLE PASSPORT: The Golden Eagle passport is an annual permit which admits tourists to all national recreational areas. Instituted five years ago, the program expired on March 31. Last Monday the House approved a bill to extend the program until Dec. 31, 1971 and authorize the Secretary of the Interior to increase the cost of the permit from $7 to $10 per year. The permit allows the purchaser and anyone in his automobile to enter federal recreational areas without additional fees.

The program although strongly endorsed by many has not been as popular as anticipated. It was hoped that about 36 million annual permits would be issued. But sales leveled off at about 600,000 and 700,000 per year. Revenue is exclusively used to expand the nation's outdoor recreational opportunities; this earmarked money is needed to improve our national parks. During the extended life of the program, it is to be completely reviewed and revamped to see how it can be made more popular.

RESOURCES RECOVERY ACT OF 1970: This is a good title given to a constructive bill on trash disposal. I was an original sponsor of a similar proposal. Each year this nation is generating about 360 million tons of solid waste (trash). We spend $4.5 billion annually to have it collected and hauled to where it can be dumped or burned. Most of the time these dumps are among the worst blights in our environment.

Practically every community is experiencing difficulties in disposing of its trash and garbage. The bill approved by the House last Tuesday provides funds to assist in the construction of solid waste disposal facilities and to carry on research to improve the means for such disposal. One technology which holds the greatest promise is the generating of electric power from solid wastes.

A recent analysis of city dumps showed that paper products, food wastes, and glass and metal products in that order are the most common items among our solid wastes. Rubber and leather goods were the least common items.

PUBLIC WORKS AND ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION APPROPRIATION: Also approved last week was a $5.2 billion public works and AEC appropriation bill for 1971. The amount is $467 million above this year's spending. Included in the bill is $1 billion for the construction of waste treatment facilities. With $440 million left over from this year, there will be available for local water pollution control in fiscal 1971 about $1.44 billion. Since the inception of this program 13 years ago, more than 10,000 grants have been made to local communities serving about 78 million persons. The total federal cost has been $1.6 billion with state and local investments totaling over $5.5 billion.

AT HOME: On Saturday, July 4, I plan to participate in the Hollyhock Lane and American Legion parades in Grand Rapids. Later in the day I will be in Portland to take part in the celebration there. Last Tuesday afternoon I met with the Kent County Farm Bureau at Fallasburg Park and addressed the Michigan Sheriffs Association in Grand Rapids in the evening.

INDEPENDENCE DAY RECESS - No newsletter next week.
Dear Friend:

The Decade of the Seventies will be a Decade of Decision.
Many of those decisions will be made in Congress by me and others as representatives of the people.

You are the people. I can best represent you if I know what you are thinking. Please take a few minutes to answer the questions below. Results of this poll will be reported to you, to the Congress, and to the President.

Sincerely,

![Signature]

(This card not printed at Government Expense.)

The attached questionnaire is designed so that both husband and wife can express an opinion. Please place your answers in the appropriate boxes, detach the questionnaire at the fold, and return it to me as soon as possible. If you want to make some special comment, please write me at the following address:

Rep. Gerald R. Ford
Room H-229
U.S. Capitol Building
Washington, D. C. 20515

If you want direct help with a problem, please contact my personal representative at my district office: 425 Cherry S.E., Grand Rapids, Mich. 49502. Tel. 456-9747.

JERRY FORD 1970 QUESTIONNAIRE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Should the Post Office Department be placed on a pay-as-you-go basis?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Do you believe the U.S. can rely on agreements reached with the Soviet Union?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Should the U.S. gradually expand its diplomatic and trade relations with Red China?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Do you favor President Nixon's multi-billion-dollar program to fight water pollution?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. President Nixon has recommended strong anti-crime legislation. Do you favor:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Allowing federal officers with a warrant issued by a federal court to enter private premises without knocking if drugs and other evidence of illegal narcotics traffic might otherwise be destroyed?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Keeping a criminal defendant in &quot;preventive detention&quot; if his record indicates he might commit a serious crime if freed on bond while awaiting trial?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Do you favor busing school children out of their neighborhood school areas to achieve better racial balance in classrooms?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Should balancing the Federal budget to curb inflation be given priority over greater spending on government programs?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Should undergraduate college students be given temporary draft deferments?</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Federal farm controls and subsidies should be:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Phased out within five years, or</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Continued as is, or</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Made permanent, with the subsidies reduced</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. What is the single most important problem in the country today? Pick one.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Air and water pollution</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Crime and violence</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. The Vietnam War</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Inflation (rise in the cost of living)</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SIMPLY DETACH THIS HALF OF CARD, AFFIX STAMP ON OTHER SIDE AND MAIL BACK

CONGRESSMAN JERRY FORD WANTS YOUR THINKING

The time has come to launch a new effort to get the Paris peace talks moving toward a negotiated settlement of the Vietnam War.

Our present top negotiator, Philip C. Habib, has been doing an excellent job under most difficult circumstances. It seems wise at this point to broaden the U.S. negotiating team by the appointment of high level advisers to those who have carried the burden in Paris. The top level adviser group should come from among the most highly respected and knowledgeable negotiators in the country.

This, I believe, would be the logical follow-through for President Nixon after his impressive report to the Nation on our Cambodia Operation.

As the President said, the Vietnam War has reached another crossroad. This is a juncture at which the Communists should opt for a negotiated settlement and an early peace rather than a protracted struggle.

I strongly believe, along with the President, that the Cambodian Operation was necessary and that it has proved a solid success. There are those who persist in calling the Cambodian Operation a failure because they favor immediate withdrawal from Indochina and want our military operations there to fail. It is impossible for me to understand how anyone could call our Cambodian Operation an invasion of Cambodia when the North Vietnamese were already there and we simply crossed the border to attack them.

One of the most encouraging results of the Cambodian Operation is that it showed the South Vietnamese to be increasingly able to handle the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong in sustained combat.

This is a big plus and one which indicates to me that withdrawal of U.S. troops from South Vietnam can be speeded up.

# # #
There is real hope for some movement in the Paris peace talks.

The North Vietnamese negotiators at Paris have complained for months that the U.S. downgraded the talks by leaving the post of permanent chief negotiator in the U.S. delegation vacant.

Now that President Nixon has named Ambassador K. E. Bruce to the position of U.S. delegation chief, the North Vietnamese should reciprocate with some gesture on their part which might break the long impasse.

Certainly the President has made a fresh move in the direction of peace by the appointment of Ambassador Bruce and his offer to remove all U.S. troops from South Vietnam within a year "if the enemy will negotiate with our new ambassador."

The demand by the Senate doves for equal time to reply to the President is ridiculous on the face of it. If the television networks are to respond to such demands every time the President makes a TV appearance we soon will have government by equal time -- a constant squaring off of the President and certain members of the Senate. That does not make sense to me. It is simply divisive. The President has every right to make periodic reports to the American people without being subjected to political sniping immediately afterward.

###
CONGRESSMAN GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER


July 3, 1970

I have sent President Nixon a telegram urging him to call spokesmen for Chicago area truck drivers and trucking firm operators to the White House in an effort to head off another general wage increase throughout the trucking industry.

Wage increases at the 12 per cent level agreed to by some Chicago truck operators pose a sharp and immediate threat to the nationwide fight against inflation. If truck operators throughout the Chicago area accede to this wage demand, the pressure will be tremendous on the International Brotherhood of Teamsters to discard the master contract they have negotiated and to seek a new contract patterned after the Chicago increase.

Not only would we then experience the impact of higher trucking costs throughout the economy, but the high wage increase in the trucking industry would encourage the United Auto Workers and other unions with upcoming contract talks to hold out for huge pay boosts.

Former Labor Secretary George Shultz and Secretary James Hodgson have worked hard to bring about a reasonable settlement of the Chicago trucking dispute but the situation has become so critical as to require the President's personal intervention.

Accordingly I have sent the President the following telegram:

Gerald R. Ford, M.C.
July 2, 1970

President Richard M. Nixon
San Clemente, California

Chicago area truck strike has had extremely serious repercussions on the economy of the Middle West. Labor-management negotiations in Chicago now have reached crucial point, with ramifications going far beyond impact on Middle West economy. Unfortunately Congress has not enacted legislation recommended by you which would have been very helpful in seeking a fair and constructive solution. In view of the regrettable lack of legislation, I urge personal White House involvement to bring labor and management to a solution which will be in the best interest of the Nation.

Sincerely,

Gerald R. Ford, M.C.

# # #
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# # #
Leaders of the Democratic Party would have the American people believe that we have "a sick economy, a very sick economy," to use the words employed on television last night by Democratic National Chairman Lawrence F. O'Brien.

This is sick talk. This is playing politics with the people's pocketbook. This is the big lie technique, aimed at scaring the American people for political gain. It is simply not borne out by the facts.

The facts are that the economy is not only sound but growing. The facts are that we can expect real economic growth at an annual rate of 3 per cent to develop over the next six months. The facts are that the economy has turned the corner from Democrat wartime inflation toward Republican price stability and peacetime prosperity.

Sen. Edmund Muskie, D-Me., last night suggested we should now impose wage and price controls to halt inflation. Yet the overwhelming majority of economists in this country, without regard for political affiliation, have repeatedly stated that wage and price controls simply do not work. You do not solve the problem of inflation simply by decreeing that prices be frozen for a time. During World War II we had strict price controls, with an enormous bureaucracy to enforce them, and the Consumer Price Index still rose an average of 3.5 per cent.

As I said earlier, we have turned the corner toward price stability and a new period of healthy economic growth. The Nixon Administration, by judiciously and firmly applying appropriate monetary and fiscal policies, has managed to avoid both a deep recession and a new inflationary surge.

Inflation has been slowing, particularly in wholesale prices where it has dwindled to a 1.4 per cent rate during the second quarter. Inflation ran to more than 5 per cent in 1969 as a result of four Democratic years when inflation was allowed to gather speed unchecked. The pace rose to about 6 per cent in the first quarter of 1970 but it now is falling back to an annual rate of 4.5 per cent or less. Most importantly, productivity has finally begun to increase and this is a most hopeful sign in the fight against inflation. So my prediction is that inflation will slow to 4 per cent or less this year.

We are on the right economic path. We can look to the future with confidence -- a future that promises high employment, diminishing unemployment, stabilization of prices, and prosperity without war.

# # #

Congressional inaction on President Nixon's Emergency Public Interest Protection Act of 1970 is absolutely incomprehensible.

We have had a sudden strike against the nation's railroads. The President has aborted the strike by employing his authority under the Railway Labor Act to order the men back to work for 60 days while an Emergency Board studies the situation and recommends a settlement. Now Northwest Airlines has also been struck.

These actions point up the absurdity of the position in which the Nation finds itself.

The country is without adequate means to deal with national emergency labor disputes in transportation and yet hearings have not even been scheduled in either the House or the Senate on the President's proposed Emergency Public Interest Protection Act.

It was last February 27 that the President sent Congress a Message detailing his proposal covering emergency disputes in the transportation industries. Why has no action been taken? Why should such disputes reach the point where Congress has to legislate a special solution which in most cases amounts to compulsory arbitration? I think these questions demand an answer. I think the American people will insist upon an answer.

As President Nixon has pointed out, the Railway Labor Act has a very bad record. It discourages genuine collective bargaining.

The President's Emergency Public Interest Protection Act is designed to promote collective bargaining -- to promote a solution short of special congressional action in a crisis atmosphere. This makes sense to me, and it should make sense to every other member of Congress.

I urge that the Congress move immediately to consider the Emergency Public Interest Protection Act.

# # #

I am delighted that the House of Representatives had sense enough not to try to tie the hands of the President of the United States in the conduct of our foreign policy.

The House is to be congratulated for having the wisdom to reject the unwarranted attempt by the United States Senate to infringe upon the powers of the President as commander-in-chief of our armed forces.

I now hope that the position of the House prevails in conference and that the Cooper-Church Amendment is removed entirely from the Military Sales Act. The Cooper-Church language would interfere with the power of the President to protect the lives of American troops. Such interference is short-sighted and unwise.

###

Mr. Speaker:

President Nixon assumed office pledging a relentless struggle against crime in the District of Columbia.

Eleven days after his inauguration, he outlined a comprehensive program of crime control designed to restore a decent measure of security to residents and visitors in the Nation's capital.

The President's program envisioned a partnership with Congress. Many of his recommendations required Congressional action.

Specifically, the President proposed a massive reorganization and expansion of the local courts, featuring added manpower and modern court administration to reduce the scandalous backlogs and delays that have characterized the present system.

He supported an enlargement of the D. C. bail agency to improve surveillance of defendants before trial.

He advocated a full-fledged public defender service to assist indigent defendants in criminal proceedings.

He called for sweeping reforms in the operation of the juvenile court and in the juvenile code.

And he asked for changes in the Bail Reform Act to correct manifest deficiencies which had become apparent through experience.

In subsequent weeks and months, other suggestions to improve the District's criminal justice system were forthcoming -- from the Department of Justice, from members of the House and Senate, and from the public at large.

In time, each chamber produced and passed a bill.

Last Monday, after more than three months of spirited debate, after 24 sessions of conference and compromise, the best in these disparate measures was at last brought together in a single omnibus crime bill for the District of Columbia.

We should send this first major crime legislation of the 91st Congress to the President's desk for signature without further delay.

(more)
The legislative process has taken a long time -- too much time for any of us to be proud or satisfied. Almost eighteen months have passed since the President's crime message. These long months have been a tragic loss when we consider the urgency and magnitude of the present crisis.

But a bill has emerged -- a sound, constitutional bill of great depth and dimension that will make history as one of the most progressive crime control measures ever enacted by the Congress.

The members of the Conference Committee who hammered out this compromise legislation deserve our thanks. Special tribute should be paid to Congressmen John McMillan, Tom Abernethy, John Dowdy, Earle Cabell, Ancher Nelsen, Bill Harsha, Joel Broyhill, and Larry Hogan, who faithfully represented the interests of the House.

The D. C. Crime Bill is long overdue -- not months overdue but years overdue -- in a city where crime has increased more than 600 per cent during the past decade.

The bill is not a panacea for every problem in this crime-beleaguered capital. But it is a reasoned response to rampant lawlessness -- an immediate response to immediate problems. It is needed now. It is needed for the future.

The House of Representatives was not satisfied with just a court reorganization bill because a comprehensive crime bill was the medicine needed.

This bill is sound, progressive, bipartisan legislation. The provision authorizing pretrial detention is designed to meet the problem of dangerous felony defendants whose past and present record of behavior demonstrates that they cannot be trusted to refrain from additional criminal conduct during the period between arrest and a speedy trial. Crime on bail is an undeniably serious problem in the District of Columbia, and it will not disappear through wishful thinking.

The no-knock provision in the bill codifies the law of the land as set out by the Supreme Court in Ker v. California. Exaggerated concern about police barging into private homes is completely unfounded in the accumulated experience of 29 states. Authority to enter a premises in exigent circumstances without first knocking is often essential to the life and safety of an officer or the preservation of critical evidence.

The wiretapping provision in the bill implements the authority granted to local jurisdictions by the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968. There is no truth whatever to charges that the provision exceeds the careful standards set out in 1968.

Idle talk about repression contributes nothing to the sober resolution of serious problems.

The D. C. Crime Bill will contribute significantly to peace, liberty, and order in the capital city of our nation. It merits the support of the Congress. # # #

I am and have been opposed to secrecy regarding a congressman's position on major issues of the day.

I firmly believe that a congressman's votes both in committee and on the Floor of the House should be a matter of public record.

For that reason I am supporting moves currently being made to place on public record the votes cast by a member in committee and during teller votes on the Floor of the House.

I also favor making all committee meetings open to the public except in cases involving the national security or the markup of bills. Closing committee meetings where the national security is involved requires no explanation. Meetings at which bills are marked up must be closed because to open them would be to bring lobbyists into such meetings. This would interfere with the proper conduct of markup sessions.

Where committee meetings are closed, this action should be taken by majority vote of the committee and only to protect the national security or to facilitate proper conduct of the business of the committee.

I would add that I strongly favor opening committee meetings to radio, television and news photographers.

I have long favored reform and modernization of the procedures of the House of Representatives. Legislation to that end currently is being considered by the House. I am supporting all constructive amendments.

###
Congressman Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids today urged the House Judiciary Committee to approve two bills aimed at halting terrorist bombings in this country.

Ford filed a strong statement with the committee in support of the legislation. The committee is to open formal hearings Thursday on the bills. One of them would make it a federal crime to bomb a federal building or a business affecting interstate commerce or to telephone a bomb threat or a bomb scare. The other would limit interstate traffic in explosives to licensees and official permittees and would prohibit the sale of explosives to minors, felons, fugitives from justice, drug addicts and mental defectives.

Ford has co-sponsored both of the bills being considered by the Judiciary Committee.

"The rash of bombings which has swept across the country in recent months is a development which must be stopped," Ford told the committee.

He added that these senseless bombings have spread fear throughout America, have taken the lives of 43 people, and have destroyed $22.6 million worth of property.

Said Ford: "These horrible events were recorded during the period from Jan. 1, 1969, to April 15, 1970, when there were 4,330 bombings, 1,475 attempted bombings and 35,129 bomb scares."

Ford said he was "deeply concerned" about the bombing menace. He declared it is "mandatory" that interstate traffic in explosives be regulated by the Federal Government and that explosives be kept out of the hands of minors, felons, fugitives from justice, drug addicts and mental defectives.

Ford asserted: "I urge the enactment of these bills restricting the sale of explosives and I hope that every state will follow up by adopting strong licensing laws governing business in explosives within its borders. These bombings must be stopped."

Ford added: "It is obvious that many of these bombings are the work of anarchists and political fanatics. The only way to deal with these potential murderers is to bring the full power of Federal, state and local law enforcement to bear on the situation. We in the Congress must further regulate the sale of explosives and do everything we reasonably can to help state and local authorities deal with these acts of terrorism."

During the twenty-one years that it has been my privilege to serve as a member of this great body, I have seen many farm bills battled and battered on this Floor.

I have seen proposals to literally enchain American agriculture, and I have fought those proposals.

I have seen some real fiscal follies designed and developed through the years and seldom have I seen the Committee on Agriculture in substantial agreement on anything.

I have seen many instances where the Administration -- be it a Republican or a Democratic Administration -- has been in a hammerlock with the Congress over farm legislation -- be it a Republican or a Democratic Congress.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric during the past two decades on farm bills was usually shrill, generally emotional, and yes, inevitably partisan.

This year, for a change, we have a different legislative atmosphere as we consider H.R. 18546.

This year we have a bill which has the support of the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poage), and the ranking minority member of that committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Belcher).

This year the Administration and the committee are working together to pass a farm bill.

This year the Committee on Agriculture, with only six dissenting votes -- three Republicans and three Democrats -- has agreed on a farm bill.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the situation is different this year because the leadership of both parties agrees that it is in the national interest to have a new farm bill to replace the expiring Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

This year there has been more light than heat in the farm bill dialogue, so let us continue to use reason, not rancor, and analysis, not emotion, as we continue our deliberations over this important legislation.

(more)
Now when I said that this year's farm bill was different, I didn't mean it was so different that there isn't any controversy about it.

This farm bill is not ready for the Consent Calendar, believe me.

There are some features in it which I personally do not think are sound, and I'm sure other members of the House feel the same way. This is not the farm bill that I would write, nor is it the kind of farm bill the Administration would write if it had the power to do so. It is a compromise bill which has the thoughts and writings of many. But, by and large, I'm convinced that this bill represents the best bill possible at this time...even if it isn't the best possible bill.

When I say this bill is the best bill possible, I mean that it is preferable, both to the farmer and the taxpayer, than either a straight continuation of the 1965 Act or a reversion to the old laws in effect prior to 1965. Either of these alternatives represents, in my opinion, a reversion to the antique notions of past farm programs which have done so much to hamstring the farmer and deplete the public treasury...programs which I, for one, have consistently opposed.

I think we all have to recognize that while in many ways this bill is similar to the legislation of the past, it at least contains some movement and direction toward the free market. It suspends quotas and controls on wheat and cotton, and it establishes a set-aside system that should help provide farmers with greater flexibility in the management of their own farms.

At the same time, this bill promises that the financial rug will not be pulled from under the American farmer for the next three years. It contains a commitment for the Administration to continue to expend about the same amount of money on the three big commodity programs as is the case now.

As just one member of this House I realize that our national prosperity is directly interlinked with our farm prosperity. Without a sound agricultural economy we are not going to have a sound total economy.

I therefore accept the fact that this bill is a form of subsidy to American agriculture.

I have not observed a developed nation in this world which did not subsidize its agriculture one way or another, and our great country is no exception. The assistance we provide in this bill will, in the long run, be repaid many times over to American taxpayers and consumers.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 18546.
I do not intend to try to substitute my judgment for what a good farm bill is for that of the 27 Members of Congress who serve on the Committee on Agriculture and who brought this bill to the Floor after 38 days of public hearings, 92 executive sessions, 27 night meetings, and a year and a half of negotiating nearly every sentence and word of this 57-page bill.

This bill is supported by the Secretary of Agriculture, by the Administration, by the Democratic leadership of the House and by me as the Republican leader.

I support it, and I urge all members of the House to do likewise.

###

During the twenty-one years that it has been my privilege to serve as a member of this great body, I have seen many farm bills battled and battered on this floor.

I have seen proposals to literally enchain American agriculture, and I have fought those proposals.

I have seen some real fiscal follies designed and developed through the years and seldom have I seen the Committee on Agriculture in substantial agreement on anything.

I have seen many instances where the Administration -- be it a Republican or a Democratic Administration -- has been in a hammerlock with the Congress over farm legislation -- be it a Republican or a Democratic Congress.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the rhetoric during the past two decades on farm bills was usually shrill, generally emotional, and yes, inevitably partisan.

This year, for a change, we have a different legislative atmosphere as we consider H.R. 18546.

This year we have a bill which has the support of the Chairman of the Agriculture Committee, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Poage), and the ranking minority member of that committee, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. Belcher).

This year the Administration and the committee are working together to pass a farm bill.

This year the Committee on Agriculture, with only six dissenting votes -- three Republicans and three Democrats -- has agreed on a farm bill.

Yes, Mr. Chairman, the situation is different this year because the leadership of both parties agrees that it is in the national interest to have a new farm bill to replace the expiring Food and Agriculture Act of 1965.

This year there has been more light than heat in the farm bill dialogue, so let us continue to use reason, not rancor, and analysis, not emotion, as we continue our deliberations over this important legislation.

(more)
Now when I said that this year's farm bill was different, I didn't mean it was so different that there isn't any controversy about it.

This farm bill is not ready for the Consent Calendar, believe me.

There are some features in it which I personally do not think are sound, and I'm sure other members of the House feel the same way. This is not the farm bill that I would write, nor is it the kind of farm bill the Administration would write if it had the power to do so. It is a compromise bill which has the thoughts and writings of many. But, by and large, I'm convinced that this bill represents the best bill possible at this time...even if it isn't the best possible bill.

When I say this bill is the best bill possible, I mean that it is preferable, both to the farmer and the taxpayer, than either a straight continuation of the 1965 Act or a reversion to the old laws in effect prior to 1965. Either of these alternatives represents, in my opinion, a reversion to the antique notions of past farm programs which have done so much to hamstring the farmer and deplete the public treasury...programs which I, for one, have consistently opposed.

I think we all have to recognize that while in many ways this bill is similar to the legislation of the past, it at least contains some movement and direction toward the free market. It suspends quotas and controls on wheat and cotton, and it establishes a set-aside system that should help provide farmers with greater flexibility in the management of their own farms.

At the same time, this bill promises that the financial rug will not be pulled from under the American farmer for the next three years. It contains a commitment for the Administration to continue to expend about the same amount of money on the three big commodity programs as is the case now.

As just one member of this House I realize that our national prosperity is directly interlinked with our farm prosperity. Without a sound agricultural economy we are not going to have a sound total economy.

I therefore accept the fact that this bill is a form of subsidy to American agriculture.

I have not observed a developed nation in this world which did not subsidize its agriculture one way or another, and our great country is no exception. The assistance we provide in this bill will, in the long run, be repaid many times over to American taxpayers and consumers.

That is why I am supporting H.R. 18546.
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MR. SPEAKER: I support this conference report and urge its prompt adoption.

I also wish to commend the Chairman and the Members of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service for what I consider to be one of the truly great accomplishments of this Congress. The postal reform bill, which we send to the President today, will stand as a landmark in the history of the United States postal service.

This legislation is the product of sincere, dedicated, bipartisan effort. Those efforts began with general studies in the last administration and moved ahead with President Nixon's specific legislative proposals of May 1969 and April 16, 1970. Today we reach the end of a journey of tremendous legislative accomplishment by sending the postal reform bill to the President for his signature.

While the final conference agreement before the House represents a fine compromise between the work of the House and the work of the Senate, it basically embodies all the recommendations of President Nixon resulting from the unprecedented negotiations between the Administration and the postal unions after the end of the March postal work stoppage. This includes, of course, the 8 per cent additional pay raise for all Post Office Department employees.

Shortly after he was inaugurated, President Nixon pledged that his Administration would move to abolish the political patronage system which has plagued the Post Office Department for nearly two centuries. That was accomplished by administrative action of the Postmaster General early last year. Under the provisions of this legislation there will be a permanent barrier against any resurgence of partisan politics in the postal service.

The Post Office Department is to be reorganized as an independent establishment in the Executive Branch and is purposely insulated from direct control by the President, the Office of Management and Budget, and the Congress.

The new postal system is intended to be self-supporting. It will have continuity of top management, with all the management tools and flexibility needed
to properly manage. It will have appropriate controls over its expenses and its revenues. It will have a workable means of raising the necessary funds for facilities and capital improvements.

The new postal service will herald a new era of dignity and respect for postal employees who will be able to sit down at the bargaining table with management and bargain collectively over pay, fringe benefits, and the conditions of their employment.

The end result of this massive reorganization of the antiquated Post Office Department can only be as the President anticipated -- "a truly superior mail service."

I am proud to have been a co-sponsor of this legislation.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I emphasize that this legislation which comes to us today for final approval after many, many months of long, tedious efforts by the Committee will stand as a monumental legislative achievement of the 91st Congress.

# # #

I am most encouraged by the news of the cease-fire in the Mideast.

This is, of course, only a first step — but it is a step leading away from the
dreadful abyss of a full-scale Mideast war and a possible confrontation between
the super-powers. I hope and pray the cease-fire will lead to a settlement of
the Mideast conflict and to a complete and permanent peace in that troubled area
of the world.

I am gratified that Chairman Celler of the Committee on the Judiciary has agreed publicly to open hearings on the impeachment of Associate Justice William O. Douglas, with witnesses examined under oath, as I have asked from the outset.

The Chairman's commitment is conditioned, however, as to time and circumstances. Public hearings will be in order, he stated in an August 5 news release, "when the special subcommittee is satisfied that the facts indicate that an impeachable offense may have been committed." The definition of "an impeachable offense" thus becomes crucial to the conduct of free and full public hearings.

The Constitution clearly entrusts the determination of this question to the conscience of the whole House of Representatives, which has the "sole power of impeachment." In response to an earlier request from Chairman Celler, as detailed in my attached letter to him, I have provided members of the Committee on the Judiciary with an independent and comprehensive legal memorandum on this question which was prepared by the Detroit, Michigan law firm of Dykema, Gossett, Spencer, Goodnow & Trigg.

My own personal views on this legal question were stated in my April 15 speech on the floor of the House, a copy of which is also attached.

# # #

Mr. Speaker: Men are not generally speaking anti-women; it simply appears to work out that way.

I, for one, do not plead guilty to the charge. In my own defense, I would note that I am very happy to confer all rights — and responsibilities — on my wife. In addition, I would point out that I had something to do with the fact that 15 of the last 16 House members to sign the petition discharging the House Judiciary Committee from jurisdiction over H. J. Res. 264, the Women's Equal Rights Amendment, were Republicans.

In all seriousness, I am delighted to have had a hand in bringing to the House floor the proposed Women's Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution.

The purpose of the amendment is most laudable: To provide constitutional protection against laws and official practices that treat men and women differently.

The proposed amendment would provide that: "Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex."

This amendment would insure equal rights under the law for men and women and would secure the right of all persons to equal treatment under the laws and official practices without differentiation based on sex.

Adoption of the amendment would, of course, require a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States. I hope the Congress will recognize the justice of this amendment and the clear and present need for it. I call upon this House to render its two-thirds approval.

We like to believe that we live in an enlightened age. How can any age and any nation be termed enlightened if it continues discrimination against women? And we do, of course, still have discrimination against women simply because they are women.

This amendment has been pending before the House Judiciary Committee for 47 years — since 1923. You would almost think there had been a conspiracy. Under the circumstances it is almost silly to say it is time we did something about it. It is long past time.

(more)
The great French writer Victor Hugo said: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come."

There is no question that the Women's Equal Rights Amendment is just such an idea. Its time has come just as surely as did the 19th Amendment to the Constitution 50 years ago, giving women the right to vote.

I think it is fitting that today, when the Women's Equal Rights Movement may well be crowned with success, the initiative to implement full equal rights for women comes in the House. After all, the House has remained quiescent or adamant on this score -- take your choice -- for 47 years while the Senate has twice passed a Women's Equal Rights Amendment, in 1950 and 1953. And we are passing the amendment free and clear of anything like the Senate's Hayden rider, which threw in a qualifier unacceptable to women.

It is also most fitting that the House should be the first to act today because the prime mover of this amendment in the Congress is my dear colleague from Michigan, Rep. Martha Griffiths. Passage of this amendment would be a monument to Martha.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment should really be unnecessary. But it clearly is mandatory because women today do not have equal rights. This amendment will give them those most valued of rights -- the rights to a job, to a promotion, to a pension, to equal social security benefits, to all the fringe benefits of any job. There is no denying that these rights are different for women than for men.

It is, of course, easy to jest about this matter. For instance, I am sure our G.I.'s will not complain if women are drafted into the Armed Forces in the same numbers as men. And I'm sure there are men who will welcome the awarding of alimony to husbands in divorce actions.

In any case, I know that men will still look upon women as the fairer sex and will want to continue opening doors for them. This is not inequality, just "woomanship."

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Griffiths and others have made an excellent case for adoption of the Women's Equal Rights Amendment. I urge overwhelming House approval of H. J. Res. 264.
On Monday, August 10, the House of Representatives will consider House Joint Resolution 264, the Women's Equal Rights Amendment to the U.S. Constitution, and is expected to approve it by more than the two-thirds majority required. The resolution had been locked up in the House Judiciary Committee and reaches the House floor only by virtue of the fact that 218 House members, a majority, signed what is known as a "discharge petition." A discharge petition, if it receives enough signatures, takes a bill away from a committee which is sitting on it. This particular discharge petition was introduced by Rep. Martha Griffiths, D-Mich. Lacking enough signatures, she appealed to Ford. Since Ford is Republican leader of the House, he used his "powers of persuasion" and the net result was that 15 of the last 16 signatures needed to bring the number of petition signers to 218 came from Republicans. That is the background for the five-minute speech Ford is scheduled to make on the House floor Monday. A copy of that speech is attached.
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The purpose of the amendment is most laudable: To provide constitutional protection against laws and official practices that treat men and women differently.

The proposed amendment would provide that: “Equality of rights under the law shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.”

This amendment would insure equal rights under the law for men and women and would secure the right of all persons to equal treatment under the laws and official practices without differentiation based on sex.

Adoption of the amendment would, of course, require a two-thirds vote of both Houses of Congress and ratification by three-fourths of the States. I hope the Congress will recognize the justice of this amendment and the clear and present need for it. I call upon this House to render its two-thirds approval.

We like to believe that we live in an enlightened age. How can any age and any nation be termed enlightened if it continues discrimination against women? And we do, of course, still have discrimination against women simply because they are women.

This amendment has been pending before the House Judiciary Committee for 47 years -- since 1923. You would almost think there had been a conspiracy. Under the circumstances it is almost silly to say it is time we did something about it.

It is long past time. (more)
The great French writer Victor Hugo said: "Greater than the tread of mighty armies is an idea whose time has come."

There is no question that the Women's Equal Rights Amendment is just such an idea. Its time has come just as surely as did the 19th Amendment to the Constitution 50 years ago, giving women the right to vote.

I think it is fitting that today, when the Women's Equal Rights Movement may well be crowned with success, the initiative to implement full equal rights for women comes in the House. After all, the House has remained quiescent or adamant on this score -- take your choice -- for 47 years while the Senate has twice passed a Women's Equal Rights Amendment, in 1950 and 1953. And we are passing the amendment free and clear of anything like the Senate's Hayden rider, which threw in a qualifier unacceptable to women.

It is also most fitting that the House should be the first to act today because the prime mover of this amendment in the Congress is my dear colleague from Michigan, Rep. Martha Griffiths. Passage of this amendment would be a monument to Martha.

Mr. Speaker, this amendment should really be unnecessary. But it clearly is mandatory because women today do not have equal rights. This amendment will give them those most valued of rights -- the rights to a job, to a promotion, to a pension, to equal social security benefits, to all the fringe benefits of any job. There is no denying that these rights are different for women than for men.

It is, of course, easy to jest about this matter. For instance, I am sure our G.I.'s will not complain if women are drafted into the Armed Forces in the same numbers as men. And I'm sure there are men who will welcome the awarding of alimony to husbands in divorce actions.

In any case, I know that men will still look upon women as the fairer sex and will want to continue opening doors for them. This is not inequality, just "womanship."

Mr. Speaker, Mrs. Griffiths and others have made an excellent case for adoption of the Women's Equal Rights Amendment. I urge overwhelming House approval of H. J. Res. 264.

# # #

I am today joining with Representative Frank Bow (R-Ohio), the ranking Republican Member of the Committee on Appropriations, the entire House Republican Leadership and other Minority Members of the Appropriations Committee in sponsoring the "Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1970" which would prevent budget-busting by the Congress as well as by a President.

For years Presidents and Congresses have sought to blame each other for big spending and budget deficits. No matter who wins this political argument, the American taxpayer loses.

This bill would apply a $205,600,000,000 limitation on federal spending for fiscal year 1971 in a way that would permit Congress to control the results of its own actions on individual appropriation bills from the point of view of the total Federal budget. In order to accomplish this it would provide a means of modifying actions on individual appropriation bills if these actions collectively would exceed the limitation proposed in this bill.

Specifically:

(1) It would provide that Congressional increases over the budget on individual appropriation bills that would have the effect of increasing total expenditures above the bill's ceiling would then be subject to automatic reduction according to a formula and by an amount necessary for the budget to remain within the ceiling.

(2) It would make possible the application of this formula in those mandatory spending programs when appropriate and necessary to comply with the limitation and exempt the government from liability for any differences between the amount appropriated and the amount made available.

(3) It would only exempt from the ceiling those increases or decreases that result from the so-called uncontrollables -- social security trust fund payments, veterans' pension funds, etc. (as shown on p. 44 of the Budget -- House Document No. 260).

(4) It would repeal the previous expenditure limitation and substitute this one for it.

I will press for prompt consideration of this "Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1970" so that every Member of this Congress will have an opportunity to vote the same way he talks on the subject of big spending.
A bill sponsored by Congressmen Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids to prohibit the mailing or interstate transport of advertisements which appeal to prurient interests has been overwhelmingly (322 to 4) approved by the U.S. House of Representatives.

Ford said his anti-smut advertising bill is an important and necessary followup to another of his anti-smut bills which passed the House of Representatives in April.

"That bill, which passed the House April 28, is designed to protect young people from the flood of obscene, perverse and depraved literature which pours unsolicited into thousands of family homes each day via the mailbox," Ford explained.

"My latest bill to be approved is aimed at prohibiting the mailing or interstate transport of prurient advertisements, which are often as obscene as the product they pander," Ford stated.

The Ford bill carries a penalty of $50,000 fine or five years in prison or both for a first offense.

"I am pleased by the progress to date of this comprehensive legislative program to keep unsolicited obscene materials out of American homes, but I will not be satisfied until all the necessary legislation to accomplish this objective is enacted," Ford declared.

####

August 13, 1970

I voted to save the taxpayers nearly a billion dollars. That is the significance of my vote to sustain the presidential vetoes of the Office of Education and Housing and Urban Development-Independent Offices appropriations bills. The two vetoed bills provided $994 million more than requested by the President, although the President's budget provided funding for education and housing at a level generously above that of the previous Administration.

The question was not whether education and housing would be adequately funded. These needs were amply met in the President's budget. The question was whether the Congress would appropriate far in excess of funding which is adequate for the times--appropriate excessive funds at a time which is critical in the fight against inflation.

This is a time when not only American families but the Federal Government should live within a sensible budget. If the Federal Government does not live within its means, how can the President ask the American people to do so? If the Congress does not cooperate with the President in holding to a sensible Federal Budget, how can the Congress expect the American people to act responsibly in the battle against inflation?

The issue in these veto override moves by the Democratic leadership in the Congress was just this: Fiscal responsibility. I am terribly disappointed that the House of Representatives has failed to fully measure up to the challenge.
A local chapter of the Michigan Prisoner of War Committee has been established in Grand Rapids. I would like to urge that the people in our area respond to the fullest extent possible to the local POW chapter's request that they write letters to Hanoi asking humane treatment and complete information on American POWs in North Vietnam and our men missing in action.

What is needed is full and continuing public demands that Hanoi live up to the terms of the Geneva Convention regarding prisoners of war. Letters from the Grand Rapids area can help. Every letter counts.

I personally have written to the ambassadors of four countries—France, Sweden, India and Poland—asking that their governments urge Hanoi to provide humane treatment for the POWs and "to inform our government of their condition so that their families may be given a report on their health and welfare." These letters were written just recently. All of the countries involved except Poland have responded affirmatively.

Something which is not generally known is that the prisoner of war issue has been put forward as a central topic by the United States at the peace talks in Paris. I fully endorse this approach and I hope and pray it produces beneficial results.

Our chief negotiator at Paris, Ambassador David K.E. Bruce, declared in his first statement at Paris recently: "As a result of the discussion thus far, we know what the central issues are to which we must now turn our attention with renewed vigor. These issues are the withdrawal of troops, a political settlement and prisoners of war."

The Congress also has been focusing attention on the prisoner of war issue and turning the heat on Hanoi. I co-sponsored a prisoner of war resolution which was adopted by the House of Representatives Dec. 15, 1969, and approved by the Senate Feb. 18, 1970. I also joined with other House members in speaking out on the issue of our prisoners of war and men missing in action. The resolution calls on President Nixon, the Departments of State and Defense, the United Nations, and the citizens of the world to appeal to the North Vietnamese and the Viet Cong for humane treatment of American prisoners. Technically, it asks the Communists to accept the tenets of the Geneva Convention concerning prisoners of war and to take steps to obtain the humane treatment and prompt release of all members of the Armed Forces of the United States now held as prisoners of war.

The wives and families of the U.S. servicemen who are prisoners of war or are missing in action know the problem. They deserve the respect, support and admiration of all our citizens.
The cost of living figures for July, released yesterday, indicate that inflation is definitely easing and that the Nixon Administration was right in sticking to its policies of fiscal and monetary restraint.

The Nixon "game plan" is producing a victory over inflation. That is the significance of the July figures--the fact that the rise in the cost of living in July was 0.3 of one per cent on a seasonally adjusted basis, only about half of the rate of increase recorded last winter.

The fact that the increase in cost of living is easing is also reflected in an increase in the average worker's spendable earnings--up 80 cents a week in July for a worker with three dependents. The average purchasing power of the American worker is increasing under the Nixon Administration.

I think every American should be encouraged by the slowdown in inflation. This easing in inflation has become more pronounced in June and July. We now can look forward to a continued improvement in our overall economic situation, both from the standpoint of cost of living and the general strength of the economy.

###
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August 22, 1970

On Labor Day we pay tribute to the people who are the backbone of our Nation—the working men and women of America. They are 70 million strong. Their work is often tough and demands manual skill. These are the Americans who turn the wheels of industry and perform the services that are essential to our daily living.

This is the 76th year that America has observed Labor Day. We set aside this special day to honor our working men and women because it is so easy to forget the contribution they make to American life. And so we tell them today how very important they are to America.

In his first annual message to Congress on Dec. 3, 1861, President Abraham Lincoln said of the Nation's workers: "Labor is prior to, and independent of, capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital, and deserves much higher consideration."

I believe as Lincoln did that America should honor her workers not just one day of the year but all the year through. The Nation should honor her workers by making their lives more satisfying and more secure.

We must eliminate work hazards to every extent practicable, and we must raise health standards.

We must continue to provide workers with better protection from the adversities of temporary unemployment.

We must strengthen the framework of free collective bargaining. We must provide more channels for the healthy settlement of labor-management disputes without a resort to crippling strikes.

We must continue to make progress toward elimination of the joblessness that flows from lack of skills or education.

We must make changes in our economy and in working conditions that will tend to elevate the quality of life for working men and women throughout America.

This is the best way to pay tribute to our workers and to thank them for their many contributions to the well-being of America. This is the only worthy way to do them honor on this Labor Day 1970.

# # #
September 9, 1970

Congressman Gerald R. Ford today announced two openings at the service academies for interested young men from the Fifth Congressional District. One with the U. S. Military Academy at West Point and the other with the U. S. Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs are being offered to high school seniors who are U. S. citizens, under 22 years of age, never married, and able to pass the physical and scholastic requirements of the respective academies.

Applications for these positions can be obtained from Jerry Ford's office at 425 Cherry Street, S.E. in Grand Rapids (telephone 456-9747) and from his Washington, D.C. office. The deadline for filing the applications is September 25.

Ford suggested that boys interested in the Naval Academy also fill out applications in the event openings develop.

Out of six openings which developed at the Military, Naval, and Air Force Academies, nine candidates from Kent and Ionia Counties entered Academy classes this year. The three additional candidates obtained appointments as a result of national selection among qualified alternates.

Appointments are also available to the Merchant Marine and Coast Guard Academies, but the selection to those institutions is not limited to a Congressional district. Michigan Congressmen may nominate up to ten candidates for the Merchant Marine Academy at Kings Point, New York to compete state-wide for 12 available scholarships. The Coast Guard makes its own selection of cadets to attend the Academy at New London, Connecticut from a nation-wide competition.

Selection of Fifth District candidates is based on the results of an open, competitive Civil Service Examination. This examination will be given on Saturday, October 3 in Grand Rapids and other cities throughout the nation. Make-up tests for those candidates unable to attend the October 3 examination will be given on Tuesday, November 3. Such applications will be accepted as late as October 30.

These all-expense college scholarships at the Academies lead to a bachelor's degree in science and a commission in one of the Services. "These appointments offer a wonderful educational opportunity and an honorable career in the service of our country," Ford said. "At the present time we have at the academies thirteen young men from Grand Rapids, three from Ionia, two each from Cedar Springs and Wyoming, and one each from Ada, Comstock Park, Dutton, and Grandville."

#####

Mr. Speaker: The airplane hijacking situation has reached international crisis proportions. The world community must act--and act quickly--not only to obtain the release of the hijack victims now being held hostage by Arab commandoes in Jordan but to prevent or at least deter future hijackings.

It would seem that agreement could be reached by the nations involved, not only on the matter of punishment for hijackers taken into custody but also on security measures which could be adopted to nip incipient hijackings in the bud.

To that end I urge that the countries which figure in airplane hijackings--actual or attempted--agree on a number of preventive measures which some have already adopted at least in part.

I suggest the placing of armed plain clothes security guards on all international commercial flights, searching baggage and the persons of passengers in some cases, and instituting an airlines personnel security program.

It is my information that U.S. airlines are employing a passenger profile or screening system which eliminates hijacking suspects among airline passengers down to approximately one-half of one per cent. The rest of the passengers then go through a magnetometer check to see if they are carrying any weapons or bombs.

Now the Federal Aviation Agency and the airlines are talking about an actual physical search of suspected hijackers on certain risk flights. I urge that such action be taken.

Another proposal with considerable merit is a boycott by the International Pilots Association of any country harboring hijackers. A boycott of this kind could not very well be instituted by a government without offending the other government involved, but it might well be carried out by an organization like the IPA.

Mr. Speaker, there is no question that action must be taken to put a stop to international airplane hijackings. This is a matter of the greatest urgency and one that calls for the highest degree of international cooperation.
Special to all Kent and Ionia County News Media

Charles A. Roberts of Kent City, a volunteer weather observer for the Weather Bureau since 1939, is one of 25 such volunteers being honored nationwide by the Environmental Science Services Administration (ESSA) of the U.S. Department of Commerce, Congressman Gerald R. Ford reported today.

Ford said Roberts will receive a John Campanius Holm Award, so named for a Lutheran minister who took systematic weather observations in the American colonies in 1644 and 1645 and was the first person known to have done so. Roberts is being recognized for outstanding service in providing accurate precipitation reports from Kent City, Ford said.

In addition to his duties as a rainfall observer, Roberts has consulted with the Kent County Road Commission concerning excessive amounts of precipitation to help determine local drainage needs.

The U.S. Weather Bureau has more than 12,000 volunteer observers throughout the country who make and record daily weather observations. The information they gather is processed and published by the Environmental Data Service, an arm of ESSA, and is invaluable in recording the climate of the Nation. Many of these observers, like Roberts, serve without pay.

# # #
SPECIAL TO ALL KENT AND IONIA COUNTY NEWS MEDIA

The American Veterans of World War II, Korea and Viet Nam (AMVETS) have chosen Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids to receive their Silver Helmet Award, AMVETS' highest award. Ford will receive the award next April in Washington, D.C. Ford will be given what is known as "the Congressional Award." The AMVETS' Peace Award will go to Pope Paul VI and their Humanitarian Award to comedian Danny Thomas.

###

Time is running out on the second session of the 91st Congress, and yet the record of this Congress in the past 8 1/2 months can be described as little better than a mixed bag.

I recently remarked that passage of the Postal Reform Act of 1970 would go down as one of the 91st Congress' finest achievements. I meant every word of that observation. Today I must sadly add that postal reform will stand as the single outstanding achievement of the 91st Congress' second session unless the Congress responds immediately to the President's Sept. 11 call for action.

The time is ripe for reform. We have fulfilled that promise to a degree but much of the field remains unplowed. The soil is fertile and the President has supplied the seed ideas. Let us in the Congress get about the business of producing a crop of reforms which will make government truly effective in America.

Apart from basic reforms listed by the President, much legislative business lies ahead of the 91st Congress. Let us accept and act quickly on the President's challenge to strengthen our anti-crime laws, clean up the environment, consolidate our manpower training programs and control drug abuse.

An election is coming up. But let every member of Congress remember that the best politics is to legislate in the best interests of the American people. Obstructionism has never paid off at the polls--and the people know who the obstructionists are. Let us join hands to move America forward. So little time remains in this session.

# # #
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# # #

There is good news today for the workers and housewives of America.

The news is that the increase in the cost of living has slowed to the lowest pace in nearly two years.

This is conclusive evidence that the Nixon Administration policies of fiscal and monetary restraint are working in the fight against inflation. This is solid evidence that all of the scare talk about the need for wage and price controls was exactly that—wild talk which flowed from a desire to reap political advantage.

We have now not just turned the corner on inflation. We are on the road to relative price stability.

I have predicted that the Administration's policies will slow inflation down to a 3 per cent rate. I renew that prediction today. As I see it, the annual rate of consumer price advance will fall from the present level of 6 per cent to about 3 1/2 per cent by the end of this year and to 3 per cent by the summer or fall of 1971.

I firmly believe that the Administration's policies of fiscal and monetary restraint are producing a victory over inflation. This has been the Administration's game plan all along. It is a game plan which is going to push the ball over the goal line.

And now that we have started down the road to relative price stability, it is all the more important that Congress refrain from mandatory overspending—refrain from jeopardizing the economic gains we have made in our transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy.

###

Ford said that in response to inquiries he was making public his position as expressed in letters sent last Sept. 29 to Ivan Zylstra, administrator of government relations, National Union of Christian Schools, and Msgr. H. H. Zerfas, superintendent of the Grand Rapids diocesan schools.

Ford wrote Msgr. Zerfas and Mr. Zylstra as follows:

"I agree that Proposal C should not be made a part of our State Constitution. There are too many unanswered questions relating to its provision to have it written into our basic law. Although this is a state issue and not one before the Congress, I, as a citizen of Michigan, will vote 'no' on Proposal C on November 3."

Ford said that in response to inquiries he was making public his position as expressed in letters sent last Sept. 29 to Ivan Zylstra, administrator of government relations, National Union of Christian Schools, and Msgr. H. H. Zerfas, superintendent of the Grand Rapids diocesan schools.
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"I agree that Proposal C should not be made a part of our State Constitution. There are too many unanswered questions relating to its provision to have it written into our basic law. Although this is a state issue and not one before the Congress, I, as a citizen of Michigan, will vote 'no' on Proposal C on November 3."

# # #
The oceans cannot hold out much longer against the flood of contaminants that is being dumped into them.

We must halt the dumping of wastes into the ocean. Such action would complement my bill, introduced Jan. 3, 1969, which would prohibit such dumping in the Great Lakes.

The situation is far more serious than most Americans realize. We must act before it is too late. We are in a race with time. If we do not act the oceans will become far more contaminated with raw sewage and other wastes than at present.

I would go farther than the President. I believe we must legislate a flat ban on the dumping of all harmful materials in either the oceans or the Great Lakes. Such dumping should not be sanctioned even by official permit, as is now done by the Army Corps of Engineers regarding the Great Lakes.

I am pleased that the Administration acted last May 20 to deal with oil spills and proposed creation of an Environmental Protection Agency and a National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) last July 9.

However, I view the matter of halting ocean dumping with greater urgency than that expressed by the Council on Environmental Quality. I repeat. There should be a flat ban on the dumping of harmful materials into the oceans and the Great Lakes, not a system of dumping by permit.

###

Mr. Speaker: President Nixon has advanced a dramatic new bid for peace in all of Indochina. The President's five proposals for peace place the onus for a continuing war in Indochina squarely on the North Vietnamese and the Vietcong.

Despite the initial negative reaction of the North Vietnamese and Vietcong at Paris, Mr. Speaker, I do believe the President's peace proposals may ultimately produce a breakthrough that could lead to any one or all of his objectives—a silencing of all guns in Indochina, an Indochina peace conference, a mutual withdrawal of all forces, release of prisoners of war, and a political settlement of the conflict.

Mr. Nixon's offer to negotiate a supervised standstill cease-fire and a firm time-table for withdrawal of all U.S. forces is most significant. This could be the trigger for meaningful talks in Paris.

I am pleased that the President has called for a supervised cease-fire rather than one like the 14 holiday cease fires we have agreed to in the past. The previous cease fires have been used by the North Vietnamese and Vietcong as a pause that refreshes.

With his five proposals for peace, the President has now laid on the negotiating table the basis for both a military and political settlement of the war in Indochina. The door to negotiation is wide open.

# # #

The Republican Leadership has considered the tentative resolution proposed by the Republican Task Force on Seniority and strongly endorses the proposal. It is the intention of the Leadership to submit the resolution to the Republican Conference and to urge its adoption at the organizing meeting of the Party for the 92nd Congress. Any action on it before that time would be only formality because a Conference of one Congress cannot bind a Conference for a following Congress.

I think the Task Force has developed an effective recommendation for improving our system of selecting Republican chairmen or ranking members of Committees. It is a compromise designed to include some of the better features of variousalternative proposals and to avoid their disadvantages. This plan does not eliminate seniority as a criterion, but will provide a means for considering other factors as well. I am sure that experience will remain an important consideration in any of the decisions on committee leadership.

The recommendation of the Task Force includes the important principle of selection. The Republican Committee on Committees will select the member it believes should be the chairman or ranking member of each committee, and each name will be submitted separately to the Republican Conference. There a secret vote will be taken on the nomination. If a nominee is rejected by the Conference, the Committee on Committees will be charged with submitting another name to the Conference.

This plan appears to have broad support among the members of the Republican Party in the House of Representatives. Speaking for the Leadership, I believe the proposal is a positive and forward step which should be adopted.

###
The September increase in the cost of living should be viewed as a temporary fluctuation. It does not alter the basic trend, which is for a slowing of inflation. Proof of that trend is the fact that the cost of living rose at a 4.2% annual rate during the 3rd quarter of this year, which includes September, as compared to 5.6% in the 2nd quarter and 6.3% in the first quarter.

The September cost of living rise is a hangover from the inflationary binge the Democrats plunged us into beginning in 1965.

Now the Democrats are blaming the Republicans because they haven't stopped Democrat inflation overnight.

We are licking inflation, and the September reading simply shows that it takes time.

# # #
The Federal Government will provide Kent County colleges with $205,500 for the period Jan. 1 through June 30, 1971, for continuation of a work-study program benefiting 543 students, Congressman Gerald R. Ford reported today.

Ford noted that these Federal funds cover 80 per cent of student payrolls, with the college or an off-campus agency putting up the remaining 20 per cent. Nationwide the work-study program grants for the six-month period involved total $85,755,491. An estimated 268,158 students will benefit.

Kent County schools and their participation in the program: Calvin College, $62,000 in Federal funds, 194 students benefiting; Grand Valley State College, $53,000, 166 students; Grand Rapids Junior College, $45,000, 141 students; Aquinas College, $25,000, 70 students; Davenport College of Business, $17,000, 53 students; and Grand Rapids Baptist College and Seminary, $3,500, 11 students.

###
Rep. Gerald R. Ford has received a "Watchdog of the Treasury" Award from the National Associated Businessmen, Inc., in recognition of his record of responsibility in handling the taxpayer's dollars.

In presenting Ford with the award, the NAB declared: "Your outstanding economy voting record indicates to your constituents and to our membership that you have a keen realization of the problems of fiscal responsibility. We know it takes a lot of courage to stand up against the pressure groups who advocate unnecessary Federal spending. As you know so well, inflation affects the cost of living which affects us all. Your votes against inflationary spending merit your constituents' appreciation."

The NAB is a nonpartisan organization with headquarters in Washington. It is made up primarily of small business firms. Its goals include fiscal responsibility in government and the elimination of Federal Government competition with private business.

# # #
The American people are committed to racial equality and Blacks in America are making substantial progress, Representative Gerald R. Ford declared tonight.

Ford cited evidence of progress by Blacks in a speech at the 14th annual fund raising dinner of the True Light Baptist Church. Ford said, "Gains in real income, education, and standard of living have been proportionately greater for blacks than for whites in recent years, that the proportion of blacks earning middle incomes has more than doubled since 1950, and that the proportion of black students in American colleges has increased more than 50% in the last two decades."

Pointing to the black progress under the Nixon Administration, Ford listed black appointments within the Administration, inauguration of the Philadelphia plan of minority group hiring, proposed changes in welfare and manpower training, the Nixon proposal for health insurance for poor families, advances in school desegregation, and increased budgetary support for the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission.

Ford said President Nixon has named 64% more non-whites to top executive positions than the previous Administration. He also noted that although Federal employment has been declining, the number of minority group members in Federal jobs rose by about 4,600 from November, 1967 to November, 1969.

MORE
On the subject of school desegregation, Ford declared: "This has been a very significant year. The volume of school desegregation this year has been greater than for any other year since the Supreme Court ordered the end of the dual school system in 1954."

Ford reported that 336 school districts were desegregated in 14 states this year, as compared with only 55 districts during the previous school year. He added that in 1967, not quite 14% of the black students in these states attended majority white schools, but that this year the estimate is 33% to 40%.

Turning to black progress on the local scene, Ford cited Federal grants of $638,430 for the Sheldon Complex, $640,781 for the West Side Complex, $2,384,000 for the Model Cities Program and $72,893 for anti-poverty program planning and youth development in low-income neighborhoods.

Ford said the Federal anti-poverty grants, school aid allocations, public housing and parkland grants to Kent County for 1968-1970 -- grants which in large measure benefitted black citizens of Grand Rapids---added up to more than $12 million.
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The Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration has approved a $27,246 grant to help finance a 12-month study of the Kent County Juvenile Court, Rep. Gerald R. Ford announced today.

Ford said the grant will fund a management systems analysis of the Kent County Juvenile Court, with the emphasis concentrated on the administration of the court.

The study will be conducted by the Center for Children's Court Services and the Department of Management of Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo.

It is anticipated, Ford said, that industrial-managerial systems and procedures will be applicable to the judicial juvenile organization.

He said the study will be conducted in five steps. First, employ meetings will be held at which workers will be asked to keep detailed logs of their activities for a month. Second, these logs will be analyzed regarding work flow, work activities, and job interrelationships. Third, organizational and work flow charts as well as job descriptions will be prepared. Fourth, a procedure manual will be developed. Finally, recommendations will be made to and evaluated by the Center.

Ford said because "it is a most progressive court."
Remarks by Rep. Gerald R. Ford before the South Kent Exchange Club

Legislation which puts together an organized assault against organized crime and bombings in this country has become Federal law.

This legislation, S. 30, is one of the greatest achievements of the 91st Congress and a major accomplishment of the Nixon Administration. There is credit enough for everybody, and credit is due. My only criticism is that the legislation should have been passed months earlier.

Apart from giving authorities new tools to fight organized crime, the new Organized Crime Control Act also zeroes in on bombings, arson and other criminal acts which threaten to turn our citadels of learning into citadels of violence.

I sponsored the anti-bombing provisions which were written into the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970, in addition to sponsoring other anti-crime measures which became part of the omnibus crime control bill. I am most pleased that my legislation has been enacted into law.

Let me impress upon you how critical the campus violence situation has become. FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover has informed me that the Students for a Democratic Society, during the last academic year, alone was directly involved in 247 arson cases, 462 personal injury incidents and more than 300 other episodes of destruction.

Such acts—the most recent at the University of Wisconsin where a student died in a bomb blast—cannot be allowed to continue. Those responsible must be tracked down. And the law enforcement agency best suited to that job is the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I was therefore glad to give my support to the President's request for 1,000 more FBI agents to investigate campus bombings and arson as well as to help combat airplane hijackings.

As you know, the FBI now will investigate bombings and arson at all colleges receiving any form of Federal aid, and that includes virtually all of them.

Under the Organized Crime Control Act just enacted into law, Federal lawmen will be able to move swiftly and forcefully against terrorist bombers and other segments of the criminal world.

Not only does the anti-bombing provision cover government buildings and nearly all college campuses, it also applies to police stations where the City is receiving (more)
The new Organized Crime Control Act is of course primarily designed to combat organized crime.

Basically, it provides for new perjury and contempt procedures calculated to induce reluctant witnesses to testify and it provides stiffer jail terms for habitual criminals.

The first five titles of the Act are designed to accomplish one purpose: To get the facts needed to obtain indictments and convictions.

The new law establishes special grand juries which may exercise more independence in fulfilling their duties and may sit for up to 36 months. The grand jury may compel witnesses to talk by guaranteeing their testimony will not be used against them. If they refuse to talk, they may be held in contempt. If they talk but lie, they may be tried for perjury. And if the witness puts his life in jeopardy by talking the Government will protect him and even try to relocate him.

Titles VI and VII of the new law facilitate the actual trial of organized criminals.

Title VI allows the Government to take a deposition of a Government witness and use it at the trial if the witness for certain reasons will not be available to testify in person. This not only protects the Government’s case but the witness as well.

Title VII rules out litigation involving claims of illegal electronic surveillance by the Government—surveillance which could not have possibly produced evidence for the prosecution.

Title VIII makes a Federal crime of large-scale gambling operations which are in violation of State law.

Title IX makes it unlawful to engage in a pattern of racketeering activity as a means of acquiring, maintaining or conducting a business.

Title X establishes a pre-sentencing procedure for determining whether a convicted defendant is an habitual, professional, or organized criminal—and provides an extended sentence for such an offender.

Title XI is the anti-bombing part of the new crime control law.

I do not claim that the new Organized Crime Control Act is a panacea for our criminal ills. I do not claim we will solve all of our crime problems simply by having enacted this legislation. But I do believe it will enable local, State and Federal law enforcement officials and our court system to deal more effectively with the problem of organized crime.

I have been most anxious to give law enforcement officials the tools to get the job done. This I believe the Congress has accomplished by enacting the Organized Crime Control Act of 1970.

# # #
For Release Wednesday, Oct. 28, and Thereafter

A heavy majority of Kent and Ionia County residents responding to a special questionnaire favor expulsion or suspension of disorderly students from colleges and strict law enforcement with whatever force is necessary to quell college riots.

Those are among the most significant findings in a current poll conducted by Rep. Gerald R. Ford in the Fifth Congressional District. Ford posed questions about campus riot situations, Vietnam policy, Social Security, and air and water pollution control.

Of those replying, 63 per cent favored expelling or suspending disorderly students and employing such force as necessary to halt student riots.

More than half—56 per cent—called for firmer controls by college administrators and 52 per cent favored banning outside agitators from campus.

Of the remaining choices, there were 37 per cent in favor of cutting off Federal funds to rioting colleges, 15 per cent for strict law enforcement but no use of deadly force, and 13 per cent for more self-government by students.

Balloting on campus disorders adds up to more than 100 per cent because those queried were permitted to check more than one possible course of action.

Respondents overwhelmingly favored Ford bills providing for high air and water quality standards and strict enforcement of them.

On Vietnam, 65 per cent of those responding endorsed President Nixon's policy of gradually withdrawing U.S. forces while turning the war over to the South Vietnamese. Of those feeling otherwise, 19 per cent favored immediate withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam, and 16 per cent wanted increased military action in an effort to end the war.

Balloting on Social Security, 97 per cent favored Ford's bill to raise Social Security benefits automatically whenever the cost of living goes up by at least 3 per cent.

##

I am appalled by the indignities inflicted upon the President of the United States by a vicious mob in San Jose, California, last evening. I am frightened by the danger to which not only our President, but our whole orderly system of self-government, was exposed by such a shameful incident.

California is not Caracas and hopefully the United States is not yet ready to let mindless mobs influence its political decisions or deny freedom of speech and assembly to its elected President and his law-abiding audiences. But the silent majority of decent Americans -- Democrats and Republicans and Independents -- must make their responsible voices heard loud and clear next Tuesday.

I call upon all candidates in this election forthrightly to repudiate such savage physical attacks upon our President or any public official and to denounce the sinister efforts of all radical extremists to interrupt our free electoral process.

####

---FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE---
October 30, 1970
THESE ARE TIMES WHEN BIG DECISIONS MUST BE MADE...DECISIONS TODAY WHICH WILL DETERMINE THE QUALITY OF OUR LIVES TOMORROW.

IT IS A TIME FOR POSITIVE ACTION, FOR LEADERSHIP, AND FOR BOLDNESS.

I LAY MY RECORD ON THE LINE FOR YOU TO SEE...AND TO JUDGE WHETHER I HAVE GIVEN YOU LEADERSHIP AND POSITIVE ACTION.

OUR CHIEF GOALS TODAY ARE PEACE IN THE WORLD AND PROGRESS AT HOME.
WE ARE BRINGING OUR BOYS HOME FROM A TERRIBLE WAR IN SOUTHEAST ASIA.
WE HAVE ACHIEVED A CEASE-FIRE IN THE MIDDLE EAST AND WE ARE BUILDING TOWARD PEACE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.
WE HAVE ENGAGED IN TALKS WITH RUSSIANS TO LIMIT NUCLEAR WEAPONS.
WE ARE MAKING PROGRESS AT HOME.
WE ARE ACTING TO STOP THE POISONING OF OUR ENVIRONMENT...TO CLEAN UP OUR AIR AND WATER AND TO GIVE OURSELVES MORE PARKLANDS. IN THE LAST TWO YEARS I HAVE HAD A HAND IN BRINGING KENT AND IONIA COUNTIES NEARLY $1.5 MILLION FOR COMMUNITY SEWER AND WATER IMPROVEMENTS AND MORE THAN $3 MILLION FOR MORE LOCAL PARKS.

MY NINE BILLS ARE A COMPREHENSIVE ATTACK ON THE PROBLEMS OF OUR ENVIRONMENT. THEY INCLUDE A FOUR-YEAR, 10-BILLION DOLLAR FEDERAL-STATE-LOCAL
CLEAN WATER PROGRAM. ONE WOULD ESTABLISH AN ENVIRONMENTAL FINANCING
AUTHORITY TO MAKE SURE THAT MUNICIPALITIES NEEDING WASTE TREATMENT PLANTS
WOULD BE ABLE TO FINANCE LOCAL COSTS.
OTHER BADLY NEEDED REFORMS ARE MY BILLS TO PROHIBIT THE DUMPING OF
DREDGING MATERIAL INTO THE GREAT LAKES...AND TO EXTEND TO ALL STATES THE
PROVISIONS OF MICHIGAN'S NEW LAW, WHICH PERMITS PRIVATE LEGAL ACTION TO BE
TAKEN AGAINST POLLUTERS OF OUR AIR AND WATER.
WE ARE HITTING CRIME VERY HARD, WITH MY BILLS FOR CONTROL OF
ORGANIZED CRIME AND A DOUBLING OF FEDERAL AID TO LOCAL POLICE DEPARTMENTS.
WE HAVE PUT THE F.B.I. TO WORK TRACKING DOWN COLLEGE CAMPUS
BOMBERS AND ARSONISTS, AND I PUSHED THAT LEGISLATION.
WE ARE GETTING STARTED ON THE MOST FAR-REACHING DRUG ABUSE CONTROL
PROGRAM EVER ATTEMPTED IN THE UNITED STATES...UNDER A BILL I STRONGLY
SUPPORTED.
AND FOR THE FIRST TIME IN 20 YEARS WE ARE PUTTING MORE FEDERAL MONEY
INTO HUMAN NEEDS THAN INTO NATIONAL DEFENSE.
IN WRITING THIS RECORD OF PROGRESS AND REFORM, REPUBLICANS HAVE
KEPT THEIR HEADS ABOUT FEDERAL SPENDING AND HAVE USED GOOD COMMON SENSE IN
TRYING TO SAVE YOUR TAX DOLLARS.
PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATIONS OF THE SIXTIES LEFT US WITH A 60-BILLION DOLLAR LEGACY OF DEFICIT SPENDING. THIS STRUGGLE AGAINST BIG SPENDERS IS CONTINUOUS.

YOU HAVE TO LIVE WITHIN YOUR POCKETBOOK, AND YOU EXPECT US TO DO THE SAME IN WASHINGTON. WE CAN BUILD AMERICA WITHOUT BANKRUPTING HER, AND WE ARE CONVERTING FROM A WARTIME TO A PEACETIME ECONOMY.

THIS IS MY RECORD. YOU BE THE JUDGE.
1-minute closing statement for WEMP debate

THE ISSUES ARE VERY CLEAR...AND I AM HAPPY TO HAVE YOU CHOOSE BETWEEN ME AND MY OPPONENT ON THOSE ISSUES.

YOU CAN JUDGE ME BY MY RECORD. MY OPPONENT HAS NO RECORD SO YOU MUST JUDGE HER ENTIRELY BY HER STATEMENTS IN THIS CAMPAIGN.

I STAND FOR PEACE THROUGH STRENGTH AND NEGOTIATION. MY OPPONENT URGES PEACE AT ANY PRICE.

I STAND FOR PROGRESS THROUGH RESPONSIBILITY AND COMMON SENSE. MY OPPONENT PROPOSES...AND THESE ARE HER WORDS..." A DOMESTIC MARSHALL PLAN COSTING WHATEVER IT COSTS", WHICH OBVIOUSLY WILL INCREASE YOUR TAXES.

I REJECT MY OPPONENT'S PROPOSAL TO LET VIETNAM FALL INTO COMMUNIST HANDS. I REJECT HER PROPOSAL THAT THE UNITED STATES USE AMERICAN TAX DOLLARS TO REBUILD A COMMUNIST VIETNAM. I REJECT HER PROPOSAL OF OPEN-ENDED SPENDING ON DOMESTIC PROBLEMS.

YOU KNOW THE ISSUES. YOU WILL BE SUPPLYING THE ANSWERS AT THE POLLING PLACE. I WOULD APPRECIATE YOUR VOTE ON NOVEMBER 3.
Congressman Gerald Ford announced today that he has for distribution in Kent and Ionia Counties about 700 pictorial 1971 calendars and about 100 two-year (1971-72) wall calendars. Requests made to Ford's Grand Rapids office at 425 Cherry Street, S.E. (telephone: 456-9747) or to him at the House of Representatives, Washington, D.C., will be honored as long as the supply lasts.

The pictorial calendar entitled "We, the People," contains thirteen full colored pictures of scenes in the national capital. The two-year calendar is the more traditional type with one picture of the capitol building.

###

I am disappointed but not surprised by the action of the Democratic Majority of the Special Subcommittee of the House Committee on the Judiciary.

It has been evident from the outset that its so-called investigation into the conduct of Associate Justice Douglas would not be vigorously pursued or objectively evaluated.

It makes a mockery of the constitutional duty of Congress to attempt to end a matter of such importance to the American people and to the integrity of the Supreme Court of the United States without one public hearing or a single word of sworn testimony.

I have not seen the final report of the Subcommittee which I understand contains additional evidence of impropriety and misbehavior on the part of Justice Douglas, which the Majority of the Subcommittee chose to gloss over. For the present I can only say that this matter is far from finished and that the sentiment of House Members, both Democrats and Republicans, is not accurately reflected in the Subcommittee's vote.

###
To All Fifth District News Media:

The American Academy of Achievement has chosen Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids to receive its "Golden Plate Award," it was announced today.

Ford is one of 50 "giants of accomplishment" who will be honored by the Academy during its 10th annual Salute to Excellence June 24-27, 1971, at Philadelphia.

The Academy is a non-profit, tax-exempt organization which is dedicated to the inspiration of youth through an annual salute to approximately 50 "captains of achievement from America's great walks of life." The Academy also honors several hundred outstanding high school students from across the nation at its annual banquet.


Ford has been Republican leader of the U.S. House of Representatives since January 1965. He has served in the House since January 1949. In 1961 he received the American Political Science Association's "Distinguished Congressional Service Award" and in 1966 he received the American Good Government Society's "George Washington Award."
While a partisan majority of the Special Subcommittee whitewashes Justice Douglas in its conclusions, the contents of its 524-page report condemn his conduct and cry for more searching inquiry.

Aside from legalistic arguments, over the past decade Justice Douglas' extensive extra-judicial earnings and activities have impaired his usefulness and clouded his contribution to the United States Supreme Court. I am of the opinion that he did practice law in the course of these non-judicial pursuits, did intervene improperly in affairs outside the scope of the judicial branch of the government, and did show poor judgment in his personal financial transactions, to say the least.

Mr. Hutchinson's cogent Minority View should have been unanimously subscribed to by the Special Subcommittee. Not all the evidence is in nor has it been tested in the normal way. Only an excess of personal or partisan loyalty or a failure fully to study the documents can explain an attempt to close the case at this point.

I return to the guideline of a great Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, the late Benjamin Cardozo, with which I closed my April 15 speech to the House.

"Not honesty alone, but the punctilious of an honor the most sensitive, is then the standard of behaviour."

If one uses the Cardozo standard rather than the Richmond standard, Justice Douglas clearly fails the test of good behavior.
I strongly support President Nixon's veto of the Employment and Manpower Training Act of 1970 because the measure adopted by the Congress goes off in the wrong directions instead of following the path of reform laid down in the President's original proposals.

The House-approved bill came fairly close to carrying out all of the President's manpower and employment objectives, and so I supported that legislation.

The task of the Congress now is to rewrite the Employment and Manpower Act of 1970 in a form that adheres fairly closely to the House bill and the provisions sought by the Administration.

Our general objectives should be a single, broadly defined manpower program and a public service jobs program which is a stepping stone to good jobs in the private sector for the workers involved. Because of changes made by the Senate, these objectives were lost sight of in the bill sent to the President.

###

I congratulate President Nixon on his decision to crack down on industrial pollution by invoking the Returee Act of 1899.

In so doing the President has circumvented the refusal of the Democratic-controlled Congress to enact the enforcement provisions of the water pollution control legislation introduced last Feb. 18.

It is nothing short of disgraceful that the Congress has failed even to hold hearings on the President's water pollution control package, including new authority to develop comprehensive water quality programs and to enforce pollution control measures.

The President, then, has performed an action under authority of a 71-year-old law. This does not lessen the blame which must be placed upon Congress for failing to live up to its own responsibilities. Nor does it lessen the need for the Administration's entire water pollution control program.

The President can take only certain actions in the absence of a congressional mandate. His current crackdown on water pollution stands in sharp contrast with the record of the eight years preceding the advent of the Nixon Administration—and the American people should recognize the facts for what they are. The eight years prior to the present Administration saw destruction of our environment go largely unchallenged. That is not a partisan statement. The facts speak for themselves.

Saving the environment should not be a partisan issue. It now remains for the majority party in Congress to join hands with the Nixon Administration in an anti-pollution crusade. We must restore America the Beautiful.

#####

The Nation has suffered a great loss in the death of Rep. L. Mendel Rivers. Nobody loved his country more. He was a patriot.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, he was more than just a friend to every man who ever served in the military. He was a pillar of strength in the defense of his country. Whatever the criticism of the position he took on behalf of a strong America, he never flinched. He never gave ground.

The Congress has been lessened by the death of Mendel Rivers, and the Nation has lost a courageous leader in the front line of its defenses.

###

Mr. Speaker: All Americans are rejoicing today over the commutation by the Soviet Supreme Court of the death sentences handed down by a lower court to two of 11 Jews accused of planning to hijack a Soviet airliner.

Our elation should be tempered, however, by the circumstances which gave rise to the entire incident—the probable entrapment by Soviet officials, the mockery of a trial, the stunningly heavy sentences. After all, the reason the incident occurred is that the Soviet Union virtually bans the emigration of Russian Jews to Israel.

The fact that the Soviet Union is holding Jews in that country against their will is unconscionable. While it is true that the Soviets, in effect, are keeping all of their citizens prisoner, the situation is particularly heinous as regards the Russian Jews. The Jews have somewhere to go, and if they wish to emigrate to Israel they should be freely permitted to do so.

# # #

Mr. Speaker: All Americans are rejoicing today over the commutation by the Soviet Supreme Court of the death sentences handed down by a lower court to two of 11 Jews accused of planning to hijack a Soviet airliner.

Our elation should be tempered, however, by the circumstances which gave rise to the entire incident—the probable entrapment by Soviet officials, the mockery of a trial, the stunningly heavy sentences, and now the reduction in sentences. After all, the reason the incident occurred is that the Soviet Union virtually bans the emigration of Russian Jews to Israel.

The fact that the Soviet Union is holding Jews in that country against their will is unconscionable. While it is true that the Soviets, in effect, are keeping all of their citizens prisoner, the situation is particularly heinous as regards the Russian Jews. The Jews have somewhere to go, and if they wish to emigrate to Israel they should be freely permitted to do so.

###
On the basis of its second session performance, the 91st Congress has to be rated as having done half of its job, with most of the failures due to Senate inaction.

It is true there have been some pluses—notably postal reform, draft reform, the Occupational Health and Safety Act, the Unemployment Compensation Amendments of 1970, the Organized Crime Control Act, and the Comprehensive Drug Control Act. These were major legislative accomplishments and in some instances landmark legislation.

But this Congress should have written a thoroughgoing record of reform, and in this respect it fell short.

This Congress should have enacted welfare reform and failed to do so.

This Congress should have enacted revenue sharing legislation and failed to do so.

This Congress should have enacted a manpower training Act which would have carried out the President's objective of a broadly-based single program and instead darted off in false directions.

This Congress should have enacted legislation to improve the handling of national emergency disputes in transportation and failed to do so.

This Congress should have enacted legislation laying down a clear-cut basis for Federal-State-and-local cooperation in licking the problem of water pollution and failed to do so.

This Congress should have approved a constitutional amendment changing the method of selecting our President and failed to do so.

This Congress should have approved a constitutional amendment giving 18-year-olds the right to vote in state and local as well as national elections but failed to do so.

This Congress should have approved a Social Security increase and Social Security reform and failed to do so.

This Congress has too many failures written next to its name to be able to point to its legislative record with pride.

Most strikingly, we found ourselves in a situation where the Senate of the United States became little more than a debating society and a number of its members were too busy launching their presidential candidacies to properly transact the Nation's business.
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This Congress should have enacted legislation to improve the handling of national emergency disputes in transportation and failed to do so.
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Most strikingly, we found ourselves in a situation where the Senate of the United States became little more than a debating society and a number of its members were too busy launching their presidential candidacies to properly transact the Nation's business.
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