The Republican Leadership of the House of Representatives is holding an introductory conference for new Republican House Members of the 92nd Congress this weekend at the Key Bridge Marriott Motor Hotel.

The 25 Congressmen-elect and their wives (as well as those sworn in after the start of the 91st Congress) will confer informally with key Administration officials and members of the Minority Leadership on organization, procedures, legislative prospects and policy goals facing the new Congress when it convenes January 21.

"We have found it invaluable in the past to get together with our new Members to help them off to a good start and to help us understand their viewpoints and concerns," House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford said. "As the minority in the next Congress with a responsibility for advancing President Nixon's reform program we must have maximum teamwork and mutual understanding and we are starting early to build it."

Other leaders participating in the panels Friday afternoon and Saturday will be Republican Whip Leslie C. Arends (R-Ill.), Conference Chairman John B. Anderson (R-Ill.), Policy Committee Chairman John J. Rhodes (R-Ariz.), Rep. H. Allen Smith (R-Calif.) Ranking Republican Member of the Rules Committee, and Senator-elect Robert A. Taft, Jr. (R-Ohio), chairman of the House Republican Research Committee in the 91st Congress.

The Members-elect will also hear Executive Director John T. Calkins and key members of the Republican Congressional Campaign Committee staff on the importance of getting re-elected in 1972.

Wives of the House leaders will meet separately on Saturday with the wives of the new Republican Members for a panel discussion of the duties of a Congressional wife and the details of Washington living. Miss Nancy Hanks, Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, will be guest speaker at the ladies' luncheon.

Director George P. Shultz of the Office of Management and Budget and Presidential Counsel for Congressional Relations Clark MacGregor will lead off the White House contingent participating in the conference. Briefings on President Nixon's foreign and domestic policies will be given by Dr. Henry Kissinger, Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs and Mr. John Ehrlichman, Assistant to the President for Domestic Affairs.

All of the working sessions will be limited to participants but a press briefing will be given by Rep. Ford at the close of Saturday afternoon's conference (approximately 5:30 p.m.) in the Federal Room, which will be available as a press room from 3 p.m. on. Media coverage will be welcome at the 6:00 p.m. reception and 7:30 p.m. dinner which will conclude the Saturday program. The dinner speaker will be the new Chairman of the Republican National Committee who will be elected Friday.

(Members of the press who plan to cover the dinner please advise Mr. Paul Theis, Director of Public Relations, Republican Congressional Committee, Lincoln 4-3010, as soon as possible.)
Congressman Gerald R. Ford
House Republican Leader

--Friday Evening, Jan. 22, 1971--

NEWS RELEASE

This Statement Embargoed Until Delivery of the State of the Union Message

President Nixon's State of the Union Message is a document which looks forward, not backward.

With this message to the Congress, the President has unveiled a visionary course for the Nation which offers us the driving dream the American people yearn for. Nowhere in the message is there a word of criticism or a dwelling on mistakes past. He has extended the hand of partnership to the Congress.

In setting forth his six great goals for the 92nd Congress and the Nation, the President envisages vast reforms in both the programs and structure of the Federal Government—fundamental, problem-solving reforms, not patchwork.

I hope the 92nd Congress will work with the President to achieve all six of his great goals—welfare reform, full prosperity in peacetime, the restoration of our environment, the best possible health care for all Americans, strengthening of our state and local governments through revenue sharing, and complete reform of the Federal Government through a restructuring of cabinet departments.

I applaud the President's pledge to lick cancer through a sharply increased outlay of research funds, and I strongly favor his proposal to make $5 billion in shared revenue available to the states and cities. I might add I hope the 92nd will be a "Health Congress."

With his revenue sharing proposal, the President has made it clear he wants to bring government to the people and to bring the people to the government. He wants to make young people a part of participatory democracy and to make democracy a part of their lives.

I believe the American people will endorse the bold course laid out by the President. I hope their representatives in Congress will do likewise.

#######
I am deeply disappointed that Grand Rapids, Mich., has not been included
in the Railpak System by the Department of Transportation as of this time, and I
am hopeful that it will be incorporated into the routings in the future.

In a letter to me, Transportation Secretary John Volpe declared: "I will work
very hard to be sure that the most paramount of considerations will be given to
the recommendations for service between Detroit and Chicago via Grand Rapids."

The Michigan Public Service Commission strongly favors rail passenger
service linking Grand Rapids with Chicago and Detroit, and local citizens are
vigorously supporting such service. I urge that they continue their efforts on
behalf of Grand Rapids service with the thought that we may yet prevail.

Secretary Volpe has assured me that changes in Railpak routings can be made
in the future. This gives reason to hope that Grand Rapids will be included in
the Detroit-Chicago run, which is definitely a part of the new system.

The Secretary has told me: "We are very aware of the extraordinary
reputation that Grand Rapids has had throughout its tradition and history as a
furniture manufacturing center, as well as being the second largest city in
Michigan. These very factors are being analyzed by my staff and will be considered
very carefully in putting together this final system."
---FOR RELEASE AT 12 NOON FRIDAY---
January 29, 1971

President Nixon's fiscal 1972 budget is a carefully drawn fiscal plan which stands out as perhaps the first Federal budget clearly designed to help promote full employment and peacetime prosperity.

It is also a fair share budget, drafted to provide proper health care for our citizens regardless of economic circumstance, to place an income floor under every family in America, and to strengthen efforts to guarantee the civil rights of all Americans.

I fully support the concept of employing the Federal budget to bring about full prosperity in peacetime, in combination with monetary policy. It is far better to plan a deficit aimed at achieving prosperity with price stability than to stumble into a deficit with a blindfold on. In the one instance, we have our eyes focused on a healthy national objective; in the other, we simply sink into uncomprehending red ink.

It is time for an expansionary budget. We have turned the corner on inflation. We will continue to make progress on this problem. Meantime we cannot afford to keep a halter on the economy. Instead, we must prescribe the medicine of stimulation.

In the human needs sector of the budget, I reaffirm my support for reform of the scandalous welfare system and pledge my support for accelerated efforts to find a cure for cancer and to provide all needy Americans with proper healthy care. In combating cancer, we must provide all the funds that can be profitably spent.

I shall also support every sound effort to restore and preserve our environment. One of the most serious shortcomings of the last Congress was its failure to establish an Environmental Financing Authority to help communities meet their share of water pollution control costs where necessary.

I am also pleased by the sharp increases in funding to fight street crime and organized crime and to bring about prison reform.

I thoroughly agree with the President that the Federal grant system must be revised. I have long favored block grants in broad problem areas, as the President has proposed under special revenue sharing, and also general sharing of completely untied revenue.

With regard to the Defense Department budget, I feel that deep thoughtless cutting by the Congress would be most ill-advised. Some of our forces are lacking in combat-readiness and must be modernized. We are confronted with the need for technological progress. We cannot afford to take a head-in-the-sand attitude toward our military needs. Our national defense is a matter of high priority.

Coincidental with the need to modernize our forces is the need to modernize our military personnel policies. We must reduce our draft calls to zero and make the transition to an all-volunteer force. The funds requested by the Defense Department to this end would be well used.
President Nixon's fiscal 1972 budget is a carefully drawn fiscal plan which
stands out as perhaps the first Federal budget clearly designed to help promote
full employment and peacetime prosperity.

It is also a fair share budget, providing proper health care for
our citizens regardless of economic circumstance, to place an income floor under
every family in America, and to strengthen efforts to guarantee the civil rights
of all Americans.

I fully support the concept of employing the Federal budget to bring about
full prosperity in peacetime, in combination with monetary policy. It is far
better to plan a deficit by achieving prosperity with price stability than to
stumble into a deficit with a blindfold on. In the one instance, we have our eyes
focused on a healthy national objective; in the other, we simply sink into
uncomprehending red ink.

It is time for an expansionary budget. We have turned the corner on
inflation. We will continue to make progress on this problem. Meantime we cannot
afford to keep a halter on the economy. Instead, we must prescribe the medicine of
stimulation.

In the human needs sector of the budget, I reaffirm my support for reform of
the scandalous welfare system, and pledge my support for accelerated efforts to find
a cure for cancer and to provide all needy Americans with proper health care. In
combating cancer, we must provide all the funds that can be profitably spent.

I shall also support every sound effort to restore and preserve our environ-
ment. One of the most serious shortcomings of the past Congress was its failure to
authorize an Environmental Financing Authority to help communities meet their share
of water, air pollution control costs, and necesas.

I am also pleased by the sharp increases in funding to fight street crime and
organized crime and to bring about prison reform.

I thoroughly agree with the President that the Federal grant system must be
revised. I have long favored block grants in broad problem areas, as the President
has proposed under special revenue sharing, and also general sharing of completely
untied revenue.

With regard to the Defense Department budget, I feel that deep thoughtless
cutting by the Congress would be most ill-advised. Some of our forces are lacking
in combat-readiness and must be modernized. We are confronted with the need for
technological progress. We cannot afford to take a head-in-the-sand attitude toward
our military needs. Our national defense is a matter of high priority.

Coincidental with the need to modernize our forces is the need to modernize
our military personnel policies. We must reduce our draft calls to zero and make
the transition to an all-volunteer force. The funds requested by the Defense
Department to this end would be well used.

# # #

Ford made the statement in response to a plea for such an investigation from Peter W. Steketee, chairman of the West Michigan Environmental Action Council with headquarters in Grand Rapids.

Steketee told Ford the plane apparently was using the Consumers Power Company nuclear power plant at Big Rock, Mich., as a practice bombing target at the time of the crash and was flying at an extremely low level. He termed this "an extremely dangerous practice." Steketee speculated that if a B-52 should ever crash into the power plant the result could conceivably be a spread of radiation and could be disastrous. He urged that all such planes be routed away from nuclear power plants.

Ford told Steketee he agrees with his demand for an investigation and said he urged the Air Force prior to the Charlevoix crash to alter the B-52 practice run route. Ford said he had acted at the request of Consumers Power.

He said the Air Force replied that the matter was "under consideration" and that the efforts were being made to reroute the training runs. Ford said the Air Force attitude appeared "cooperative."
Remarks by Representative Ford on President's Environment Program

The President's Environment Message

Mr. Speaker:

The President said on January 1 last year that the time had come to give priority to our concerns about our environment. Together last year we made some important steps forward, setting up a strong Council on Environmental Quality in the Executive Office to coordinate our environmental programs and prepare new initiatives, reorganizing our pollution control programs into a single independent agency under dynamic leadership, enacting comprehensive legislation on air quality and solid wastes, establishing much needed (National) parks, and initiating a potentially very effective enforcement of water quality under the permit authority of the Refuse Act.

In today's Message on the Environment the President has made crystal clear that concern about the environment is to no fad and that it is our national policy/systematically defend our environment from all assaults. Rather than describe the fifteen or so legislative measures, the treaties and the many executive actions involved, I will only sketch the main categories of action proposed.--
Measures to strengthen pollution control programs

-- Charges on sulfur oxides and lead to supplement regulatory controls on air pollution

-- More effective control of water pollution through a $12 billion financing program and strengthened standard-setting and enforcement authorities

-- Comprehensive improvement in pesticide control authority

-- A Federal procurement program to encourage recycling of paper

Measures to control emerging problems

-- Regulation of toxic substances

-- Regulation of noise pollution

-- Controls on ocean dumping

Measures to promote environmental quality in land use decisions

-- A new and greatly expanded open space and recreation program, bringing parks to the people in urban areas

-- A national land use policy

-- Adjustments in our tax policy to foster our land use goals

-- Substantial expansion of the wilderness areas preservation system

-- Advance clearance of power plant sites
-- Regulation of strip mining
Further institutional improvement
-- Establishment of an Environmental Institute to
   conduct studies and recommend policy alternatives
Steps toward a better world environment
-- Expanded international cooperation
-- A World Heritage Trust to preserve parks and areas
   of unique cultural value throughout the world.

At a time when there are many issues that divide us,
I welcome so clear and strong a call to a cause that finds
broad support in both parties, all generations and all parts of the country. I know that in my own State of
Michigan, which has been a leader in this field, the President's Environment Message will be greeted and supported. I believe my colleagues here will find that the President's proposals respond to deep felt needs across the country.

With so extensive an agenda it is fortunate that this message was placed before us early. There have been extensive advance briefings of many of the committees concerned so I anticipate we can get off to a fast start.

I also anticipate that we will have our own constructive contributions to make to this program and that we will have
broad support from both sides of the aisle for the President's initiatives. I believe that this will be true not only of the familiar anti-pollution programs included but also of such innovations as using market forces to abate pollution (by taxes on sulfur oxides in fuel and lead in gasoline), using government contract policy to promote recycling, strengthening State powers over land use to protect the environment and guide development, and programs to head off such emerging environmental problems as noise, pollution from toxic substances such as mercury and ocean dumping.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the President and his colleagues on his Environment Message. They have done their work with vision, vigor and a sensitivity to the country's needs. I know my colleagues in this House will respond in kind.

MR. SPEAKER: It is time for a showdown. It is time the Congress quit running away from the question of what to do about national emergency labor disputes in the transportation industry.

The President has again sent the Congress his proposed Emergency Public Interest Protection Act, which would bring the railroads and airlines under the Taft-Hartley Act and amend Taft-Hartley to give the President three additional options for handling national emergency labor disputes in transportation.

It is possible that none of us agrees word for word with the language of the legislation being proposed by the President to deal with this pressing national problem. But it is incumbent upon the Congress to give the President's proposal a hearing and to formulate a solution.

It is a shameful shirking of responsibility for the Congress to avoid coming to grips with the critical need for improving the Federal machinery for handling labor disputes affecting transportation.

Action is needed—and now. The threat of another railroad strike in the space of just a few weeks points up the urgency of the situation. The American people should not stand for continued delay.

MR. SPEAKER: It is time for a showdown. It is time the Congress quit running away from the question of what to do about national emergency labor disputes in the transportation industry.

The President has again sent the Congress his proposed Emergency Public Interest Protection Act, which would bring the railroads and airlines under the Taft-Hartley Act and amend Taft-Hartley to give the President three additional options for handling national emergency labor disputes in transportation.

It is possible that none of us agrees word for word with the language of the legislation being proposed by the President to deal with this pressing national problem. But it is incumbent upon the Congress to give the President's proposal a hearing and to formulate a solution.

It is a shameful shirking of responsibility for the Congress to avoid coming to grips with the critical need for improving the Federal machinery for handling labor disputes affecting transportation.

Action is needed—and now. The threat of another railroad strike in the space of just a few weeks points up the urgency of the situation. The American people should not stand for continued delay.

MR. SPEAKER: The President has laid before the Congress a compelling case for general revenue sharing with the states and cities. His arguments are most cogent.

What the President is proposing is a new approach to government. In a sense it is not new. He is asking that we return to the time when the bulk of government decisions in America were made in town meetings across the land. He is, in effect, urging that we return to government by the people.

I realize these are strange words when addressed to the representatives of the people, which is what all members of the U.S. House of Representatives are. I am fond of calling this "the People's House." But the fact remains that because the Federal Government is the all-powerful tax collector in this land we have strayed grievously away from the principle that government should be as close as possible to the people.

General revenue sharing affords the Congress an opportunity to come closer to the people—to put the money and the responsibility where the problems are.

I believe that in endorsing general revenue sharing a member of Congress will be reaffirming his faith in the local political process—and that process is the foundation of free government, government by free men.

The alternative to general revenue sharing is the grafting of new growth onto old Federal programs.

I urge that we take to new paths—that we cut through the tangled undergrowth of the Federal bureaucracy with an approach that will usher in a new era of self-government for the American people.
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I strongly support the South Vietnamese incursion into Southern Laos and President Nixon's decision to provide the South Vietnamese with the air support they need to destroy vitally important North Vietnamese bases.

The objective of the operation is to disrupt the supply and infiltration network of the North Vietnamese forces in Laos and thus to ensure the continued withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam. The operation by South Vietnamese forces not only will achieve this objective but will open the door to accelerated withdrawal of American troops from Vietnam.

Like the Cambodian venture, the incursion into Southern Laos promises to destroy the enemy's ability to mount a major new offensive against South Vietnam, taking us into a new monsoon season and ensuring continued success of President Nixon's Vietnamization program.

The North Vietnamese forces and military supplies in Laos posed an increasing threat to U.S. forces as they were being withdrawn. Their supply and infiltration network has been used for many years to launch attacks against U.S. and South Vietnamese forces in South Vietnam.

The territory in which this action is taking place has been subjected to U.S. air attacks since 1965 and is therefore not a new theater of military operations.

While the South Vietnamese incursion into Laos is a new development, the government of Laos has candidly stated that this incursion has been forced by the North Vietnamese. I fully agree with that view of the situation.

All Americans should applaud the determination of the South Vietnamese to protect their own vital interests and should applaud the Laotian incursion as an assist to U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam.

# # #
The Republican Congressional Committee each year conducts a fund raising drive throughout the Country. From those funds the Committee makes funds available to freshman G.O.P. Congressmen, other incumbent G.O.P. Congressmen and non-incumbent candidates.

Because of my position as Republican leader of the House, I receive contributions from all over the Country. When I reach the limitation set by law, I turn such contributions over to the Republican Congressional Committee to be used on behalf of all G.O.P. candidates for Congress. The Committee subsequently files a report with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, listing all donors and the amounts contributed by each.

The Republican Congressional Committee used no more money on my behalf in the 1970 campaign than had been provided to freshmen G.O.P. Congressmen in the last Congress. These freshmen were given an initial allocation of $2,000, a subsequent allocation of $5,000 and $4,000 for public relations: that is a total of $11,000.

The law does not prohibit any Congressional candidate not wishing personally to accept a political contribution from turning that money over to a political committee. Those funds are then controlled by that committee and not by the individual who has turned that money over to them.

The Republican Congressional Committee's expenditures on my behalf were made under normal procedure followed by the Committee not only in 1970 but in previous campaigns.

I had been allocated money by the Committee in previous years - money I had not used. So to all intents and purposes, some of the money used by the Committee in my 1970 campaign was left over from previous allocations to me.
I live by the letter of the Campaign laws. There is no question that these laws are utterly unrealistic in the limits they set on campaign spending. I have pressed since 1965 for modernization of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act and I will continue to do so. That law was written 46 years ago and does not take into account modern-day costs of radio and television campaigning.
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Those funds then are controlled by that committee and not by the individual who has turned the money over to them.

The Republican Congressional Committee's expenditures on my behalf were made under normal procedure followed by the committee not only in 1970 but in previous campaigns.

I had been allocated money by the committee in previous years—money I had not used. So to all intents and purposes some of the money used by the committee in my 1970 campaign was left over from previous allocations to me.
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# # #
Some items in this folder were not digitized because it contains copyrighted materials. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library for access to these materials.
In Our Opinion—

Ford Within Law
On Spending Report

Ford has struck his hand through that piece of federal Swiss cheese known as the Corrupt Practices Act. Now it appears someone is trying to slap his wrist.

A story in Thursday's Citizen Patriot said that Rep. Ford failed to report $11,000 in contributions he received in his recent re-election campaign. That money included some large contributions from the Securities Industries Campaign Committee, the Bankers Political Action Committee, the Boiler-makers-Blacksmiths union and a New York oilman.

Before anyone starts pointing the finger at Rep. Ford they should know that the Corrupt Practices Act has so many holes in it that the empty spaces far outweigh the substance.

In the 45-year history of the law and its amendments, no office seeker or holder has ever been prosecuted for violating its provisions.

And the reason for that phenomenon in this era of free-spending, is that the federal government doesn't want to waste its time and money on a prosecution it has little chance of winning.

About the only thing the Corrupt Practices Act has done is to encourage corrupt practices in the devious ways the law is flawed.

Here there is more evidence to the contrary. Rep. Ford is as he claims, within the law on his campaign spending report.

The law has a limit of $10,000 for a campaign for the House, but that limit has been interpreted as applying to each of the various campaign committees a candidate has, and not to the combined total of all the committees.

It has been a common practice since the Corrupt Practices Act was first passed in 1927 to form more than one campaign committee and thus exceed the spending limit the act was intended to enforce.

Rare is the candidate, indeed, who can finance an election with only one campaign committee.

Thus it appears that Rep. Ford was only doing what most other candidates do.

A candidate who spends up to his legal limit merely forms another committee to handle the additional spending (and hopefully) additional income.

The question raised in the news report seems to be over the interpretation of the word "received." Does a candidate have to report those contributions after the legal limit has been reached if he gives the money to another campaign committee?

This part of the Corrupt Practices Act is open to varying interpretation.

Some feel that a candidate must report that income even though his committee cannot legally spend it. Others believe that because the contributions are given to another committee, the candidate himself did not actually receive them and thus does not have to report them. Instead the contributions are filed with another committee which actually spent it.

It appears in the Ford case that the minority leader more than any other candidate has spent money to the Republican Congressional Committee which in turn sent it to other Ford committees that had bills to pay.

But Ford is not alone in such political parties and has since the passage of the Corrupt Practices Act.

It's nothing new, thousands of words have been printed on that piece of federal Swiss cheese and it still weighs the same.

But apparently Congress likes the odor—nobody has ever really tried to change the fragrance.
February 15, 1971

The Republican Congressional Committee each year conducts a fund-raising drive throughout the country. From those funds the committee makes money available to freshman GOP congressmen, other incumbent GOP congressmen, and non-incumbent GOP congressional candidates.

Because of my position as Republican leader of the House, I receive contributions from all over the country. When I reach the limitation set by law, I turn such contributions over to the Republican Congressional Committee to be used on behalf of all GOP candidates for Congress. The committee subsequently files a report with the Clerk of the House of Representatives, listing all donors and the amounts contributed. In fact the reporter who wrote the news article on this subject obtained his information from the public records on file with the Clerk of the House and with the Kent County Clerk. There was no attempt to hide anything, either by me or the Republican Congressional Committee.

The Republican Congressional Committee used no more money on my behalf in the 1970 campaign than had been provided to freshman GOP congressmen in the last Congress. These freshmen were given an initial allocation of $2,000, a subsequent allocation of $5,000, and $4,000 for public relations. That is a total of $11,000.

The law does not prohibit any congressional candidate not wishing personally to accept a political contribution from turning that money over to a political committee.

Those funds then are controlled by that committee and not by the individual who has turned the money over to them.

The Republican Congressional Committee's expenditures on my behalf were made under normal procedure followed by the committee not only in 1970 but in previous campaigns.

I had been allocated money by the committee in previous years—money I had not used. So to all intents and purposes some of the money used by the committee in my 1970 campaign was left over from previous allocations to me.

I complied fully with all the campaign laws. There is no question that these laws are utterly unrealistic in the limits they set on campaign spending. I have pressed since 1965 for modernization of the Federal Corrupt Practices Act, and I will continue to do so. That law was written 46 years ago and does not take into account modern-day costs of radio and television campaigning.
Mr. Speaker: The President has again urged action on a problem that cries out for attention—the difficulty young people are having throughout the nation in financing their higher education.

No qualified student should fail to go to college for lack of funds. If we accept that statement—and I think every member of Congress does—then the Congress should not fail to act this year on proposals to expand funding opportunities for prospective college students.

The President's proposals in this area of difficulty make great good sense. Under his program, Federal funds would go first and in the largest amounts to the neediest students. But loan money would be readily available to students from higher income families.

The creation of a National Student Loan Association has been delayed far too long. All of us know that in many communities it is virtually impossible for a prospective college student to get a loan from a bank. This situation must be remedied, and the proposed National Student Loan Association appears to be the obvious answer.

We must open higher education to all of our qualified young people. America must truly be the land of opportunity.

# # #
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###

The action taken by the President to dampen inflationary pressures in the construction industry should be welcomed—not only by the American people generally but by construction workers in particular.

Suspension of the Davis-Bacon Act will increase competition in bidding on government projects. It will tend to hold down further rises in construction costs. It will tend to create more work for construction workers. In the final analysis, both the public and the construction workers will benefit.

The President is saying that the government will not have a part in abetting inflation. He is saying that the Nixon Administration will take decisive action as necessary to bring inflation under control.

""
FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
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February 25, 1971

The President's second State of the World Message is an excellent exposition of American foreign policy.

It is further testimony that President Nixon has taken the American people into his confidence more fully than any President before him.

The section on Indochina outlines our military and diplomatic moves directed toward peace in Southeast Asia more clearly than has ever been done before. The President places the blame for conflict throughout Indochina precisely where it belongs—on the Communist leaders in Hanoi.

In the section on the Middle East, the President points up the constant danger of a U.S.-Soviet confrontation there. One of the Administration's great accomplishments stemmed from the low-keyed manner in which the Administration steered away from that danger during the Jordanian crisis last September.

All in all, the President's second State of the World Message is a valuable contribution to an understanding of U.S. foreign policy—not only by the American people but by peoples throughout the universe.

###

As President Nixon clearly spells out in his message received by the Congress today, there are vital and distinct ways in which special revenue sharing differs from block grants.

Special Revenue Sharing differs from block grants in that it would require no matching funds, no demonstration of maintenance of effort, and no prior project approval.

Special Revenue Sharing proposals are not a threat to the adoption of General Revenue Sharing. Special Revenue Sharing fits in with the same philosophy in which General Revenue Sharing is rooted—that no program or project strings will govern the use of revenue sharing funds.

Special Revenue Sharing funds would be spent under six broad headings—law enforcement, manpower training, urban development, rural development, transportation and education. State and local governments would enjoy great freedom and flexibility with the use of funds allocated for those general purposes.

The Nation has reached a critical juncture in the development of our federal system.

Revenue sharing—general and special—represents an historic opportunity to restore fiscal balance to the system and to markedly strengthen state and local government. It is an act of faith in the local political process. It is sorely needed.

###

All Americans can feel greatly encouraged by President Nixon's remarks Thursday night concerning the Laotian incursion by South Vietnamese troops aided by U.S. air support.

The fact that 55% of the traffic coming down the Ho Chih Minh Trail has been halted is clear evidence of the incursion's success and proof that taking this action was a matter of sound military strategy.

I personally believe the Laotian incursion by the South Vietnamese will produce even more dramatic results and will unquestionably mean an acceleration of U.S. troop withdrawals from South Vietnam.

I commend the President for his candor and the completeness of his answers during his foreign policy press conference. He has kept every promise he has made to the American people on Vietnam and he has taken them into his confidence.
Rep. Gerald R. Ford last night challenged the Democratic-controlled Congress to "ride the winds of change with the Republican Party."

Speaking at a Lincoln Day Dinner in Ionia, Ford said President Nixon has laid before the Congress a blueprint for progress which would scrap what has failed and have the Nation meet the needs of tomorrow in tomorrow's terms.

Ford urged that the Congress join with the President in seeking to meet the six great goals set forth in the President's State of the Union Message—prosperity in peacetime, welfare reform, the restoration of our environment, the best possible health care for all Americans, strengthening of State and local government through a sharing of Federal revenue, and complete reform of the Federal Government through an overhaul of cabinet departments.

Ford pointed to recent Presidential messages to the Congress on health care and law enforcement and manpower revenue sharing and declared: "President Nixon has taken dramatic new initiatives on social legislation and on the structure of government—and the response among the people makes it clear he has captured the imagination of the nation."

Ford said the President is asking for a chance to prove that government can work.

He said he is seeking to do this by replacing the present "scandalous" welfare system, by bolstering state and local governments, by overhauling job training and job placement programs, and by sharing Federal revenue with the states and local communities.

Said Ford: "The President wants to reform government itself—so that instead of sliding further into musclebound ineffectiveness it can at last deliver the services it promises and bridge the gap between promise and performance."

Ford added: "Through Federal revenue sharing, by putting the money where the problems are, we will be returning government to the people. And, as Abraham Lincoln so well expressed it, 'We hold to the true Republican position. In leaving the people's business in their hands, we cannot be wrong.'"

Ford's bill would amend the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935 to permit companies regulated under the Act to participate in government-assisted low and moderate income housing programs. Commerce Committee Chairman Harley O. Staggers, D-W.Va., and Rep. William L. Springer, Ill., the committee's senior Republican, are poised to introduce identical bills.

Enactment of Ford's Holding Company Act Amendment would allow Michigan Consolidated Gas Company to go ahead with three low and moderate income housing projects in Michigan. These projects would provide 538 homes at a cost of roughly $10 million.

One of the projects consists of 150 units in Kentwood, just south of Grand Rapids. The others are a 175-unit project in an urban renewal area of Muskegon and 213 units in Romulus, a Detroit suburb.

Said Ford: "While I have considerable interest in the overall housing needs of the country, I am particularly interested in seeing the Kentwood project proceed. All of the necessary local and FHA approvals have been obtained. This project will provide 150 homes which are greatly needed in the Grand Rapids area. Very little has been done in the area in the way of lower income housing construction."

Ford also noted that the project will provide additional employment in the Grand Rapids area, "which is badly needed at this time."

The Grand Rapids project ultimately is expected to result in 302 homes. The first phase of the project, 150 units, is estimated to cost $2.8 million.

Michigan Consolidated Gas Company had been building low and moderate income housing in Michigan until the Securities and Exchange Commission ruled against such activity on June 22, 1970.

The 1970 ruling was a reversal of an SEC ruling handed down in March 1969, at which time the SEC authorized such activity by Michigan Consolidated Gas. After the favorable 1969 ruling, Michigan Consolidated built 298 units in Elmwood and 134 units in Inkster, Mich.

There are housing units in Michigan that hinge on enactment of the Ford bill. There are also housing projects in other parts of the country that are awaiting this legislation.

# # #
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Thomas E. Dewey was a truly outstanding American. Whatever his role—as racket-busting district attorney, governor of New York for three terms, twice the Republican candidate for President—he always distinguished himself.

In his later years, Tom Dewey was a sage adviser on national issues. I served with him on the Republican National Coordinating Committee and joined with him in discussions to which he made invaluable contributions.

Tom Dewey was a dedicated American. He loved his country more than anything else in life. He was a quiet patriot, but a true patriot.

Tom Dewey was born in Owosso, Mich., and my state of Michigan can be proud that it gave Tom Dewey to the Nation. His death is a loss to us all.

#####
Mr. Speaker, in the last four decades more and more power has been concentrated in the Washington bureaucracy.

During that time the Congress appears to have been fascinated by sheer numbers—a fantastic increase in numbers of Government programs, numbers of Federal dollars allocated to those programs, and numbers of Federal workers employed in those programs.

The problems remain. In fact, the problems have become worse. And in recent years when Presidents have tried to point to progress they have talked in terms of increased dollar outlays rather than results.

This has brought crushing disappointment to the American people—a bitter realization that performance has fallen far short of political promises.

There is an inescapable conclusion—that the system is at fault, that thorough-going changes are needed in the fundamental structure of the Federal Government and the federal aid system.

The President has sent us his proposals for Federal revenue sharing—and these are most welcome.

Today we have received the President’s proposal for governmental reorganization. This, combined with revenue sharing, places us on the threshold of a new era in American political history, an era in which the people are given more control over their own destinies.

We need only look at the record and we must recognize that governmental reorganization is a must. In the past 20 years the number of Cabinet departments has increased from 9 to 12; the number of major independent agencies has increased from 27 to 41; the number of Federal employes has increased from 2.1 million to 2.7 million; the Federal budget has increased from $42 billion to more than $200 billion; and the number of Federal programs has jumped more than 10-fold to about 1,400.

We need wholesale reorganization of the Federal government. We need to reorganize the Executive Branch along the lines of the functions served by various departments and agencies, not the constituencies they now serve.

This is the thrust of the President’s plan—to organize the Federal Government by function. This, I believe, would eliminate overlapping and clear away the present complicated maze.

Our citizens are sick of the complexity of big government. They are sick of waste. They are sick of the miles and miles of red tape in which government now is entangled...and the people with it.

I urge the Congress to give careful study to the President’s proposals and to bring order out of chaos. The Congress must not stand in the way of progress.
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House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford today threw his weight behind a bill to prevent nationwide television and radio blackouts of major sporting events like the Frazier-Ali fight.

Ford joined in sponsoring a bill which would amend the Federal Communications Act to prohibit monopoly coverage of big sports events. The bill was introduced by Rep. Charles W. Sandman Jr., R-N.J.

"I think the restricting of the Frazier-Ali fight broadcasts to closed circuit television was unfair to millions of fight fans across the country," Ford declared.

"I hope Congress will prevent such occurrences in the future by enacting the Sandman-Ford bill."

The Sandman-Ford bill would require promoters of the "final national or international championship events in professional sports" to obtain a permit from the Federal Communications Commission.

A permit would be issued only if the POC is satisfied that broadcasters in "each type of electronic medium"—TV, radio and the closed circuit system—have had a chance to bid for broadcast rights and that the highest bid in each medium has been accepted.

"This bill would make it certain," Ford said, "that the general public would have the opportunity to witness major sporting events on all types of broadcast media."

Events such as the Super Bowl, the World Series, the Stanley Cup championships, the NBA and ABA playoffs and championship boxing matches are among the events covered by the Sandman-Ford bill.

If the POC approach to licensing the broadcast monopoly is unsuccessful, Ford said, there is a possibility of accomplishing the same result by amending the antitrust laws. That approach would be tooo owners, managers or promoters of professional sports from awarding exclusive rights to any one type of broadcast media.
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I applaud the action of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives in urging full support of President Nixon's initiatives for peace in Vietnam and the release of all prisoners of war. The President will be strengthened by the support of all Americans in the courageous course he is pursuing.
I applaud the action of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives in urging full support of President Nixon's initiatives for peace in Vietnam and the release of all prisoners of war. The President will be strengthened by the support of all Americans in the courageous course he is pursuing.
RESOLVED, That it is the sense of the Democratic Caucus of the House of Representatives that in the 92nd Congress the House of Representatives should work to end the U. S. military involvement in Indo-China and to bring about the release of all prisoners in a time certain, and during the 92nd Congress.

RESOLVED, Further, that in pursuit of these objectives, the Democratic Caucus urges full support whenever possible by both House Democrats and Republicans of the initiatives of the President, the House Committees, and Members, and the Senate, which may be pertinent to these ends.
Congressman Gerald R. Ford today announced that he is inaugurating "hot line" telephone service between his constituents and his Washington office.

Ford explained that any of his constituents in Kent and Ionia Counties may talk with his Washington office without charge on urgent business matters simply by calling his district office in Grand Rapids. The number is 456-9607.

Ford said two special lines have been installed in his Grand Rapids office. If one line is busy, the call automatically will come in on the second line.

"When someone calls 456-9607, a staff member in my district office will put the call through to my Washington office," Ford said. "I or one of my Washington staff members then will take the call and handle the problem," he added.

Ford emphasized that the hot line service is primarily to expedite matters of immediate concern. In most instances, he said, letter-writing is best because then a constituent can explain all details of a problem.

###

Mr. Speaker, no effort is more vital to improving the quality of life in America than improving the quality of education in America.

For this reason, I look upon Education Revenue Sharing as the most important of the Special Revenue Sharing proposals sent to the Congress by the President.

The Education Revenue Sharing Message received by the Congress today should be scanned most carefully by every member, since it is aimed at remedying the most glaring deficiencies in our present system of Federal aid to schools.

I see Education Revenue Sharing as the answer to two of the greatest weaknesses in the present system—inability to plan and lack of flexibility.

Local school officials presently are at a tremendous disadvantage in budgeting from one year to the next. They can never be certain how much Federal aid they will receive. They are also handicapped in undertaking innovative programs. Washington requires that they abide by certain rules in order to obtain Federal funds.

Education Revenue Sharing would hurdle these barriers to proper local administration of schools.

There would be no fragmentation of Federal grants, no rigid assignment of funds. Instead there would be an assured Federal contribution toward the overall quality of local education, with flexibility for local planners.

I had anticipated a formidable obstacle to Education Revenue Sharing in connection with aid to non-public schools. But I find reassurance in the President's pledge that "non-public school students would be counted in the reckoning of population for purposes of allocation, and all forms of educational services would be available to them." Where State law prevents non-public school participation, the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare "shall arrange for such children to receive similar services on an equitable basis and shall pay the cost thereof out of the State's allotment." I find this completely satisfactory.
THE PRESIDENT'S COMMITMENT TO END TOTAL AMERICAN INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM AND HIS CONTINUING STRIDES TOWARD THAT GOAL SHOULD GREATLY ENCOURAGE ALL AMERICANS.

THE SUCCESS OF HIS VIETNAMIZATION PROGRAM HAS MADE IT POSSIBLE TO EXPAND U.S. WITHDRAWALS FROM VIETNAM TO BETTER THAN 14,000 MEN A MONTH. IF OUR WITHDRAWALS CONTINUE INTO 1972 AT THE RATE NOW PROGRAMMED BY THE PRESIDENT, WE WILL BE DOWN TO 55,000 MEN BY SEPT. 1 OF NEXT YEAR.

I APPLAUD THE PRESIDENT FOR STICKING WITH HIS RESOLVE TO END OUR INVOLVEMENT IN VIETNAM IN A WAY THAT WILL LEAVE BEHIND A VIABLE AND INDEPENDENT SOUTH VIETNAM. I APPLAUD THE PRESIDENT FOR DOING WHAT IS RIGHT...NOT WHAT IS POLITICALLY AND TEMPORARILY EXPEDIENT.

####
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Khruschev — 4/7/61
Congressman Gerald R. Ford today urged favorable committee action on his bill or identical bills to ban the unregulated dumping of any materials into the oceans and the Great Lakes.

Ford made his plea in a statement filed with the Joint Subcommittee on Fisheries and Wildlife and Oceanography of the House Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. The subcommittee currently is considering a number of ocean dumping bills.

Ford's bill would ban the dumping of any material into the oceans and the Great Lakes while giving the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to issue dumping permits when, in his judgment, the dumping would "not unreasonably degrade or unreasonably endanger human health, welfare, or amenities, or the marine environment, ecological systems, or economic potentialities."

Violators of Ford's proposed Marine Protection Act of 1971 would be subject to a $50,000 fine or a year in jail. Each day of continuing wilful violations would be a separate offense.

In his statement to the subcommittee Ford declared:

"There are environmental problems that are far more critical than ocean dumping. But there is no time better than the present for acknowledging that the current level of ocean dumping is creating serious environmental damage in some areas.

"We should recognize now that the volume of wastes dumped in the ocean is increasing rapidly.

"We should warn ourselves now that a vast new influx of wastes is likely to occur as municipalities and industries look to the ocean as a convenient spot to dump their wastes.

"We should view with alarm now the trends indicating that ocean dumping could become a major, nationwide environmental problem.

"We must act now to safeguard our basic environmental balance by banning unregulated dumping of any materials into the oceans and by strictly limiting the ocean disposal of any materials harmful to the environment."
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Ford's bill would ban the dumping of any material into the oceans and the Great Lakes while giving the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to issue dumping permits when, in his judgment, the dumping would "not unreasonably degrade or unreasonably endanger human health, welfare, or amenities, or the marine environment, ecological systems, or economic potentialities."

Violators of Ford's proposed Marine Protection Act of 1971 would be subject to a $50,000 fine or a year in jail. Each day of continuing willful violations would be a separate offense.

In his statement to the subcommittee Ford declared:

"There are environmental problems that are far more critical than ocean dumping. But there is no time better than the present for acknowledging that the current level of ocean dumping is creating serious environmental damage in some areas.
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"We must act now to safeguard our basic environmental balance by banning unregulated dumping of any materials into the oceans and by strictly limiting the ocean disposal of any materials harmful to the environment."
April 20, 1971

FOR RELEASE AT WILL.

The board of directors of the National Police Officers Association has appointed Congressman Gerald R. Ford an honorary vice-president of the association. Ford was notified of the honor by Frank J. Schira, association executive director.
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News Release from the Office of Congressman Gerald R. Ford

Congressman Gerald R. Ford today announced that he and others will meet with Federal Highway Administrator Francis C. Turner in the hope of expediting construction of a four-lane divided US 131 from Cedar Springs to Cadillac.

Ford said he has set up a meeting Wednesday (April 28) in his office with Turner, U.S. Rep. Elford A. Cederberg of Bay City, a group of State legislators, and officials of the US 131 Area Development Association.

"A way must be found to expedite construction of a new US 131 from Cedar Springs to Cadillac," Ford declared. "The State Highway Department and the State Highway Commission obviously are not giving 131 any greater priority than US 31, if as much. Their plan to build these two four-lane freeways at pretty much the same pace smacks of nothing but politics to me. The facts show 81 fatalities on the 186-mile stretch from Grand Rapids to Petoskey on 131 as compared with 53 fatalities on 31 from Muskegon to Petoskey. This situation cannot be tolerated any longer. US 131 should definitely be speeded up."

State Rep. Thomas G. Ford Sr. of Grand Rapids, Congressman Ford's brother, has been pressuring the State Highway Department for more than five years to expedite construction of a new 131.


Congressman Ford said the group will propose to Turner that 131 either be taken into the Interstate Highway System or that U.S. highway funds be earmarked specifically for the project because 131 is "a killer highway."

The US 131 freeway now ends at M 57 south of Cedar Springs. Bids are scheduled to be taken this summer and next fall for the stretch from M 57 to M 46 north of Howard City. The State Highway Department says that 19-mile stretch should be opened to traffic in 1973.

The section from Howard City to Reed City now is scheduled for contracting in 1975. Congressman Ford is hopeful that with Federal intervention the Howard City-to-Reed City section can be advanced for contracting to at least 1973.
What is most striking and significant about the marked slowdown in the cost of living rise during the first quarter of 1971 is that it comes at a time when the economy has registered the sharpest quarterly growth in our history.

What this means is that we are now apparently enjoying the best of both worlds—a bringing of inflation under control at the same time that the economy moves briskly forward. This stands in sharp contrast to 1970, when the economy was at a virtual standstill while inflation still came on strong. That was a time when we temporarily suffered the worst of both worlds—a condition brought about by our refusal to deal firmly with inflation during the 1965-68 period.

A review of both the inflation and growth sides of the economic ledger gives us real cause for encouragement.

The cost of living during the first quarter of 1971 rose only 2.7 per cent on an annual basis, the smallest quarterly rise in four years.

At the same time the gross national product grew by 28.5 billion, the highest absolute increase in history. Retail sales are up. Automobile sales are setting records. Housing starts are at an annual rate of 1.9 million. Unemployment is levelling off and can be expected to move downward as the economy continues to expand and available jobs increase.

The cost of money is coming down. Interest rates have fallen sharply for the first time in 10 years. Roughly 60 days ago, U.S. Treasury bills sold at rates that marked an eight-year low.

We have genuine reasons for optimism. Overall, the economy is looking healthy.
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MR. SPEAKER:

President Nixon has moved vigorously to help American farmers expand their sales and income, and his actions are most welcome. The farmer needs and deserves our assistance.

I applaud the $1 million increase in fiscal 1972 funding for the Foreign Agricultural Service, which helps our farmers expand their sales abroad.

I applaud the increased Agriculture Department purchases of pork for food distribution and school lunch programs this fiscal year.

I applaud the increase in farm operating loans in fiscal 1972 and the increase in insured ownership loans in the current fiscal year.

I applaud the increase in funds to fight crop and livestock disease and the increase in funding for agricultural research and for soil and water conservation.

I join with the President in saluting American agriculture as we approach May 7, America's Agriculture Day. The American farmer merits the plaudits and the gratitude of our people for the tremendous job he is doing.
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The tactics being engaged in by the radical demonstrators now operating
in Washington are foreign to America, and I feel sure the American people roundly
condemn them.

The attempts the radicals are making to shut down the Nation's capital
stand in sharp contrast with the peaceful peace march of April 24, when upwards
of 175,000 persons made their point without infringing on the rights of others.

To try to block traffic and keep others from getting to their jobs is an
action which cannot be tolerated. Such tactics are counter-productive.

I congratulate the authorities for handling the situation as skillfully as
they have. Law-abiding citizens owe them a debt of gratitude.
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West German Chancellor Willi Brandt's policy of Ostpolitik (East Politics) will not benefit NATO or the Free World, House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford declared today.

Ford said he is "disappointed" that Brandt has chosen to lead West Germany on the path of Ostpolitik. Ford said he has not discussed with President Nixon the Socialist West German premier's efforts to negotiate with the Communists. But he said he personally is convinced that Brandt is "giving away something he did not have to give away and is getting nothing in return."

Ford made his remarks in an interview with the legislative committee of the Steuben Society of America, a group which has just concluded a four-day visit to Washington, D.C. Ford will be the principal speaker at the Steuben Society's 52nd Founder's Day Banquet May 22 at the Hotel Americana in New York City.

"It appears," Ford told the Steuben Society committee, "that the West German chancellor is preempting the prerogatives of the Western powers in seeking to negotiate a final East-West settlement and a German peace treaty."

On another subject, Ford expressed the view that inequities were created by the Immigration Act of 1965. This Act, Ford said, should be reviewed by the Congress.

###
MEMO TO CORRESPONDENTS:

CONGRESSIONAL FORD AND SENATOR SCOTT HAVE ARRANGED FOR CASPAR W. WEINBERGER, DEPUTY DIRECTOR OF THE BUDGET, TO CONDUCT A SPECIAL BRIEFING FOR HOUSE AND SENATE NEWSMEN ON THE SUBJECT OF FROZEN FUNDS. THE SESSION IS SCHEDULED MONDAY, MAY 17 AT 10:00 a.m., IN S-207.

PAUL MILTICH
PRESS SECRETARY TO REP. GERALD R. FORD
One hundred and sixty-two Republican members of the House have signed a statement congratulating the Nixon Administration on keeping the Federal Government functioning during the May Day Tribe disturbances.

Another group of 48 Republican congressmen declared their support for the President's "determination not to permit policy to be made in the streets" and asserted that the protest against his Vietnam policy "is not at all representative of the sentiments felt in our respective districts."

In a "Thank you, Mr. President" statement, the larger group extended to Mr. Nixon their "gratitude and congratulations for the successful efforts in keeping the United States Government open and functioning in the face of attempts to shut the government down.

This group also expressed their "thanks to Attorney General John Mitchell and Police Chief Jerry Wilson for their excellent planning and cooperation in preserving orderly procedures in a very trying situation."

The group went on to say: "We think that all America watched as our patience was tested once again on the streets of our Nation's capital, and we are confident that all your Administration's efforts deserve a hearty 'well done.' Every American must be concerned at attempts to disrupt the important, necessary and vital processes of the United States Government. We are proud to say that the maintenance of order with the minimum use of force serves as a tribute to the constitutional sanctity of those processes."

The group of 48, in their letter to the President, said that contrary to the impression created by the demonstrators "criticism of your (Mr. Nixon's) Vietnam policy is more muted (back home) than at any time since your inauguration."
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The group of 48, in their letter to the President, said that contrary to the impression created by the demonstrators "criticism of your (Mr. Nixon's) Vietnam policy is more muted (back home) than at any time since your inauguration."
CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
Monday, May 17, 1971

Congress must act immediately to end the strike which has paralyzed the Nation's railroads. If the strike is permitted to continue, it will wreck the economy of the country.

No matter how quickly the strike is ended, the fact remains that it never should have been allowed to occur. This Nation cannot afford a rail strike, and the sooner the Congress legislates to provide some other means of settling railroad labor-management disputes the better.

It is an indictment of the Democratic-controlled Congress that nothing is being done to deal with the almost annual strikes against the railroads except on an emergency order-'em-back-to-work basis.

The President has faced up to his responsibility. On Feb. 27, 1970, he outlined legislation which would serve as the basis for hearings on the subject. The least the Democratic-controlled Congress should do is to hold hearings in the hope of coming up with a solution.

The solution may not be exactly in line with the President's proposals, but a solution must be found.

Further delay serves no purpose whatsoever. There is no excuse for it. If the Democratic leadership in the Congress continues to refuse to act, then they certainly owe the American people an explanation. The present situation is nothing short of tragic.

I continue to believe that calling quits to the United States program for two experimental prototype SSTs is a mistake. In the long run, it will prove contrary to the best interests of this country.

But the mistake was not made today by the Senate. The mistake was made last March when both the House and the Senate, by slim majorities, voted to cancel the project without tangible results as it neared completion.

Last week the House of Representatives, considering serious unemployment in the aviation industry, a decline in the dollar's international strength, and continuing SST development by the French, British and Soviets, tried to correct its March mistake.

The House acted on the basis of the best information available and, I believe responsibly. Certainly events have shown this was not any attempt to bail out the Boeing Company. It was an attempt to serve the long-range interests of the United States, to retain the world-wide competitive advantage which American-built commercial aircraft have enjoyed since the dawn of aviation, and to conserve the heavy investment the taxpayers already had made in this experimental program.

Subsequently, for reasons not yet fully clear, high officials of the companies concerned have made statements suggesting that they are no longer interested in carrying out the original terms. One must remember that the Congress abruptly repudiated these terms last March. Under such circumstances the Senate has acted understandably, if not wisely. It is unrealistic not to assume the House will concur.

At some date in the future we will have to face this issue again and the cost of resolving it will then be far greater, in my judgment. The United States may now lose its long-standing pre-eminence in commercial aviation forever because of Congress' mistake last March compounded by the shortsighted refusal of the contractors to make minimal sacrifices and take minor risks today.

The U.S.-Soviet agreement to simultaneously negotiate limitations on both offensive and defensive nuclear weapons is clearly one of the most significant breakthroughs for peace in the history of the modern world.

While intensive negotiations lie ahead and further agreements may elude us for an indefinite period, we must recognize this initial agreement as a step toward preserving world peace and a step toward relief for the American and Russian peoples from the crushing cost burden of the nuclear arms race.

The U.S.-Russian agreement holds a vast potential for benefit to mankind. It indicates a more enlightened attitude on the part of the Russians. It prompts me to look for the day when we can come to a substantive arms control agreement. I feel there is genuine cause for optimism.
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May 22, 1971

Dear News Editor:

My 1971 congressional questionnaire has been mailed to the 147,000 residences in the Fifth District.

Any help you can provide in calling attention to this survey would be appreciated. I am hoping that as many people as possible will fill out the questionnaire and return it to me.

This year I have done something different in formulating the questionnaire. Since some people feel that any questions I personally put together may be biased, I wrote to political science professors at every college in the Grand Rapids Area and asked each of them to submit 10 suggested questions. I drew upon responses from these professors in formulating my questionnaire.

I am sending you a copy of the questionnaire so that you might have information regarding the questions in the survey. If you care to publish the questionnaire, I would be most pleased.

The results of the questionnaire will be helpful to me in deciding how to vote on the many bills which will be coming up in the 92nd Congress.

Best regards,

Gerald R. Ford, M.C.

GRF:pe

Enclosures
Congressman Gerald R. Ford today announced he has sent out a 1971 questionnaire to the nearly 148,000 residences in the Fifth Congressional District to get a sampling of opinion on current issues.

Ford said the questions contained in the survey form are based on sample questionnaires prepared for him at his request by political science professors on the faculties of colleges in the Grand Rapids Area.

"Invariably some people feel that questions I prepare myself are drawn so as to invite a particular answer," Ford said. "For that reason I decided to base my questionnaire on sample questions submitted to me by political science instructors. This should set to rest any question of bias on my part."

Ford said he has used a format which permits husband and wife to answer the questions individually—as was done last year.

"I find that husband and wife do not always agree in their thinking on issues of the day," Ford said. "So I feel it is a good idea to offer them an opportunity to express varying views in answer to my questionnaire."

Ford said the majority responses to questions in the survey will help him decide how to vote on crucial questions in Congress in the months ahead.

"This 1971 questionnaire will provide me with valuable guidance," Ford said. "Of course, I have the ultimate responsibility for deciding how to vote on any particular question. But I would like the advice of the people of Kent and Ionia Counties on important questions facing the Congress."

Seven of the 11 questions in the poll require yes or no answers. The other four are multiple choice. There are two questions on Vietnam—a yes or no question on whether to keep a residual force in Vietnam until all prisoners of war are released, and a multiple choice question on withdrawal from Vietnam. # # #
Memo to Correspondents:

House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford and other Republican sponsors of President Nixon's general revenue sharing bill will hold a news conference Tuesday, June 1, at 10 a.m. in Room 135, Cannon House Office Building.

Among the 133 Republican cosponsors of the measure in the House participating in the news conference will be Minority Whip Leslie C. Arends (Ill.), Conference Chairman John B. Anderson (Ill.), Conference Vice Chairman Robert T. Stafford (Vt.), Conference Secretary Richard H. Poff (Va.), Research Committee Chairman Barber B. Conable (N.Y.) and Rep. Dan Kuykendall (Tenn.), chairman of the Congressional Task Force on Revenue Sharing.

Assistant Secretary of the Treasury Murray L. Weidenbaum will be present to provide reporters with facts and figures on the Administration proposal.

Hearings on General Revenue Sharing will begin June 2 before the House Committee on Ways and Means.

Paul Miltich
Press Secretary to
Rep. Gerald R. Ford