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Mr. Jack Anderson is to be condemned for dragging the name of the President of the United States before the Senate Judiciary Committee on the basis of evidence which is so unreliable that it would be barred from every court of law in the Nation.

Mr. Anderson has used the universally discredited technique of multiple hearsay to substantiate his charges, a gimmick which involves the presentation of evidence three or four times removed from the source.

It is virtually impossible to verify the accuracy or the veracity of this kind of evidence, and Mr. Anderson knows it. He has shown no reservations in using it to support his charges before the Senate Judiciary Committee.

He has denigrated countless numbers of dedicated public servants over the years by this illegitimate evidentiary technique, and now his list has been expanded to include the President of the United States. I am dismayed by the fact that this irresponsible individual has been permitted to make his charges on such a transparent basis, virtually unchallenged by members of the Judiciary Committee or his colleagues in the press. Were Mr. Anderson required to produce substantive evidence of probative value in the I.T.T. case, he surely would be unable to do so.

Without multiple hearsay evidence, Jack Anderson is a man without a case.

###
House Republican Leader Gerald R. Ford today introduced a proposed Constitutional Amendment providing for the holding of a nationwide Presidential primary election every four years.

Ford's Amendment is identical with one introduced in the Senate March 13 by Senate Majority Leader Mike Mansfield of Montana and Sen. George Aiken, R-Vt.

It calls for a national Presidential primary the first Tuesday after the first Monday in August in the year preceding the expiration of the regular term of the President and Vice President.

The person receiving the greatest number of votes cast by registered voters of his party affiliation—a plurality of at least 40 per cent—would become his party's official candidate for President.

If either of the parties failed to give its highest vote-getter at least 40 per cent, a runoff election would be held between the two top vote-getters of the party on the 28th day after the day on which the primary election was held.

Only persons eligible to vote in the primary election could vote in the runoff.

To get on the primary ballot in all the States, a major party candidate would be required to file petitions signed by qualified voters equal to one per cent of the vote cast in the last election for presidential candidates of his party in each of 17 States.

For candidates of minor parties—which did not have electors on the ballot in 17 states but polled at least 10 per cent of the vote cast nationwide—the requirement would be one per cent of the total vote cast throughout the nation in the last election.

Only persons registered by party affiliation could vote in the primary, and there could be no crossovers.

Ford commented: "After observing the antics of presidential hopefuls in the various State primaries this year, it seems to me we should put an end to this chaotic situation by having one same-day primary throughout the Nation. Unlike the present primaries, the national primary I propose would decide something. It would, with a runoff if necessary, give us our presidential candidates."

Ford emphasized that the major political parties would continue to nominate vice presidential candidates and adopt party platforms.
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MEMO TO: Mr. Ford
FROM: Paul
DATE: Saturday, July 22
      11:50 a.m.

After 12:30, please call following statement in to 333-0390,
Committee for Re-election of the President:

"Spiro Agnew will add strength to the Republican ticket in 1972,
as he did in 1968. The President was wise not to split up a
winning team. The Vice President has been forthright and courageous
and deserves wide-spread support."
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The Tower-Kemp compromise Republican Convention rule change regarding state representation at future conventions appears to properly distribute representation between the small states and the large.

I have long felt that the present bonus system discriminates against the large states, such as Michigan. The Tower-Kemp compromise eliminates this kind of discrimination. It seems to me it is fair to both large states and small.

While I cannot speak for the Michigan delegation, I believe the Tower-Kemp compromise because it is national in scope is worthy of the most careful consideration by the Convention Rules Subcommittee.

# # #

The Tower-Kemp compromise Republican Convention rule change regarding state representation at future conventions appears to properly distribute representation between the small states and the large.

I have long felt that the present bonus system discriminates against the large states, such as Michigan. The Tower-Kemp compromise eliminates this kind of discrimination. It seems to me it is fair to both large states and small.

While I cannot speak for the Michigan delegation, I believe the Tower-Kemp compromise because it is national in scope is worthy of the most careful consideration by the Convention Rules Subcommittee.

###

Republicans will build toward a majority in the U. S. House of Representatives, beginning with the gains we made on Nov. 7.

While the net pickup of seats by the GOP was not all I had hoped for, the fact remains that we have narrowed the gap.

My guess is that the House Republican leadership will be able to put together a winning combination for the President on most key votes in the House. We may well have a working majority while not a numerical one.

# # #

The resignations were a necessary first step by the White House in clearing the air on the Watergate Affair -- and this does not imply guilt on the part of any White House official who has resigned.

I am also pleased that the President is going to address the Nation on this matter and that he has named Elliot Richardson as attorney general with the responsibility of uncovering the whole truth about the Watergate case.

I have the greatest confidence in the President, and I am absolutely positive he had nothing to do with this mess.

I also have tremendous confidence in Elliot Richardson. He is a man of great integrity. The American people can rest assured that with Richardson directing the Watergate investigation and prosecution all of the facts will come to light and all of those involved will be exposed. Now we can expect that fact will be separated from fiction -- and this certainly needs doing.

The Watergate Affair may have an adverse impact on the Republican Party in the 1974 election, but if so it would be most tragic and undeserved. I would emphasize that no Republican member of Congress was in any way involved in the Watergate Affair.
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President Nixon demonstrated with his speech on the Watergate Affair that he fully deserves the trust and confidence of the American people.

It was fitting and proper that the President assume responsibility for the Watergate Affair -- and it was a most courageous act.

Now that the President has given Attorney General-designate Elliot Richardson the authority to appoint a special prosecutor, there remains no doubt that the entire truth about the Watergate Affair will be revealed.

I think it appropriate, therefore, that the American people now lay aside their concern with Watergate and turn their attention -- as the President is doing -- to matters of greater moment to the Nation.
HOUSE GOP SETS UP TASK FORCE ON ELECTION REFORM

WASHINGTON, D.C....Congressional Republicans today announced the establishment of a 15-Congressman Task Force on Election Reform. Rep Bill Frenzel (Minn.) will be chairman of the study group.

According to Frenzel, "Republican Members of Congress are dismayed by the Watergate revelations of illegal campaign practices. The Task Force will focus on seeking various ways to tighten and revise federal campaign laws to discourage abuse by ensuring swift and impartial enforcement procedures."

Other Members of the Task Force, in addition to Frenzel, are Reps.

Edward C. Blesser, Jr. (Pa.), Clarence J. Brown (Ohio), Chair W. Burgener (Calif.), M. Caldwell Butler (Va.), Philip M. Crane (Ill.), David W. Dennis (Ind.), Lou Frey (Fla.), Harold V. Froelich (Wisc.), James F. Hastings (N.Y.), John E. Hunt (N.J.), Edward Hutchinson (Mich.), William J. Keating (Ohio), Trent Lott (Miss.), and Matthew J. Rinaldo (N.J.).

The Task Force plans to examine federal laws pertaining to campaign contributions and expenditures, reporting procedures and enforcement. Their findings and recommendations will be reported back to the House Republican Conference.

Announcing the establishment of the Task Force was Rep. Barber B. Conable, Jr. (N.Y.) who is Chairman of the House Republican Research Committee. The Task Force will operate under the aegis of the Research Committee.

Other topics on the Task Force agenda include voter registration legislation, election fraud, electoral college reform, selection procedures for Vice-Presidential candidates, and presidential primaries.

I commend the President for his forthright statement, which is his honest recollection of any and all aspects of the Watergate Affair. This statement should clear the air as far as all allegations involving the President are concerned.

I accept the President's statement that he neither approved nor had knowledge of any unethical and illegal activities undertaken on his behalf in connection with the 1972 presidential campaign, or of the Watergate coverup.

With regard to the President's orders concerning national security leaks, the President acted properly in his attempts to plug such leaks. No government, including a democracy, can function effectively if highly sensitive information is disclosed. No President can effectively carry out his responsibilities for the conduct of our foreign affairs if the confidentiality of high level negotiations is not preserved.
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The President's appointment of Former Defense Secretary Melvin Laird as his chief domestic adviser is an excellent move and is most welcome news. The President could have made no better choice.

I am pleased that Gen. Haig has decided to resign his commission and to remain on the White House staff. Alexander Haig is a most capable individual.

There is no question but that both of these actions strengthen the White House staff and should lead to a big improvement in White House relations with Congress.
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Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford regarding Watergate and the Banking and Currency Committee

(Memo to Fifth District News Media: I understand that an attempt will be made by Bob Kleiner at a press conference Monday morning to tie me in with Watergate. The following statement is my comment on any charges that might be made in connection with the House Banking and Currency Committee vote last Oct. 3 against a committee investigation of the Watergate Affair.)

"On Oct. 3, 1972, the House Banking and Currency Committee voted 20 to 15 against conducting an investigation of the June break-in and bugging of Democratic National Headquarters.

"All 14 Republican members of the committee voted against the proposed investigation. So did six Democrats. Had these six Democrats voted with other Democratic members of the committee to proceed with the investigation, the vote would have been 21 to 14 to go ahead with the probe. It is therefore ridiculous for Fifth District Democrats—or for that matter, for Democrats anywhere—to charge that Republicans blocked an investigation of Watergate by the House Banking and Currency Committee.

"The motivation of the committee Democrats who voted against the investigation was the same as that of the Republicans. The investigation would have interfered with the proper prosecution of the suspects arrested in connection with the Watergate break-in and would have been interpreted as infringing on their constitutional right to a fair trial.

"The White House did not even discuss this matter with me in advance of the Oct. 3 meeting of the Banking and Currency Committee. The House Republican Leadership did meet with Republican members of the committee on Sept. 26 and 27 in the Office of the Republican Whip (Rep. Leslie Arends, R-Ill.) but these meetings took place at the request—I emphasize, at the request—of the committee Republicans and not on the initiative of the leadership or the White House. The Republican committee members wanted to discuss with the leadership the problem that confronted them—the fact that public committee hearings could jeopardize the rights of the Watergate defendants. I never received a request from the White House that the House Republican Leadership meet with Republican members of the House Banking and Currency Committee. For anyone to try to tie me in with Watergate because of the vote Oct. 3, 1972 in the Banking and Currency Committee against an investigation of Watergate is utterly ridiculous. Such charges are a complete fabrication without any basis in fact."

The time has come for Congressman Ford to account to the voters of the Fifth District as to his part in covering up the illegal burglary of the Watergate Democratic offices.

Under oath, and with an offer to take a lie-detector test, John Dean has accused Gerry Ford of stalling a Congressional investigation of Watergate at the request of the White House during last fall's presidential election.

Mr. Ford says Mr. Dean "is not correct" and says "to the best of my recollection, the White House never talked to me about this matter." Either John Dean or Mr. Ford is not telling the truth. They can't both be right.

GERRY FORD SHOULD, AND WE CHALLENGE HIM TO, VOLUNTARILY APPEAR BEFORE THE SENATE ERVIN COMMITTEE AND TESTIFY UNDER OATH AS TO THE FACTS SURROUNDING HIS ACTIVITIES IN STOPPING THE INVESTIGATION LAST FALL.

Mr. Ford's accounting to the voters should not stop there. He should tell us why he has not expressed one word of concern about the immoral and unconstitutional acts of Mr. Nixon and the White House gang. Just a few of them include:

1. The establishment of a National Surveillance
Agency to violate the constitutional rights of the United States citizens.

2. The White House "plumbers" unit that stole documents from Dr. Ellsberg's physician and other illegal acts.

3. Circulating false documents about the morals of Democratic Presidential candidates.

4. Compiling a list of political "enemies" and the use of the Internal Revenue Service and other Federal agencies to harrass and intimidate them.

5. White House spending of $2,000,000 in cash for various illegal schemes.

6. Having the acting director of the FBI destroy evidence.

7. Ordering the CIA to delay an FBI investigation.

8. The promise of executive clemency in an effort to buy perjury and obstruct justice.

Mr. Ford has continued in his role as Congressional errand boy and apologist for the corrupt Nixon administration. The voters deserve better than that.

If Mr. Ford understands his oath of office to "uphold and defend the Constitution of the United States" we could expect him to condemn these acts and take the lead in seeing that they are stopped. We hope he will give us the facts under oath and take some leadership in protecting us from these police state tactics.
It has come to my attention that some of my constituents mistakenly believe I have reversed my position regarding release of the Presidential tapes dealing with Watergate. I have not changed my position one iota. I believe the White House could have selected out those portions of the tapes relating to Watergate and that the President should have made those portions of the tapes available to the Ervin Committee and to Mr. Cox, the Special Prosecutor. I subsequently said I believed the Supreme Court on constitutional grounds would uphold the President's right to withhold the tapes. I simply meant to say that I think the President is on sound legal ground in withholding the tapes. I still believe he should have released them.
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I believe deeply in the American principle that a man should be presumed to be innocent unless proved to be guilty.

I favor a House investigation of the charges against Vice-President Agnew because fairness dictates that he should be permitted this opportunity to defend himself in open hearings.

The Vice-President is being tried in the news media due to the many leaks concerning the charges against him. It would seem impossible that he could get a fair hearing in the courts under the circumstances. I therefore think the House should grant his request for a full investigation of the charges against him.

This investigation should be carried out by a select committee especially appointed for that purpose. Such a committee could concentrate on the investigation. That would appear preferable to having the matter handled by the House Judiciary Committee, which has many other items of business to deal with in the course of its regular duties.

In my view, the House should act as soon as possible on the Vice-President's request and should act affirmatively, in line with the Calhoun case of 1826-27. The Calhoun case established a precedent which should guide us now.
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Comment by Rep. Gerald R. Ford on Agnew Resignation

My reaction when I heard the news was initially one of disbelief and then of great sadness. I can only conclude that he resigned from the Vice-Presidency for the reason stated in a letter from him delivered to me on the floor of the House Wednesday afternoon: "After an extremely difficult weighing of all the factors, my deep concern for the country required this decision." I would only add the comment that the vacancy in the office of Vice-President now should be filled with the greatest possible dispatch.
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I feel deeply honored. If the Congress sees fit to approve the nomination, I will serve the Nation in the post of Vice-President to the best of my ability and do my utmost to deserve the trust and faith of the American people. There is a compelling need right now to unite the people of this country. If there is anything I can do to further that end, I will strive mightily to do it.

#####
The compromise agreed to by the President and Sens. Ervin and Baker is an eminently sensible way of avoiding a constitutional crisis over the issue of the tapes. At the same time it serves the truth by making basic information available to the Ervin Committee and the court, and it does this without undermining the doctrine of executive privilege. I think Sen. Stennis is an excellent choice to listen to the tapes and authenticate the President's summary of the contents. Sen. Stennis is a man of the highest integrity. I believe this compromise will be acceptable to the American people. I hope Mr. Cox does not persist in refusing to accept it.
STATEMENT BY VICE PRESIDENT-DESIGNATE GERALD R. FORD
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Both appointees are men of the highest caliber.

I became acquainted with Leon Jaworski and came to know his abilities when he served as a member of the legal staff of the Warren Commission. I was most impressed with him then, and I heartily approve of him now in the role of special prosecutor.

Sen. Säbøe has had excellent experience as an attorney general in Ohio and an outstanding record as a United States Senator. I think he will make a top-flight Attorney General of the United States.
STATEMENT BY THE HONORABLE GERALD R. FORD
MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
BEFORE THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION
THURSDAY, NOV. 1, 1973

ADVANCE FOR RELEASE AT 10:00 A.M. E.S.T.

This is a new experience for me, I realize it is also a new experience for you, and for the American people. I feel that I am among friends however I ask you only to treat me as true friends treat one another, with directness, with candor, without favor and without guile, in full and mutual awareness of the solemn oath we have all taken to the Constitution and our responsibility to the people of this great Republic.

Before going further, I must add my gratitude to the two distinguished Senators who ably represent my home State in the United States Senate. Together, Phil Hart, Bob Griffin and I have spent a combined total of 57 years in Washington trying to outdo one another in doing things for Michigan — and none of us is ready to concede that contest yet. But I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge publicly, before trying to exchange a vote for a gavel, that Michigan and Grand Rapids have given me far more than I could ever give them.

Yet I am deeply conscious that today the Congress and the citizens we represent are embarking upon an historic voyage into uncharted waters. I come before you as the nominee of the President to fill a vacancy in the office of Vice President of the United States under the provisions of the 25th Amendment to the Constitution, for which 65 Senators and 368 Members of the House voted in 1965 and which the Legislatures of 48 States subsequently ratified.

I might note that the State where I was born, Nebraska, was the first to ratify the 25th Amendment.

As you might guess, I have recently reviewed the debate on the 25th Amendment and there is little doubt that most of our attention in framing it was centered on the question of Presidential succession, on filling a vacancy in the Presidency.

Section 2, which dealt with the problem of filling a vacancy in the Vice Presidency, was a subsidiary issue in our minds, despite the fact that on 16 previous occasions, for a total of 37 years in our Constitutional history, the nation has been without a Vice President.

Vice Presidents have died and they have resigned, but our circumstances today are unprecedented. Until now they have always been elected, at first separately but
most of the time together with the President, by an Electoral College chosen for that purpose by all the people. One Vice President, Richard Mentor Johnson, was elected by the Senate in 1837 under the 12th Amendment when the electoral vote was tied.

This is the first time in history that both the Senate and the House of Representatives have been required to advise and consent to the President's nomination of a Vice President.

These are not ordinary times nor, I suppose, will the times ever be ordinary when the 25th Amendment must be invoked. I want to assure you, the members of this committee and all my colleagues in the Congress, that I fully appreciate and share your determination to consider with the utmost diligence qualifications and fitness for the second office of the Republic. For the sake of the country we all love, for your sakes and certainly for mine, I would not want it otherwise.

I am a member of this Congress. I have a vote and a responsibility under the will Constitution the same as yours. Under the circumstances, I/vote "Present" when my nomination is before the House. I am used to this. Custom has compelled me to do it in the last 5 votes for Speaker, when I lost to the Honorable John McCormack and the Honorable Carl Albert.

You know, life plays some funny tricks on people. Here I have been trying with might and main for 25 years to become Speaker of the House. Suddenly, I'm a candidate for President of the Senate, where I could hardly ever vote and where I'll never get a chance to speak.

When I was asked by the President for my recommendations for Vice President I really did suggest Hugh Scott and Mel Laird and one other whose name I won't tell -- but the President didn't pay any attention to my advice.

I know you are going to have a lot of questions for me, but there are two big ones perhaps I can answer at the start.

First, what makes you, Jerry Ford, qualified to be Vice President of the United States? Second, what kind of a Vice President would you hope to be?

Let me take the second question first. How do I regard the office of the Vice Presidency -- in the climate and context of right now, and in terms of the future. History isn't much help here, except recent history, through which we have all lived.

There are only three living Americans who have held this high office, and three weeks ago at the White House one of them told me he wanted me to take the job.
The first two telephone calls I got after that announcement were from the two other former Vice Presidents. And for their generous good wishes I will always be grateful.

Events at home and abroad have moved so swiftly since that night that I have not had much time for scholarly homework on the duties of the Vice Presidency, or even to collect my own feelings at the sudden change in my own style of life.

My thoughts have been mixed -- pride in the confidence which President Nixon has shown for me and deep satisfaction that apparently it is shared by hundreds of other old friends and colleagues, in the Congress, and throughout the country. I have felt a touch of sadness at the thought of leaving the House of Representatives which has been my home for nearly half my life.

I have also felt something like awe and astonishment at the magnitude of the new responsibilities I have been asked to assume. At the same time I have a new and invigorating sense of determination and purpose to do my best to meet them.

Since I first ran for Congress in 1948 -- the same year one of the greatest Vice Presidents ever to succeed to the Presidency was renewing his lease on the White House by whacking the Republican 80th Congress with hammer and tongs -- I have believed that public office is a public trust. I believe that any man or woman who wins the votes of a majority of his fellow citizens has a solemn obligation to serve them faithfully and well, and to do them as much honor as they have done him.

Now I'm contemplating the first public office to which I would not be elected by the people, but by my peers in the Congress as the people's agents. As the first candidate to be so chosen, I recognize and welcome the fact that this committee, as it should, will inquire fully into my worthiness to have the trust of the Nation.

In this century, 32 men have been chosen by the two major parties as candidates for Vice President, and 19 of them have served in the House or the Senate or both. Of the 15 who won, 9 have served in the Congress and I believe there is no better training school for this job than service in the Congress. I am proud to be a Member of Congress, and if I were to express my new ambition in a nutshell, that ambition of mine is to earn the respect as well by all the American people as I hope I have with my good friends in the 5th District of Michigan.

Like that of most men and women who serve in Congress, my public life has been an open book -- carefully reread every two years by my constituents. Likewise, the door to my office in Washington has been open, not only to my constituents but to any
citizens who have wanted to discuss with me their views and their problems relating to legislation and the Federal government -- or even just to satisfy their curiosity as to what a Congressman looks like. These contacts with people have represented a large part of my job, and since 1965 when I became Minority Leader of the House by the "landslide margin" of 73 to 67 such contacts have become more and more national in character. I not only think an open door is a duty, but I have learned a lot from the people who have passed through it, both from those who agree with me and from those who don't.

Perhaps the worst misgivings I have about the Vice Presidency are that such contacts with all kinds of people would be more difficult -- and that my friends might stop calling me Jerry.

Not only has my public life been an open book but in the last three weeks my private life has been opened as well. Once I told the President I'd accept -- I guess I told him as much -- I made a firm decision, I decided to make available to this Committee and to the House Committee on the Judiciary, without reservation except reliance on their good judgment, every record relating to my public service, my personal finances, my health and the health of my wife and children, and to respond as fully and accurately as possible to every reasonable inquiry.

I asked all public officials, Federal, State and local, and all persons or agencies that have custody of normally private records regarding me to make them fully and speedily available, including all of my campaign finances, office and personal bank accounts -- even our children's savings accounts -- my income tax records and confidential financial disclosure reports required by House rules, all correspondence of my Congressional Office and the records of my certified public accountant in Grand Rapids, including a statement of my Net Worth. It has been a monumental job, just locating and digging out the records I have, all in a very short time. I have answered every request unreservedly, and I want to give such answers because of the great importance of the present inquiry.

I believe you and the Congress and the American people must become fully satisfied that I am worthy of your trust and that I am fit to perform the duties of the Vice Presidency.

I am not a saint, and I'm sure I have done things I might have done better or differently or not at all. I have also left undone things that I should have done.
But I believe and hope that I have been honest with myself and with others, that I have been faithful to my friends and fair to my opponents, and that I have tried my best to make this great government work for the good of all Americans.

President Eisenhower had a very simple rule — I have never heard of a better one for people in public office who have to make decisions: get all the facts and all the good counsel you can, and then do what's best for America.

My old law professor at Yale, Eugene V. Rostow, who had a distinguished tour of duty at the State Department during the Johnson Administration, took the time to write me a warm and inspiring letter upon my nomination. I would like to share some of his words with you, because the master still says things much better than his pupil:

"Constitutionally and politically, the first and most important requirement for the post, I should say, is that the Vice-President be capable of discharging the duties of the Presidency, should fate call him to that office. I am opposed to any other criterion in the selection of Vice-Presidents, above all in these times of difficulty and danger at home and abroad. The nation has never needed strong Presidents more urgently, as the Middle East crisis of the last few months demonstrates. A critical factor of that most dangerous confrontation was the President's resolute public and private diplomacy, notably his threat to use force if need be. The basic question to ask about a prospective Vice-President is whether he has the character and insight to do what Theodore Roosevelt and Harry Truman did when they were called to the Presidency.

"While in office, the Vice-President should serve as a vital part of the President's administration. He should have no independent responsibility for policy, save as the President's adviser and agent. That is the idea behind the Twelfth Amendment, in my opinion. The Vice-President's duties and functions as the President's roving halfback cannot and need not be defined with precision. They will depend upon circumstance — on the nature of the pressing business before the country, and on the temperaments and special talents of the two men. Some Presidents have used their Vice-Presidents wisely and well; others, as we all know, have ignored them.

"In your case, it is apparent that President Nixon could well enlist your experience, and your influence in Congress, to help rebuild the relationship of confidence and cooperation between President and Congress which should characterize our constitutional order at its finest moments."

The Constitutional duties of a Vice President are few, and his statutory duties while numerous do not really define his role. It is trite and cynical to sum it all up by saying the Vice President does whatever the President wants him to, and no more. I have a different idea, I hope a broader one. It is based on the uniqueness of my situation and, above all, on the greatest single need of our country today.

I realize, of course, that almost exactly a year ago President Nixon and Vice President Agnew were elected by majorities of the people in 49 of the 50 States. Not
only that, but the President was running on his record of four years. He was re-elected by a massive majority who approved of his program and his policies as they had been tried and tested over that period. I fought hard for those programs in the Congress as Republican Leader in the House. I defended them vigorously all over the country and on the campaign trail, and for that I have no apologies. If being for his President and for his party and for its candidates disqualified anyone from becoming Vice President, then we'll never have another Truman, Nixon, Johnson or Humphrey.

But while I feel a strong obligation to recognize the Presidential mandate of 1972, I am also very much mindful of the Congressional mandate on the same election day. The very same Americans who gave the Republican President a margin of 17,838,725 votes also gave the Senate a Democratic majority of 56 to 42, with one Independent and one Conservative, and the House a Democratic majority of 243 to 192.

The Founding Fathers in 1787 never intended -- and the American people in 1972 never intended -- to paralyze and cripple the government in Washington. But responsible citizens and leaders in both parties are beginning to worry about our national government becoming seriously weakened by partisan division.

I have served in one Republican Congress and a dozen Democratic Congresses. I have served during three Democratic and two Republican Presidencies. In the course of 25 years I've stood with the Congress when it was right and with the President when he was right, in my judgment, regardless of which party controlled the executive branch or the legislative branch of government.

I know from firsthand experience that almost without exception the people in their wisdom send to Congress men and women who are reasonable, who prefer action to inaction, who are capable of compromise, who love their country and who are concerned for the future of the oldest representative republic on earth.

I know these men and women can work together because I have worked together with them the best years of my life.

So I come back to the first question: What makes you, Jerry Ford, qualified to be Vice President of the United States?

My answer is that I believe I can be a ready conciliator and calm communicator between the White House and Capitol Hill, between the re-election mandate of the Republican President and the equally emphatic mandate of the Democratic 93rd Congress. I believe I can do this -- not because I know much about the Vice Presidency -- but
because I know both the Congress of the United States and the President of the United States as well and as intimately as anybody who has known both for a quarter century.

I count most of the members of the Senate and of the House as my friends. They have been wonderfully kind and helpful during these hectic days in volunteering support and encouragement to me. The President of the United States has been my friend from the time he was a second-termer from California in the House and took time to make a freshman from Michigan feel welcome. He has always been truthful to me, as have my good friends in the Congress. I have never misled them even when they might have wanted to hear something gentler than the truth. And if I change jobs that is the way I intend to continue.

Truth is the glue that holds government together, and not only government, but civilization itself.

So gentlemen, I readily promise to answer your questions truthfully. I know you will not pull any punches -- the American people will never forgive any of us if you do. Through my testimony it is my intention to replace misunderstanding with understanding and to substitute truth for untruths.

We have all taken the same oath before God and under the Constitution, and we are today charged with the duty of trying and testing a new Amendment to that Constitution for the first time. Many of us had a voice and a vote in bringing about the 25th Amendment. From that debate I would like to quote two distinguished Senators -- anonymously, since I hope you will not throw too many of my own words from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD back at me.

One, a Republican, noted that "The security of our nation demands that the office of the Vice President should never be left vacant for long." Another, a Democrat, observed that "At a time of national crisis, the public would not tolerate the playing of politics in the choice of a Vice President."

I agree with both these distinguished Senators, and I also agree with the only American who has ever served consecutively as Speaker of the House and as President of the Senate, John Nance Garner.

"Men who have known how to compromise intelligently have rendered great service to their country," said "Cactus Jack", probably sitting right in the Capitol Office which I now occupy as Minority Leader. "The most constructive laws on our statute books have been put there by intelligent compromise -- that does not mean that men
have to abandon fundamentals or basic principles."

So my platform, gentlemen, is always to support truth and intelligent compromise. And I pledge to you and to the American people that if confirmed, then, as President Eisenhower did, I will do what I believe is best for America. I will do it as President Lincoln did, "with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right."

Thank you for your courteous attention.
Comment by Vice President-Designate Gerald R. Ford on White House meeting of Nov. 9

It was a full and frank discussion with the President, indicating his total cooperation with the court.

Under the circumstances, no details can be given out without the authority of the court.

#####
The House Republican Policy Committee strongly opposes the passage of H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act. Although the bill attempts to simplify procedures for registration and to facilitate participation in the political process, it will wreak havoc with election administration procedures, cause chaos in the political process and reduce overall voter turnout.

H.R. 8053, the "Postcard Registration Bill", would establish a Voter Registration Administration in the General Accounting Office, which would initiate a voter registration program through the Postal Service. Between 120 and 60 days prior to the close of registration, the Postal Service would deliver registration forms to every household in the United States; the forms would be available also in post offices and other public places. Citizens could register to vote in federal elections by filling out and mailing these cards to local registration officials.

The Voter Registration Act would, thus, mandate mail registration to the detriment of more effective methods of registration. State election officials have testified that it would not benefit the poor, minorities and other groups, a large portion of whom are unregistered at present, and that the Act might well reduce overall voter registration.

(OVER)
The bill would create an administrative nightmare. Many of the postcards would be illegible and incomplete. By creating dual registration systems, many voters, understandably confused, would fail to register. Duplicate and fraudulent registrations would mushroom. Consequently, most state and local election officials, fearing that the bill will cause breakdowns in the election administration process, oppose its passage, and have said they will not adopt this system for state and local elections.

H.R. 8053 would establish yet another federal bureaucracy with almost unlimited authority to spend up to $100 million annually of the taxpayers' money; the power to rig and manipulate the electoral process is apparent. Since the passage of the Voting Rights bill of 1965 the States have done a good job of improving voter registration systems. H.R. 8053 would reverse the progress and dilute the power of the States. It is but another attempt by the Federal Government to derogate the authority of the States.

The House Republican Policy Committee urges defeat of H.R. 8053, the Voter Registration Act.