

**The original documents are located in Box D28, folder “Manufacturing Chemists Association, New York, NY, November 25, 1969” of the Ford Congressional Papers: Press Secretary and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.**

### **Copyright Notice**

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

File

**MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION**

**SEMIANNUAL MEETING**

**Presentation by**

**The Honorable Gerald Ford  
Minority Leader  
U. S. House of Representatives**

**New York, New York**

**November 25, 1969**

**PRO-TYPISTS, INC.  
PROFESSIONAL TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE  
AREA CODE 202 347-5395**



1  
2  
3  
4 **MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION**  
5 **SEMIANNUAL MEETING**  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 **Presentation by**  
12 **The Honorable Gerald Ford**  
13 **Minority Leader**  
14 **U. S. House of Representatives**  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 **New York, New York**

24 **November 25, 1969**  
25

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS ASSOCIATION  
SEMIANNUAL MEETING

Presentation by  
The Honorable Gerald Ford  
Minority Leader  
U. S. House of Representatives

New York, New York  
November 25, 1969





P R O C E E D I N G S

MR. FORD: Thank you very much, Glenn; General Decker, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It's a great privilege, and I consider it a high honor to have the opportunity of participating in the final meeting of your Semi-annual Manufacturing Chemists Association Conclave here in New York City. Those of us who make speeches occasionally, I think, are deeply grateful for those like Glenn who gild the lily just a bit in the introduction. Inadvertently, I'm sure, they make a mistake now and then in the course of their remarks. I pass no judgments on Glenn's observations and comments. Oftentimes I've found that the introduction is far more memorable than the speech that follows.

But I have had a few instances where, in the course of an introduction, there is an inadvertent error; and I don't relate this story just because of my Alma Mater's success last Saturday against Ohio State--

(Applause.)

--but I was down at a large political gathering in the state of Ohio a year or so ago, and in the course of the introduction by one of my colleagues from Ohio State University, he -- I'm sure, inadvertently -- indicated that I was a graduate of Ohio State University. Well, in such an adverse audience, in the enemy's territory, I had to be, you know, a little cautious how I would defend my Alma Mater's reputation.

~~And~~ I didn't quite have the ~~key~~, and I didn't know how  
to respond without making it difficult for myself, ~~and~~ <sup>however</sup> as I came  
to the podium I thought of the incident of the man who had the  
burden and the responsibility of introducing to a tremendous  
political audience the Governor of the Virgin Islands. ~~and~~ <sup>In</sup>  
the course of ~~this~~ <sup>the</sup> introduction -- and this was a vast gathering,  
fifteen, twenty thousand -- the ~~man~~ <sup>Testmaster</sup> got up and talked for a long  
time about the accomplishments, the achievements, and of course  
the virtue of the Governor of the Virgin Islands. He concluded  
with the final ringing sentence: "Ladies and gentlemen, it's  
my privilege and honor to introduce to you, the Virgin of the  
Governor's Island."

Glenn introduced me as the Minority Leader of the House.  
I can't tell, because of the lights, whether there are any ladies  
in the audience, but any time such an introduction comes along,  
I'm a little uncomfortable in a mixed audience, because ~~I think~~  
all ladies know who the minority leader of a house is -- a  
husband. On the other hand, I think all husbands know who the  
speaker of the house is.

Let me say that I'm delighted to be here, ~~and~~ I must  
relate to you the letter that I got from Jim Morton, when he  
asked me to be your guest tonight. In the letter asking me to  
join with you this evening, he listed about six very renowned,  
outstanding public officials who had previously been your guests  
of honor. And he ended with this sentence; he said: "Senator

1 Mansfield was our guest of honor a year ago, and we would like  
2 you to join us this year; and up to now we've had outstanding  
3 speakers."

4 (Laughter.)

5 Despite that warm invitation--

6 (Laughter.)

7 -- I'm delighted to join you tonight, and I have a  
8 special reason for being here. Your retiring principal officer,  
9 I guess -- I'm not quite sure of the title -- is an old and dear  
10 friend of mine. And I speak now about General George Decker.  
11 I was privileged to be <sup>moved</sup> ~~precipitated~~ from the Committee on Public  
12 Works to the Committee on Appropriations in January of 1953.  
13 And, having spent four years in the Navy, I was designated the  
14 Chairman of the Army Subcommittee on Appropriations. I guess  
15 this is the way the Congress works.

16 But anyhow, all of a sudden I had the responsibility  
17 of sitting opposite <sup>the</sup> ~~a~~ table, in long and extensive hearings, with  
18 General Decker, who was then the Comptroller for the United  
19 States Army. I subsequently knew him in various capacities in  
20 the Army, culminating, of course, in his responsibility as Chief  
21 of Staff of the United States Army. And I can say without hesi-  
22 tation or qualification -- and I had quite a bit of experience  
23 listening to witnesses, talking with the top officials, both  
24 civilian and military -- that no person was trusted more by our  
25 Committee, Democrat or Republican, in trying to get the straight



1 answers in dollars, programs, or policy, than we got from  
2 General George Decker.

3 (Applause.)

4 His reputation for honesty and integrity before the  
5 Committee was unmatched. I might add, parenthetically, that *fine*  
6 reputation did not ~~follow~~ *follow* him to the golf course. He was much  
7 too good and had much too high a handicap for *our our best*  
8 ~~interest.~~ *interest.* ~~compete.~~ George, although you're leaving this organization, I  
9 understand, and Bill Driver is taking over, you will be most  
10 welcome by George Mallon, *by the committee & for* by all of us who many, many hours  
11 listened to *your testimony* you and got your words of wisdom, and ~~you~~ *you* will be most  
12 welcome before us or before the Congress at any time. [ We wish  
13 you well as you retire and improve that handicap a little.  
14 It doesn't need much (laughing). ]

15 Let me say that I'm delighted to be here to follow  
16 Senator Mansfield, who I understand was your guest here about  
17 a year ago. I had the benefit of listening -- not listening to,  
18 but reading Mike Mansfield's speech to this organization a year  
19 ago. The title was, "Towards a Discerning Internationalism."  
20 It was an erudite, thoughtful, and I believe totally constructive  
21 discussion of what our nation should do in the area of foreign  
22 policy. Even though we represent different political parties,  
23 I consider Mike Mansfield a close personal friend; and one of  
24 the things we learn in the political arena in Washington is  
25 that you can disagree without being disagreeable.

1 In Mike's observations and comments shortly after the  
2 election of 1968, he talked about the decision of the American  
3 people in November, a year ago. He related the fact that the  
4 American people had selected a Republican President but had re-  
5 tained control of the Legislative Branch in the Democratic  
6 Party, where in the Senate the margin is 57 to 43, and in the  
7 House approximately <sup>244</sup>~~300~~ to 188 or 189, depending on vacancies.

8 Naturally, those of us on my side of the aisle were  
9 pleased with the election for Chief Executive but a little dis-  
10 appointed with the results as far as the Congress was concerned.  
11 We had been a little more kindly treated by the American people  
12 in the elections in 1966, where in the races for the House of  
13 Representatives we had made a very substantial gain after the  
14 debacle of 1964 and had picked up a net gain of 47, with actually  
15 59 new Republicans elected to the House. Some members had been  
16 defeated; a few had retired, so we had 59 out of about 187 brand  
17 new members. And those of us in the leadership on our side of  
18 the aisle thought it would be a real good idea to have all these  
19 new members and their wives and our leadership and our wives  
20 at a conference center just outside of Washington, D. C., for  
21 a three-day seminar ~~of~~ where we could talk about issues, where  
22 we could talk about parliamentary problems, where we could get  
23 acquainted.

24 And so we met at a place called Airlie House for three  
25 days -- a long, hard schedule. At the opening luncheon I was

*Arise To speak*

asked to say a few words, ~~and~~ I ~~got up~~ and I looked out, and here were 59 attractive, articulate, brand new bodies who would substantially add to the number of votes we had on the floor of the House. And I must have said in the course of my comments and observations that I was happily clucking over this new brood of Republicans.

Well, the meeting at lunch broke up, and we went on to our business sessions. We had a social hour that night, got up the next morning bright and early to go on to the business of the day; ~~and~~ I walked into the dining room and somebody handed me a copy of the New York Times. Front page story, lead article, first sentence -- and I quote precisely -- it said: "Congressman Jerry Ford, House Republican leader, was happily clucking over his new brood."

(Laughter.)

Well, I thought it was amusing that a great newspaper like the New York Times would make a simple typographical error that would somewhat significantly change what I thought I had said the previous luncheon. But I passed it off; I kidded the New York Times correspondent who was there, ~~and~~ <sup>he</sup> had a hard time defending ~~it~~ <sup>the mistake</sup>. I went on to the business of the day. My wife was down with us, as I indicated earlier; she came down to a late breakfast. And she walked into the dining room, and some friend of mine--

(Laughter.)



1 --immediately handed her a copy of the New York Times.

2 I have yet to satisfactorily explain who that "new broad" is.

3 But needless to say that the election of 1968 did  
4 provide the American people for at least the next two years a  
5 divided government, with the Executive Branch of the government  
6 in the hands of one political party, and the Legislative Branch  
7 of the government in the hands of another political party. This  
8 is a most unusual circumstance in the history of American poli-  
9 tics. ~~I think~~ <sup>similar</sup> You have to go back over a hundred years to find  
10 ~~these~~ circumstances. Oh, yes, we've had other instances where  
11 a new President entered with a Congress of his own party, and  
12 then in the next election his party lost and control of the  
13 Congress passed from his to another party.

14 But seldom in the history of American politics have we  
15 had a new President elected, and the control of a coordinate,  
16 co-equal branch of the government left in the hands of an oppo-  
17 sition party. This was the will of the American people last  
18 November. I pass no judgment on whether it was right or wrong;  
19 it's a fact of life.

20 And so, since January of this year, Washington has not  
21 really been a monolithic political setup. It's been a divided  
22 political setup. And the net result has been that ~~I think~~ the  
23 press and the public have been confused. But the ordinary  
24 American, as I travel around the country -- and I've traveled  
25 almost 200,000 miles this year -- the ordinary citizen in America



1 looks at the political situation in Washington as though it was  
2 a monolithic political situation. I don't know whether that's  
3 good or bad at the moment.

4 But as of today ~~I think~~ the President, a Republican,  
5 and the Congress, Democratic, is treated as one and the same.  
6 There may be some benefits to the country from this, I don't  
7 know; there may be some ~~drawbacks~~ <sup>benefits</sup>. But the facts are that the  
8 ordinary citizen looks upon Washington as one conglomerate, if  
9 that's the right term. And I think that we in the Congress and  
10 those of us who support the Administration ought to be cognizant  
11 <sup>of</sup> ~~as~~ how we as Americans -- not as politicians, Democrats or  
12 Republicans -- can move to make sure that we do the right job  
13 for the country as a whole, regardless of political affiliations  
14 or backgrounds.

15 And whereas Mike Mansfield a year ago talked to you  
16 about the subject, "Towards a Discerning Internationalism," let  
17 me, if I might tonight, discuss with you the problem of legis-  
18 lating for a better America. And because of the unique situation  
19 that the American people determined a year ago, of a divided  
20 government; and because the process of legislation is not just  
21 what the Congress does, but what the President recommends, I  
22 speak tonight about a program that is the co-equal responsibility  
23 of the Executive as well as the Legislative Branch.

24 Now, the President when he took over in January had a  
25 very specific decision to make -- a hard choice. And this

1 choice has now filtered down to what the Congress will do. But  
 2 the basic decision had to be made by the Chief Executive, and it  
 3 was precisely this: The President could have <sup>accepted</sup> ~~taken~~ that legis-  
 4 lation which was on the statute books, put on by previous con-  
 5 gresses, for the purpose of meeting <sup>previous</sup> ~~the~~ demands of our society,  
 6 solving the problems of our society -- a program that from a  
 7 legislative point of view had not satisfied the American people,  
 8 <sup>based</sup> ~~predicated~~ on the election, <sup>7/1968 and then</sup> ~~but~~ just sought to solve the prob-  
 9 lems by the expenditure of more federal funds, using the legis-  
 10 lative tools that were there and available.

11 That was one choice. The alternative was to recognize  
 12 that we had problems in America that had to be solved domestically  
 13 as well as internationally, and at the same time, perhaps seek  
 14 a new approach or new directions for the future -- maybe costing  
 15 as much money, but at least new paths for us to follow in a  
 16 legislative way.

17 The President, by a very conscious decision, decided  
 18 that we should abandon the programs of the past, that we shouldn't  
 19 just seek to solve the problems by spending more money in old  
 20 programs, <sup>President Nixon</sup> ~~he~~ determined that it was better to approach the prob-  
 21 lems that existed with some ideas of reform, bona fide, legiti-  
 22 mate, broad reform. And during the course from January 20 to  
 23 now, the President has submitted to the Congress approximately  
 24 forty messages, ~~and~~ <sup>In</sup> most instances they have been followed by  
 25 specific legislative recommendations.

1           So far the Congress has not responded as well as I  
 2 think they should, but I ~~think~~ it's premature to pass judgment  
 3 on whether the Congress has done as well as it ought under the  
 4 circumstances. I ~~happen to~~ agree ~~that~~ <sup>with</sup> with the President  
 5 in his message of October 11, when he outlined what had been  
 6 submitted by the President, <sup>& what should be the common factor</sup> and the record of the Congress. I  
 7 think it's well under this divided government situation to get  
 8 the words of the President, who is trying to work as a partner  
 9 with the Congress in this situation; and let me quote -- these  
 10 are the words of the President's message urging us in the Legis-  
 11 lative Branch to move -- and I quote:

12           "If a working partnership between men of differing  
 13 philosophies and different parties is to continue, then  
 14 candor on both sides is required. There may be merit in  
 15 both charges, neither the Democratic Congress nor the  
 16 Republican Administration is without fault for the delay  
 17 of vital legislation; but in my view the American people  
 18 are not interested in political posturing between the Exec-  
 19 utive Branch and Capitol Hill. We are co-equal branches  
 20 of government, elected not to maneuver for partisan advan-  
 21 tage, but to work together to find hopeful answers to  
 22 problems that confound the people all of us serve. Both  
 23 the President and the Congress have been commissioned by  
 24 the same American people for a limited time to achieve  
 25 objectives upon which the great majority can agree. For



1 our part, we are willing to travel more than half way, to  
2 work with Congress to accomplish what needs to be done.  
3 The time for staking out political claims will come soon  
4 enough.

5 "Let us resolve, therefore, to make the legislative  
6 ~~is~~ issue of the 1970 campaign the question of who deserves  
7 ~~the~~ greater credit for the 91st Congress record of accom-  
8 plishment, not which of us should be held accountable be-  
9 cause it did nothing. The country is not interested in what  
10 we say, but in what we do. Let us roll up our sleeves and  
11 go to work. Before us are urgent legislative priorities."

12 And with that introduction, let me take some of the  
13 major legislative priorities that I think are on the desk of the  
14 Congress at the present time. I might add that in reviewing  
15 Mike Mansfield's speech of a year ago, I noted that Mike indicated  
16 that we had gone through a rather traumatic experience in the  
17 election night, because of the distinct possibility, that night,  
18 because of a third-party candidate, that the Congress of the  
19 United States, not the American people, would have had to choose  
20 the next President of the United States.

21 Mike Mansfield certainly indicated that the Congress  
22 ought to respond with an affirmative constitutional provision  
23 that would change the method by which we select the President  
24 of the United States. For about 180 years we have chosen a  
25 President by an electoral college method, and although we have

1 in the main made good decisions, on two occasions in America's  
2 history, the politicians, not the people, selected the President  
3 of the United States. And Mike Mansfield a year ago seemed to  
4 indicate a sigh of relief that we avoided that possibility in  
5 1968. And by inference he was urging the Congress to move ahead  
6 to find a new way in which we could choose a President of the  
7 United States.

8 I'm glad to report to you that the House of Representa-  
9 tives has now approved by the necessary two-thirds margin a  
10 constitutional provision by which we will choose the next Presi-  
11 dent of the United States by the direct election method. I hope  
12 and trust the United States Senate will do the same. And if you  
13 have any influence with your Senators, I urge you to contact  
14 them to follow the lead of the House of Representatives.

15 There are other alternatives, I must confess -- the  
16 district plan, the proportionate distribution of electoral ~~col-~~  
17 *voting plan* ~~lege votes~~. But, by any standard in the years ahead, as I see it,  
18 ~~and as better than two-thirds of the members of the House thought,~~  
19 we should choose our Presidents in the future by the direct  
20 election method. This would avoid the possibility of the kind  
21 of constitutional crisis we might have faced in '68, a kind of  
22 constitutional crisis America cannot afford in 1972, 1976, or  
23 years thereafter.

24 So I trust that if you can or are so disposed you will  
25 urge the Senate to act affirmatively in order to avoid these

1 kinds of crises in the future. This is reform, I think, long  
2 overdue, and greatly needed.

3 But there are other reform proposals before the Congress  
4 recommended by the President -- <sup>innovative</sup> ~~in this case~~, <sup>such as</sup> welfare reform.

5 Never in the history of -- or recent history, I should say, has  
6 there been such an environment where the most extreme on the  
7 political left -- such as Walter Reuther -- or the most extreme  
8 on the political right, all agree that we ought to junk the

9 present welfare system. Everybody admits it's too costly; it's  
10 <sup>effort</sup> ~~duplication~~, one after another. We ought to get rid of it, and

11 the President has submitted to the Congress a program to substi-  
12 tute "work-fare" for welfare. This, I think, would be a tremen-  
13 dous step forward, not necessarily relieving the fiscal or fi-  
14 nancial burden from the point of view of the federal government,  
15 but the principal ingredient, which is reform, is that it would  
16 help to get individuals and families off of the welfare cycle  
17 through the incentive process. In other words, if an individual  
18 is willing to work, he or she will not lose their total wages.  
19 They will lose a proportionate <sup>amount</sup> ~~share~~, but the incentive exists  
20 for them to work and help and to gradually move themselves out  
21 of the welfare cycle into the work cycle.

22 I think it's fair to say that no man stands taller  
23 than when he gets a hand-up rather than a handout. ~~and~~ I hope  
24 and trust that the Congress will respond affirmatively to this  
25 new approach -- this reform recommendation aimed at abandoning



1 the welfare program that has failed and shooting for a new  
2 work-fare program that will revitalize our total approach to  
3 those who are less fortunate than we.

4 Crime. Well, you're familiar with the statistics as  
5 well as myself. In the last eight years we've had the crime  
6 rate go up ten times faster than our population. You in your  
7 community<sup>ies</sup> like myself in my community, are cognizant of those  
8 horrible crimes that unfortunately happen much too frequently.  
9 The federal government is not the only governmental agency that  
10 can do something about this. You have to rely on local govern-  
11 ment and state government; but the federal government in certain  
12 areas has a specific and, I think, greater responsibility. And  
13 the Congress ought to give to the Department of Justice <sup>as President Nixon has proposed</sup> new tools  
14 to meet the challenge of <sup>Crime,</sup> ~~these areas that the criminal element~~  
15 ~~must be forced to have new charges against them, new tools.~~

16 Let me say that there are three areas, particularly,  
17 <sup>where</sup> ~~that~~ Congress must respond: One, in organized crime. I don't  
18 know all of you personally, but when I make the observation that  
19 we need new tools to meet the challenges of organized crime in  
20 a rural community, the audience doesn't understand what I'm  
21 talking about. But if I talk to an audience in a major metro-  
22 politan city, they surely understand it.

23 Organized crime, as you know, does have a stranglehold  
24 on too many individuals, governmental units, <sup>political</sup> organizations in  
25 many of our large cities. They're the most sophisticated



1 criminals that exist in America today. And if <sup>we are</sup> you're to meet  
 2 the challenge of organized crime, the Department of Justice  
 3 needs some <sup>of the best,</sup> toughest, strongest tools that it can get, legisla-  
 4 tively speaking -- and Congress better respond. We cannot  
 5 tolerate organized crime as we know it in <sup>our society.</sup> ~~Detroit and other~~  
 6 ~~areas of our country.~~

7 The Attorney General and his people need the toughest  
 8 tools that Congress can give them -- and we'd better do it.

9 Let me turn also to the area of narcotics. Again, the  
 10 President has submitted a very broad program, and let me illus-  
 11 trate the program by describing to you a meeting that was held  
 12 in the Cabinet room about two or three weeks ago. I used to see  
 13 John Conner there occasionally when I got invited down by  
 14 President Johnson. John can <sup>understand</sup> ~~understand~~ the meeting. <sup>President Johnson</sup> ~~We~~ had  
 15 the Democratic, Republican leadership, <sup>he</sup> ~~they~~ had three witnesses  
 16 -- not really witnesses in the typical sense, but <sup>he</sup> ~~they~~ had three  
 17 <sup>special guests</sup> to present the need and necessity for action by the Congress.

18 One, the head of the narcotics division; he told of the absolute  
 19 essentiality of legislation to make penalties tougher <sup>or</sup> ~~mandatory~~ mandatory  
 20 for the pushers and the peddlers of narcotics.

21 The second person to describe the need and necessity  
 22 for legislation, the Secretary of HEW, Bob Finch. He wasn't  
 23 pushing for tougher penalties; <sup>advocating or</sup> ~~he was pushing~~ <sup>advocating or</sup> ~~urging~~ <sup>urging</sup> that  
 24 Congress give to the proper authorities greater flexibility in  
 25 the penalties, greater flexibility <sup>in punishment</sup> for the first offenders, so

1 that they wouldn't be treated as the hardened criminals, --  
 2 ~~very dramatic presentation with many illustrations.~~

3 But the third person to speak to all of us was a man  
 4 who had just lost his daughter. He spoke to us and said that  
 5 his daughter, who was not a hippie, his family, that was not  
 6 a way-out family, had suffered a grievous loss. And he urged  
 7 us -- those of us in the Congress of both political faiths --  
 8 to respond to the kind of legislation that the President had  
 9 recommended, because he was embarking on a crusade to convince  
 10 the American people that we had to meet this challenge of the  
 11 drug traffic.

12 It was the most dramatic incident I've ever experienced,  
 13 either in the Congress or in the White House, or elsewhere.  
 14 I can't imagine the Congress not responding to the kind of  
 15 <sup>stiff</sup> criminal penalties for the pushers <sup>necessity</sup> and the kind of flexibility  
 16 for the first offenders. So far we haven't, <sup>Congress has not responded</sup> but this is on our  
 17 doorstep, and <sup>the public should demand action</sup> it must be accomplished.

18 The third area was that of the distribution of porno-  
 19 graphic material, obscene literature -- through the mails pri-  
 20 marily. I don't know your experience, but my wife and I have  
 21 four small -- well, not small -- we have four children from  
 22 nineteen to twelve. How we get <sup>on</sup> in the mailing lists of some  
 23 of these <sup>organization</sup> people who distribute the kind of literature that they  
 24 do is beyond my comprehension; ~~but if they send it to us, I'm~~  
 25 ~~sure they send it to many like ourselves.~~ <sup>It is the</sup> Most disgusting kind  
 1

of photographs and literature that I <sup>have ever seen</sup> ever saw.

Isn't it unbelievable that our Post Office Department is called upon to distribute to your families and to mine this kind of literature -- and we're paying for it. Well, the Post Office Department <sup>should</sup> ought to get the kind of legislation that's needed, so they can move in, seize the plants, stop the production, prohibit the distribution -- it's tough. I don't know how the present Supreme Court will handle it; but maybe we'll have a different one in the future that will do something about it.

(Applause.)

But this kind of <sup>legislation</sup> action is needed and necessary if we are to protect the young. And this, I think, is fully justified under any criteria that I'm familiar with.

And then, let me talk, if I might, about tax reform. I'm treading a bit on difficult waters here, I <sup>suspect</sup> guess. I'm sure many of you here feel that the investment tax credit is absolutely needed and necessary. I'm sure many of you here feel that the extension of the surtax ought to be forgotten about. I'm sure many of you disagree with the so-called tax reform provisions in the House version, and may disagree with those provisions in the Senate version. But let me just point this out, and I concede that there may be some honest areas of difference of opinion, but the average citizen of this country -- for good reasons -- feels that there are inequities in our federal tax structure.



1           This overall situation is brought to his attention by  
2 the ever-increasing local taxes that he pays, by the ever-in-  
3 creasing state tax burden that he pays, and the fact that our  
4 federal burden has not decreased. And then he reads about certain  
5 taxpayers, small in number, but symbolic, who pay no taxes at  
6 the federal level -- and there are some.

7           The ordinary taxpayer, earning \$8000 a year, who pays  
8 roughly, maybe \$1000 a year in taxes combined, doesn't understand  
9 why some limited number of taxpayers at the federal level should  
10 pay no taxes. And whether we like it or not, there's a ground-  
11 swell of tax reform among the American people. And the Congress  
12 is responding.

13           I think it's proven one thing for sure: That what is  
14 a loophole in the mind of one person is a totally justified  
15 equity in another, and I'm not sure that the 368-page tax bill  
16 that the House passed is going to really eradicate all of the  
17 loopholes. I'm not sure that tax bill, which was a monumental  
18 proposal, is going to end all the inequities. I'm sure it won't.  
19 But I am certain of one thing -- that the ordinary taxpayer is  
20 insisting on some form of tax reform, and that's why the Con-  
21 gress has responded. I just hope and trust that we do come up  
22 with a reasonably fair and reasonably equitable proposal. I  
23 can't be certain, but I hope in the process we don't destroy  
24 fiscal responsibility in the process.

25           There is a great temptation to not only have tax reform,

1 but to also incorporate in it tax reduction, that under current  
2 circumstances cannot be justified. Maybe a year from now, when  
3 we're over the fiscal crisis that I trust we will overcome,  
4 there can be bona fide, legitimate tax reduction at the federal  
5 level, <sup>however</sup> ~~but~~ right now I ~~think~~ it would be most unwise and hazardous  
6 to incorporate in a tax reform proposal tax reductions beyond  
7 the capacity of us to handle *in a responsible fiscal manner*.

8 Now, speaking of tax matters, I must tell one story,  
9 and I do it with some hesitation, except that I'm a great admirer  
10 of the American voter, who's a terribly independent guy.  
11 But who on occasion gets a little frustrated, understandably.  
12 One of my next-door neighbors, in Alexandria, Virginia, ~~where~~  
13 ~~we live~~, is a high-ranking official in the Bureau of Internal  
14 Revenue. Last summer he said to me, "Jerry, have you ever noticed  
15 in the upper right-hand corner of your Internal Revenue  
16 tax return there's a blank area, and under that blank area in  
17 large, black type there's the admonition which reads as follows:  
18 'Please do not write here.'"

19 ~~Well~~, I confess I had never seen or noticed the blank  
20 area; I hadn't been cognizant of the admonition not to trans-  
21 gress. Then he went on, and he smiled and said, "Jerry, ~~have~~  
22 ~~you ever~~ ~~he said~~, "You'd be amazed how many thousands of  
23 taxpayers, after they've signed their name alleging that all the  
24 facts and all the figures are the truth and nothing but the  
25 truth on their return, and after they've signed that check

1 paying whatever they allegedly owe Uncle Sam, then in a typical,  
2 frustrated, independent attitude of an ordinary American, in  
3 their own handwriting, write across that blank area, 'I'll write  
4 any damn place I please.'"

5 (Laughter.)

6 Well, I can understand that. But let me now turn, if  
7 I might, to another area of reform which I think is of great  
8 importance. And it relates to the previous subject. In the last  
9 ten years, Uncle Sam, the federal government, has spent on local  
10 programs, or state programs, an increasing percentage of the  
11 federal government's funds. About ten years ago, we had roughly  
12 a hundred programs of what we called categorical grants, and  
13 the annual expenditure for those programs was in the range of  
14 a half a billion dollars per year. The last fiscal year those  
15 programs had expanded to roughly five hundred; and the annual  
16 expenditure had gone from a half a billion dollars to nineteen  
17 billion dollars.

18 And if you look at ~~the~~ projections, as John knows, these  
19 projections for those same programs ten years from now would  
20 be close to sixty billion dollars a year. Now, that's what the  
21 experts in the federal government were projecting for your  
22 federal government in what we call "categorical grants," where  
23 the decision as to what you should do with your federal tax  
24 money should be made by the people in Washington.

25 Now, there's an alternative method of helping the



1 local community and the state government -- what we call revenue  
 2 sharing. This is the only reasonable alternative. You are not  
 3 going to cut those <sup>existing</sup> programs off, and you're not going to hold  
 4 ~~them down~~ <sup>unless you have an alternative answer</sup>. The public will demand and insist that federal funds  
 5 flow back to state and local government; they need the money,  
 6 they have problems to solve.

7 So your real choice is whether you do it by the cate-  
 8 gorical grant program, where some bureaucrat in Washington  
 9 makes the decision, or whether you send back to the state and  
 10 local community a fixed percentage of the federal funds so that  
 11 your locally-elected officials can make the decision on the  
 12 ladder of priority. It's just that simple. And as anyone  
 13 knows who studies the federal budgetary situation, even if we  
 14 don't increase the rates of federal taxes, Uncle Sam takes in  
 15 approximately six to eight billion dollars more a year just be-  
 16 cause we're an expanding and growing economy. And it's this  
 17 dividend that would be utilized for these purposes.

18 Now, the choice is simple. You either continue these  
 19 bureaucratic, managed programs from Washington, or you turn over  
 20 <sup>the choice of action</sup> to responsible local officials that you pick to make the choice.  
 21 The ~~problems~~ are different in Grand Rapids, Michigan, and Miami,  
 22 Florida, or San Francisco or Cincinnati. And I would much  
 23 prefer the final decision-making being done by the local people  
 24 rather than the bureaucrats in Washington.

25 And this is the choice I think we must take, the road



1 we must travel. And I think we can and we will. And I consider  
 2 this one of the highest matters of legislative priority by this  
 3 Congress -- maybe not this year, but certainly within the next  
 4 session beginning in January.

5 Let me turn, now, if I might, to a comment or two about  
 6 foreign policy. This morning I was privileged to be at the White  
 7 House for a breakfast with the President and others, where he  
 8 discussed the announcement that he made this after-- no, I guess  
 9 this morning -- about chemical and biological warfare. I didn't  
 10 plan that breakfast or this announcement with the meeting that  
 11 I'm attending tonight; but it certainly is of interest, I'm sure,  
 12 to all of you, whether you're involved in various governmental  
 13 programs or not. ~~I think~~ the decision of the President to re-  
 14 commend to the Senate that the Senate approve the treaty that  
 15 has been hanging in limbo since ~~March 1925~~ ~~I think this~~ is  
 16 a step forward in improving the image of the United States.

17 It will not be harmful under the terms, as I understand  
 18 it, of our course of action. Under our chemical warfare pro-  
 19 gram, the President said, "We reaffirm our oft-repeated renun-  
 20 ciation of the first use of lethal chemical weapons, and we  
 21 extend this renunciation to the first use of incapacitating  
 22 chemicals." ~~and~~ <sup>Senate</sup> The President has recommended that the Congress  
 23 approve the Geneva Protocols of 1925.

24 In the area of biological warfare, the President has  
 25 said, "We will stop the production of biological or germ warfare

1 from an offensive point of view. But it is in our interest to  
2 continue research and development for immunization against those  
3 germ warfare developments of an enemy so that we are prepared  
4 in case of a first attack by an enemy.

5 I think this overall decision of the President is a  
6 step in the right direction. It will not be harmful to our  
7 overall national security.

8 One comment about Vietnam, and then I shall conclude.  
9 Senator Mansfield in his comments to you a year ago was speaking  
10 hopefully of progress in the year ahead. I think all of us  
11 recognize such progress has taken place. A year ago we had  
12 approximately 540,000 U. S. military personnel in Vietnam; as  
13 of yesterday we had about 483,000, a de-escalation of our man-  
14 power commitment -- 20 percent, roughly; about 12 percent cut-  
15 back in our combat responsibilities. I believe that we're on  
16 the road to the achievement of peace in Vietnam without sur-  
17 rendering our leadership in the free world, without sacrificing  
18 those who have given so much.

19 I can't forecast in certainty what's going to happen  
20 in the months ahead. I'm optimistic. The vietnamization pro-  
21 gram will work if we're patient, if we give support to the  
22 South Vietnamese government. I'm convinced it's broadening its  
23 base; it's more politically stable. I think we should pursue  
24 what we can to meet the challenge in Paris, although obviously  
25 little or no success has accrued to date. But we can achieve

1 peace in Vietnam without capitulation, without surrender.

2 And let me say this as I conclude. The other day I  
3 was reading the book by, ~~I think it's~~ William S. Schirer, The  
4 Rise and Fall of the Third Reich. I think there's a lesson to  
5 be learned. That book tells a story of Chamberlain announcing  
6 to the British House of Commons that he had been called by Hitler  
7 to come to Europe to agree on a peace treaty for peace in their  
8 time, over the dismemberment of Czechoslovakia. And when he  
9 made this announcement in the House of Commons, there were cheers,  
10 there were many accolades.

11 He went, as you all know; they made the deal. Czecho-  
12 slovakia was dismembered. Chamberlain came back; he announced  
13 the treaty that had been decided upon between Hitler on the one  
14 hand and Chamberlain on the other. According to the author,  
15 pandemonium broke loose in the House of Commons. Everybody was  
16 overjoyed. Cheers, accolades, praise -- Chamberlain was the  
17 hero of the hour. One lone voice rose in the House of Commons.  
18 Winston Churchill. He tried to speak; he was drowned out; he  
19 was condemned. His was the speech of strength, warning Britain  
20 and the Allies that this was a false peace that would only lead  
21 to a greater war.

22 Churchill was the strong man. He should have been  
23 listened to. Chamberlain was the weakling, who regrettably was  
24 followed. History ought to tell us something. We need in this  
25 hour of crisis, as we have needed in other periods of tension



1 and problem -- a strong leader. A person who tells it as it is.  
2 A person who says there will be perils and problems, but if we  
3 persist with strength and stand up for America, we will prevail.

4 We don't need a Chamberlain. We need a Churchill.  
5 America will be the better if we stand tall and strong in this  
6 hour of crisis.

7 Thank you very much.

8 (Applause.)  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25





*Distribution: 20 copies that ~~that~~*

*M Office Copy*

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.  
BEFORE THE MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS' ASSOCIATION  
TUESDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 25, 1969  
AT NEW YORK, NEW YORK

FOR RELEASE AT 6:30 P.M. TUESDAY, Nov. 25

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please -- you can never have both."

Tonight I am going to present to you some truths -- truths which I hope will stir you up a bit.

Let me begin by saying that in Washington we have mapped new attacks on problems that have plagued the American people for years.

As a consequence, we are now standing as a Nation and a people on the threshold of an age of reform.

If the winds of change blow as vigorously as I hope, our Nation will travel in new directions as we enter the decade of the Seventies.

Reform. To reform something -- by dictionary definition -- is to change it into a new and improved form or condition; to improve by change of form and by removal of faults or abuses.

That, my friends, is exactly what the Nixon Administration has set out to do. Reform is the watchword of the Nixon Administration. But the story of the new Administration as a Reform Administration is one which is not being told.

Very early this year, shortly after Richard Nixon assumed the office of President, I began describing him in my speeches as a reformer and crusader.

What I envisioned was that the Nixon Administration would of necessity become seized with a reforming spirit and crusading zeal.

I foresaw the advent of an age of reform in America because of President Nixon's legacy -- the situation "as it was" when he took office.

Richard Nixon assumed the leadership of a country massively entangled in a jungle war halfway around the world, a country which had suffered escalating inflation for nearly four years, a country in which the crime rate had climbed nearly 10 times as fast as the population, a country in which the problems of the cities threatened to turn urban crisis into violent revolution, a country in which major cities were being put to the torch, a country in which the Have-Nots continued to be the Have-Nots and the welfare system was like a constantly festering sore,

(more)





a country in which local, state and Federal taxes had driven taxpayers to the rim of revolt although government spending had not solved the horrendous problems rushing in from all sides.

The new Administration took stock and charted a new course. This new course, as yet unimplemented by the Congress, is a comprehensive strategy for an attack on the most critical problems facing this country.

The major goals of this comprehensive strategy strike directly at the roots of the underlying crises in our Nation.

The strategy is aimed at five objectives: Ending the war; Making the streets safe again for the American people; Curbing inflation; Reforming and ultimately ending the draft; and Giving the government back to the people.

If the Nixon Administration succeeds in achieving these objectives -- and draft reform has been largely achieved -- I believe historians will rank Richard Nixon among the greatest of our Presidents. And if this Congress responds with action, its mark on history will be one of the finest.

The reforms that President Nixon has proposed are manifold. He has sent more than 40 messages to the Congress. Those messages are related to the objectives I have just outlined and to others as well.

The top priority is, of course, to end the war in Vietnam.

President Nixon is moving vigorously to end the American role in Vietnam and, hopefully, to end the war. He is winding down the war and is doing everything he reasonably can to achieve a breakthrough at the peace table.

With the peace negotiations stuck on dead center because of enemy intransigence, "Vietnamization" has become the key to disengaging the United States from the Vietnam War. Gradually but surely we are turning the war over to the South Vietnamese, where it belongs.

We certainly cannot stay in South Vietnam forever. If the Saigon government is to stand, it must ultimately learn to stand alone.

For the first time since the United States became involved in the Vietnam War, we are taking troops out of Vietnam instead of adding to our numbers there. This is a major reversal of policy aimed at an honorable end to the Vietnam conflict.

I think a majority of the American people want a sound settlement of the Vietnam War. I want a settlement that will discourage further Communist aggression, whether it is in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, the Pacific, or in Europe.

To invite a Communist takeover of South Vietnam through a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. troops might reopen the Korean War in 1970 and create additional

(more)

problems for us and our allies in Europe.

The President's recent declaration of alternatives in Vietnam has been interpreted by some observers as a hard-line statement. They could not be more mistaken. To negotiate does not mean to capitulate. You do not become a horse trader by giving away the horse.

Despite the stubbornness of the Communists in Vietnam, I am fully convinced President Nixon will succeed in inaugurating an era of negotiation in place of an era of confrontation.

We have now entered upon strategic arms limitation talks with the Russians, and President Nixon has laid the foundation of a new foreign policy. That new foreign policy is innovative, flexible and adaptable. Basically, it is attuned to the nationalistic and regional interests of Free World and Communist countries.

President Nixon no longer sees the Communist world as a monolithic enemy alliance but as a group of nations whose common ideology is transcended by powerful nationalistic aspirations. In line with that view, the President is adapting United States policy to those nationalistic interests.

This new concept of U.S. foreign policy also is reflected in the new Nixon Doctrine for Asia -- the "do-it-yourself policy" which Mr. Nixon has laid down for the nations of Southeast Asia. This is a policy which declares to Americans and to all the world that there will be no more Vietnams.

Under President Nixon, we have seized the initiative in foreign affairs even in the face of Communist aggression. We have proclaimed and promoted doctrines of international law and justice which have given the United States a new and lofty standing in the court of world opinion.

Domestically, the President has succeeded in getting people to lower their voices...and their arms, too.

In quest of domestic tranquillity, the Nixon Administration has launched a strong crackdown against organized crime. The President also has sent Congress legislation which would deal heavier blows against organized crime and would improve the Nation's court system.

There has been special emphasis on law enforcement in each of the Administration's anticrime measures. The President wants criminals off the streets, and he knows there is no surer way to get them off the streets than to help build up law enforcement in this country.

The Nixon Administration has made the fight against crime one of its central concerns. While other departmental budgets have been cut in a hold-down

(more)

on Federal spending, the Justice Department budget has been increased. The level of law enforcement activity and narcotics control has been stepped up.

The Nixon Administration recognizes, as do all of you, that the first civil right of every American -- black or white -- is the right to protection from crime and violence.

I wish our Negro leaders throughout America would recognize that. I wish they would accept the responsibility for informing their people that it is primarily the poor blacks who are the victims of violent crime in our country. I wish all of our Negro leaders would emulate Sterling Tucker, vice-chairman of the Washington, D.C., City Council, who recently spoke out in support of vigorous law enforcement and condemned those who tacitly condone violations of the law.

It is said there can be no progress without order. I subscribe to that.

I would add that there cannot long be order without progress. I believe the Nixon Administration is promoting the kind of order and the kind of progress which will operate together to move this country forward.

We need a responsible common-sense approach to our urban problems. We are getting it from President Nixon.

The primary Nixon answer to the urban crisis is jobs and job training. The accent is on the solid American ethic of working for a living. The President's approach is based on the idea that a man never stands so tall as when he stands on his own two feet.

This is why President Nixon has proposed the first major reform of this country's welfare system since it first was established. This is why the President urges Workfare instead of Welfare. This is the way of dignity and decency. This is the American way. A hand up instead of a handout. That's the only way to bridge the gap between the Haves and Have-Nots in America.

I think President Nixon has managed to bring order to this country. He has managed to do so because he has brought order to the Presidency. We now find that the days of government by crisis have given way to crisis prevention. The scatter-gun approach is yielding to an assembling of new priorities.

Welfare reform is just one of the great array of reforms proposed by President Nixon -- reforms which I believe the American people have long wanted. Draft reform which will make the selective service system as fair as possible until we can establish a truly all-volunteer Army; postal reform which will create a government-owned self-supporting postal corporation in place of the present impossible system; poverty program reform which keeps the Office of Economic

(more)

Opportunity as an innovative agency but spins off successful experimental programs to old-line Government departments; manpower training reform which consolidates Federal manpower training programs; tax reform which takes millions of poor citizens off the taxrolls, reduces taxes for millions of other low-income Americans, gives a long-deserved break to middle-income individuals, and prevents the most wealthy from escaping taxation altogether; a New Federalism which provides an increasing slice of Federal income tax revenue for the cities and states and gives them new vigor as solvers of the problems to which they are closest; a decentralization of government authority which places greater reliance on local officials and greater power in the hands of the people.

Decentralization of government authority -- flow of power back to the cities and states, back to the people. This is a central theme of the Nixon Administration.

Power concentrated in Washington is not always effective power. It is sometimes self-defeating. The Federal bureaucracy is most complex, and it feeds upon itself. As it grows larger, the Federal Government's ability to help solve local problems often grows less.

I would like to quote to you from remarks made last May 29 at the 75th annual convention of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association in Atlantic City, N.J.

"Thirty odd years ago the federal establishment was small, as some of you will remember, and income taxes were around 2 or 3 per cent. Most people didn't pay any at all. And then Franklin Roosevelt was elected, and then for the first time the control of our government fell into the hands of modern liberals and their view was that the power of the federal government should be used to treat and to cure this country's social ills. Well, they did treat a few and they improved a few, but they didn't cure any. They started Social Security, guarantees of bank deposits and a few other things that were useful and helpful, but they also brought to Washington what might be called the illusion of bureaucratic omnipotence, the illusion that if a government collects enough money, creates enough agencies and enough bureaus, and worms its way far enough into the private aspects of American life it will make us all prosperous, healthy and happy.

"Well, Max Weber, the sociologist, proved a long time ago that a big bureaucracy, once it is established, ceases to work at the job it was given to do and begins working only for itself, trying ahead of all else to increase its budget, its staff, its size and its power."

I imagine every man in this room thinks those words were spoken by a deep-dyed conservative. Not so. The author of those words is David Brinkley,

(more)



the radio and television commentator who on more than one occasion has described himself as a liberal -- and did so at the Pennsylvania Bankers convention.

Brinkley went on to say he had visited about 40 states in the last few months and had found Americans wanting a change, "a basic change." He added that "there is every sign of a deep distrust of the present size and style of the Washington establishment and of the kind of leadership we have had from it for about 20 years."

Richard Nixon is dedicated to producing the kind of change of which David Brinkley spoke.

That is why he is talking about reversing the flow of power from Washington to the states and cities. That is why he has reduced Federal employment by 48,000. That is why he is talking about sharing Federal income tax revenue with the cities and states. He wants to implement the basic change the people so desperately desire.

Not long ago President Nixon, in a nice way, asked the Congress to help him bring about the basic changes the American people are asking for. He conceded that some of the slowness in the legislative process could be attributed to the newness of his own administration.

Then he made the reform theme clear. He said: "The legislative program of this Administration differs fundamentally from previous administrations. We do not seek more and more of the same. We were not elected to pile new resources and manpower on top of old programs. We were elected to initiate an era of change."

In effect, the President said to the Congress: I am not going to argue about why so little has been done to date. But this is what I have proposed. Now what are you going to do about it?

That, I think, is a fair question. And it is a fair question not only to ask of the Congress but of the American people. What are we going to do about it?

Let us not look only to the National Administration for correction of our past mistakes. We all have a stake in our Nation. Let us all assume some of the responsibility for setting the affairs of our country in order.

There is too much of an attitude today that "all is fine so long as I get mine." We must rid ourselves of that approach. We must all become selfless if America is to survive as a Nation and a people. We must individually and collectively seek the greatest good for the greatest number.

The responsibility for guiding the future of America rests not only with the Congress, not only with governmental leaders, not only with the President. That

(more)

responsibility devolves upon us all. Each of our lives impinges upon the lives of others. To the extent that we all live the good life, the unselfish life, the lives of all others are enriched.

We all believe in the American Dream. Let us live so that all may share in it.

# # #

*Distribution: 20 copies Mr. Ford*

*Office Copy*

AN ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.  
BEFORE THE MANUFACTURING CHEMISTS' ASSOCIATION  
TUESDAY EVENING, NOVEMBER 25, 1969  
AT NEW YORK, NEW YORK

FOR RELEASE AT 6:30 P.M. TUESDAY, Nov. 25

Ralph Waldo Emerson once said: "God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose. Take which you please -- you can never have both."

Tonight I am going to present to you some truths -- truths which I hope will stir you up a bit.

Let me begin by saying that in Washington we have mapped new attacks on problems that have plagued the American people for years.

As a consequence, we are now standing as a Nation and a people on the threshold of an age of reform.

If the winds of change blow as vigorously as I hope, our Nation will travel in new directions as we enter the decade of the Seventies.

Reform. To reform something -- by dictionary definition -- is to change it into a new and improved form or condition; to improve by change of form and by removal of faults or abuses.

That, my friends, is exactly what the Nixon Administration has set out to do. Reform is the watchword of the Nixon Administration. But the story of the new Administration as a Reform Administration is one which is not being told.

Very early this year, shortly after Richard Nixon assumed the office of President, I began describing him in my speeches as a reformer and crusader.

What I envisioned was that the Nixon Administration would of necessity become seized with a reforming spirit and crusading zeal.

I foresaw the advent of an age of reform in America because of President Nixon's legacy -- the situation "as it was" when he took office.

Richard Nixon assumed the leadership of a country massively entangled in a jungle war halfway around the world, a country which had suffered escalating inflation for nearly four years, a country in which the crime rate had climbed nearly 10 times as fast as the population, a country in which the problems of the cities threatened to turn urban crisis into violent revolution, a country in which major cities were being put to the torch, a country in which the Have-Nots continued to be the Have-Nots and the welfare system was like a constantly festering sore,

(more)





a country in which local, state and Federal taxes had driven taxpayers to the rim of revolt although government spending had not solved the horrendous problems rushing in from all sides.

The new Administration took stock and charted a new course. This new course, as yet unimplemented by the Congress, is a comprehensive strategy for an attack on the most critical problems facing this country.

The major goals of this comprehensive strategy strike directly at the roots of the underlying crises in our Nation.

The strategy is aimed at five objectives: Ending the war; Making the streets safe again for the American people; Curbing inflation; Reforming and ultimately ending the draft; and Giving the government back to the people.

If the Nixon Administration succeeds in achieving these objectives -- and draft reform has been largely achieved -- I believe historians will rank Richard Nixon among the greatest of our Presidents. And if this Congress responds with action, its mark on history will be one of the finest.

The reforms that President Nixon has proposed are manifold. He has sent more than 40 messages to the Congress. Those messages are related to the objectives I have just outlined and to others as well.

The top priority is, of course, to end the war in Vietnam.

President Nixon is moving vigorously to end the American role in Vietnam and, hopefully, to end the war. He is winding down the war and is doing everything he reasonably can to achieve a breakthrough at the peace table.

With the peace negotiations stuck on dead center because of enemy intransigence, "Vietnamization" has become the key to disengaging the United States from the Vietnam War. Gradually but surely we are turning the war over to the South Vietnamese, where it belongs.

We certainly cannot stay in South Vietnam forever. If the Saigon government is to stand, it must ultimately learn to stand alone.

For the first time since the United States became involved in the Vietnam War, we are taking troops out of Vietnam instead of adding to our numbers there. This is a major reversal of policy aimed at an honorable end to the Vietnam conflict.

I think a majority of the American people want a sound settlement of the Vietnam War. I want a settlement that will discourage further Communist aggression, whether it is in Southeast Asia, the Middle East, the Pacific, or in Europe.

To invite a Communist takeover of South Vietnam through a precipitous withdrawal of U.S. troops might reopen the Korean War in 1970 and create additional

(more)

problems for us and our allies in Europe.

The President's recent declaration of alternatives in Vietnam has been interpreted by some observers as a hard-line statement. They could not be more mistaken. To negotiate does not mean to capitulate. You do not become a horse trader by giving away the horse.

Despite the stubbornness of the Communists in Vietnam, I am fully convinced President Nixon will succeed in inaugurating an era of negotiation in place of an era of confrontation.

We have now entered upon strategic arms limitation talks with the Russians, and President Nixon has laid the foundation of a new foreign policy. That new foreign policy is innovative, flexible and adaptable. Basically, it is attuned to the nationalistic and regional interests of Free World and Communist countries.

President Nixon no longer sees the Communist world as a monolithic enemy alliance but as a group of nations whose common ideology is transcended by powerful nationalistic aspirations. In line with that view, the President is adapting United States policy to those nationalistic interests.

This new concept of U.S. foreign policy also is reflected in the new Nixon Doctrine for Asia -- the "do-it-yourself policy" which Mr. Nixon has laid down for the nations of Southeast Asia. This is a policy which declares to Americans and to all the world that there will be no more Vietnams.

Under President Nixon, we have seized the initiative in foreign affairs even in the face of Communist aggression. We have proclaimed and promoted doctrines of international law and justice which have given the United States a new and lofty standing in the court of world opinion.

Domestically, the President has succeeded in getting people to lower their voices...and their arms, too.

In quest of domestic tranquillity, the Nixon Administration has launched a strong crackdown against organized crime. The President also has sent Congress legislation which would deal heavier blows against organized crime and would improve the Nation's court system.

There has been special emphasis on law enforcement in each of the Administration's anticrime measures. The President wants criminals off the streets, and he knows there is no surer way to get them off the streets than to help build up law enforcement in this country.

The Nixon Administration has made the fight against crime one of its central concerns. While other departmental budgets have been cut in a hold-down

(more)

on Federal spending, the Justice Department budget has been increased. The level of law enforcement activity and narcotics control has been stepped up.

The Nixon Administration recognizes, as do all of you, that the first civil right of every American -- black or white -- is the right to protection from crime and violence.

I wish our Negro leaders throughout America would recognize that. I wish they would accept the responsibility for informing their people that it is primarily the poor blacks who are the victims of violent crime in our country. I wish all of our Negro leaders would emulate Sterling Tucker, vice-chairman of the Washington, D.C., City Council, who recently spoke out in support of vigorous law enforcement and condemned those who tacitly condone violations of the law.

It is said there can be no progress without order. I subscribe to that.

I would add that there cannot long be order without progress. I believe the Nixon Administration is promoting the kind of order and the kind of progress which will operate together to move this country forward.

We need a responsible common-sense approach to our urban problems. We are getting it from President Nixon.

The primary Nixon answer to the urban crisis is jobs and job training. The accent is on the solid American ethic of working for a living. The President's approach is based on the idea that a man never stands so tall as when he stands on his own two feet.

This is why President Nixon has proposed the first major reform of this country's welfare system since it first was established. This is why the President urges Workfare instead of Welfare. This is the way of dignity and decency. This is the American way. A hand up instead of a handout. That's the only way to bridge the gap between the Haves and Have-Nots in America.

I think President Nixon has managed to bring order to this country. He has managed to do so because he has brought order to the Presidency. We now find that the days of government by crisis have given way to crisis prevention. The scatter-gun approach is yielding to an assembling of new priorities.

Welfare reform is just one of the great array of reforms proposed by President Nixon -- reforms which I believe the American people have long wanted. Draft reform which will make the selective service system as fair as possible until we can establish a truly all-volunteer Army; postal reform which will create a government-owned self-supporting postal corporation in place of the present impossible system; poverty program reform which keeps the Office of Economic

(more)



Opportunity as an innovative agency but spins off successful experimental programs to old-line Government departments; manpower training reform which consolidates Federal manpower training programs; tax reform which takes millions of poor citizens off the taxrolls, reduces taxes for millions of other low-income Americans, gives a long-deserved break to middle-income individuals, and prevents the most wealthy from escaping taxation altogether; a New Federalism which provides an increasing slice of Federal income tax revenue for the cities and states and gives them new vigor as solvers of the problems to which they are closest; a decentralization of government authority which places greater reliance on local officials and greater power in the hands of the people.

Decentralization of government authority -- flow of power back to the cities and states, back to the people. This is a central theme of the Nixon Administration.

Power concentrated in Washington is not always effective power. It is sometimes self-defeating. The Federal bureaucracy is most complex, and it feeds upon itself. As it grows larger, the Federal Government's ability to help solve local problems often grows less.

I would like to quote to you from remarks made last May 29 at the 75th annual convention of the Pennsylvania Bankers Association in Atlantic City, N.J.

"Thirty odd years ago the federal establishment was small, as some of you will remember, and income taxes were around 2 or 3 per cent. Most people didn't pay any at all. And then Franklin Roosevelt was elected, and then for the first time the control of our government fell into the hands of modern liberals and their view was that the power of the federal government should be used to treat and to cure this country's social ills. Well, they did treat a few and they improved a few, but they didn't cure any. They started Social Security, guarantees of bank deposits and a few other things that were useful and helpful, but they also brought to Washington what might be called the illusion of bureaucratic omnipotence, the illusion that if a government collects enough money, creates enough agencies and enough bureaus, and worms its way far enough into the private aspects of American life it will make us all prosperous, healthy and happy.

"Well, Max Weber, the sociologist, proved a long time ago that a big bureaucracy, once it is established, ceases to work at the job it was given to do and begins working only for itself, trying ahead of all else to increase its budget, its staff, its size and its power."

I imagine every man in this room thinks those words were spoken by a deep-dyed conservative. Not so. The author of those words is David Brinkley,

(more)

the radio and television commentator who on more than one occasion has described himself as a liberal -- and did so at the Pennsylvania Bankers convention.

Brinkley went on to say he had visited about 40 states in the last few months and had found Americans wanting a change, "a basic change." He added that "there is every sign of a deep distrust of the present size and style of the Washington establishment and of the kind of leadership we have had from it for about 20 years."

Richard Nixon is dedicated to producing the kind of change of which David Brinkley spoke.

That is why he is talking about reversing the flow of power from Washington to the states and cities. That is why he has reduced Federal employment by 48,000. That is why he is talking about sharing Federal income tax revenue with the cities and states. He wants to implement the basic change the people so desperately desire.

Not long ago President Nixon, in a nice way, asked the Congress to help him bring about the basic changes the American people are asking for. He conceded that some of the slowness in the legislative process could be attributed to the newness of his own administration.

Then he made the reform theme clear. He said: "The legislative program of this Administration differs fundamentally from previous administrations. We do not seek more and more of the same. We were not elected to pile new resources and manpower on top of old programs. We were elected to initiate an era of change."

In effect, the President said to the Congress: I am not going to argue about why so little has been done to date. But this is what I have proposed. Now what are you going to do about it?

That, I think, is a fair question. And it is a fair question not only to ask of the Congress but of the American people. What are we going to do about it?

Let us not look only to the National Administration for correction of our past mistakes. We all have a stake in our Nation. Let us all assume some of the responsibility for setting the affairs of our country in order.

There is too much of an attitude today that "all is fine so long as I get mine." We must rid ourselves of that approach. We must all become selfless if America is to survive as a Nation and a people. We must individually and collectively seek the greatest good for the greatest number.

The responsibility for guiding the future of America rests not only with the Congress, not only with governmental leaders, not only with the President. That

(more)

responsibility devolves upon us all. Each of our lives impinges upon the lives of others. To the extent that we all live the good life, the unselfish life, the lives of all others are enriched.

We all believe in the American Dream. Let us live so that all may share in it.

# # #