The original documents are located in Box D32, folder "Alfred University, Alfred, NY, April 24, 1972" 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 The Council donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Digitized from Box D32 of The Ford Congressional Papers: Since South Secretary Viet Van can not defund itself and Vietnam Ization equals wereasing air aid white decreasing much dosen to place are we since Wixon took office: Perhaps the U.S. should and Speech File at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library anti Communistic attende IN SE Asia. Comment?

MONDAY, APRIL 24, 1972.

We are forther for your form

TONIGHT. IN THIS ATMOSPHERE, I FEEL LIKE, I ASTATESMAN AND NOT A POLITICIAN.

BUT ACTUALLY A MAN MUST BE A GOOD POLITICIAN IF HE IS GOING TO BE A STATESMAN, AND THAT IS THE BASIC THRUST OF WHAT I AM GOING TO TALK ABOUT TONIGHT.

MY SUBJECT IS NEW DIRECTIONS

FOR THE SEVENTIES -- CHALLENGES FACING

THE POLITICAL PARTIES AND THE NATION IN

THE 1970'S. THE CHALLENGES THAT FACE

THE NATION ARE INDEED THE CHALLENGES

FACING THE POLITICAL PARTIES. THE

POLITICAL PARTY THAT IS MOST SUCCESSFUL

DURING THE SEVENTIES WILL BE THE PARTY

THAT BEST MEETS THE CHALLENGES OF OUR TIMES AND SELLS THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON ITS STEWARDSHIP.

ONE PROBLEM THAT CURRENTLY UNDERLIES ALL OF THE OTHERS. THAT PROBLEM IS MAKING GOVERNMENT SUFFICIENTLY RESPONSIVE TO THE PEOPLE. IF WE DON'T MAKE GOVERNMENT RESPONSIVE TO THE PEOPLE, WE DON'T MAKE IT BELIEVABLE. AND WE MUST MAKE GOVERNMENT BELIEVABLE IF WE ARE TO HAVE A FUNCTIONING DEMOCRACY.

WE HAVE ALL SEEN MANY AMERICANS
BECOME INCREASINGLY SKEPTICAL OF OUR
POLITICAL SYSTEM -- AND I SPEAK NOW NOT
ONLY OF THE YOUNG BUT OF COUNTLESS OLDER
AMERICANS. THEY QUESTION WHETHER IT
MATTERS IF THEY DO NOT GO TO THE POLLS.

AND THIS KIND OF QUESTIONING THREATENS
OUR DEMOCRATIC SYSTEM.

THERE IS AN ANSWER TO THIS

QUESTIONING -- AND THAT ANSWER IS TO MAKE

GOVERNMENT WORK IN A WAY THAT PEOPLE

CAN SEE AND FEEL.

THE OTHER PARTY MAY COME FORWARD WITH ITS OWN IDEAS BUT I PERSONALLY FEEL THE BEST CURES FOR POPULAR LETHARGY AND VOTER APATHY LIE IN RETURNING POWER TO THE PEOPLE AND RESTRUCTURING THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT.

ABOUT NO-STRINGS SHARING OF FEDERAL
REVENUE WITH STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS
AND ABOUT AN OVERHAUL OF FEDERAL CABINET
DEPARTMENTS.

THIS IS NOT VERY SEXY STUFF,
BUT IT'S WHAT IS NEEDED TO CLOSE THE GAP

BETWEEN PROMISE AND PERFORMANCE IN THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE PEOPLE.

FEDERAL REVENUE SHARING IS A
CONTINUING FINANCIAL TRANSFUSION THAT
CAN SAVE OUR FEDERAL SYSTEM AND BRING
NEW STRENGTH TO GOVERNMENT AT THE
GRASSROOTS LEVEL. MONEY IS POWER, AND THE
IDEA IS TO PUT MORE OF THE MONEY WHERE MORE
OF THE POWER OUGHT TO BE -- AT THE LOCAL
LEVEL. THE IDEA IS TO PUT THE MONEY WHERE
THE PROBLEMS ARE, AND IN THAT WAY TO
SOLVE THEM.

OF JUST TALKING ABOUT THEM, PEOPLE WILL BELIEVE IN GOVERNMENT.

THIS IS WHY WE NEED A
REORGANIZATION OF THE VERY FRAMEWORK OF

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT -- TO MAKE IT BETTER ABLE TO DEAL WITH THE PROBLEMS OF OUR PEOPLE. UNDER THE PLAN I HAVE IN MIND. SIX OF THE PRESENT 11 CABINET DEPARTMENTS WOULD BE CONSOLIDATED INTO FOUR NEW DEPARTMENTS: HUMAN RESOURCES, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, NATURAL RESOURCES, AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS. HEARINGS HAVE BEEN CONDUCTED IN THE CONGRESS, AND IT IS SAFE TO PREDICT THAT AT LEAST THE NEW COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT WILL SEE THE LIGHT OF DAY THIS YEAR.

I SAID EARLIER THAT THE ONLY
WAY TO MAKE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE BELIEVERS
IN THEIR GOVERNMENT IS TO LICK OUR
PROBLEMS. SURELY ONE OF THE BIGGEST
PROBLEMS OF ALL IS THE PRESENT WELFARE
SYSTEM, WHICH IS LIKE POURING MONEY
THROUGH A SIEVE.

WE MUST REFORM OUR ANTIQUATED AND DEMEANING WELFARE SYSTEM. THE PRESENT SYSTEM IS A SCANDAL. IT JUST ISN'T WORKING. NOBODY IS FOR A SYSTEM THAT MAKES IT MORE ATTRACTIVE TO BE ON WELFARE THAN TO WORK.

THE ANSWER, I THINK, IS THE ADMINISTRATION'S NEW FAMILY ASSISTANCE PLAN -- A PLAN TIED TO THE WORK ETHIC, A PLAN THAT ENCOURAGES FAMILIES TO STAY TOGETHER, A PLAN THAT WOULD PUT A FLOOR UNDER THE INCOME OF EVERY FAMILY IN AMERICA. IT IS THE KEY TO TAKING PEOPLE OFF WELFARE ROLLS AND PUTTING THEM ON PAYROLLS. IT IS THE MEANS TO A LIFE OF DIGNITY FOR LOW-INCOME AMERICANS.

WHEN WE TALK ABOUT MOVING PEOPLE FROM WELFARE ROLLS TO PAYROLLS,

OF WHAT I CALL "THE NEW PROSPERITY" -PROSPERITY IN PEACETIME.

SELDOM IN THE HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES HAVE WE HAD PEACE AND PROSPERITY AT THE SAME TIME. PROSPERITY HAS USUALLY COME WITH A WARTIME ECONOMY, A BOOMING DEFENSE INDUSTRY. WE ARE NOW TRYING TO ACHIEVE PROSPERITY AT THE SAME TIME THAT WE END OUR INVOLVEMENT IN A COSTLY AND TRAGIC WAR.

WHAT ARE WE DEALING WITH? WE ARE SEEKING TO BRING UNDER CONTROL AN INFLATION THAT ROARED AHEAD ALMOST UNCHECKED BETWEEN 1965 AND 1969. WE ARE SEEKING TO STIMULATE AN ECONOMY THAT HAS BEEN THROTTLED BACK AS WE HAVE FOUGHT INFLATION, HAVE PARTIALLY SHUT DOWN OUR

DEFENSE INDUSTRIES AND HAVE CUT OUR FIGHTING FORCES BY A MILLION MEN.

THE CHALLENGE THAT FACES THE
TWO MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES IN THE
SEVENTIES IS WHETHER WE MAKE
INFLATION-FIGHTING WORK WHILE AT THE
SAME TIME STIMULATING THE ECONOMY TO
BRING ABOUT PEACETIME PROSPERITY.

WE ARE MAKING PROGRESS TOWARD
PRICE STABILITY AND ECONOMIC PROSPERITY
DESPITE POLITICAL IN-FIGHTING AND THE
NATURAL RELUCTANCE OF SOME AMERICANS TO
SEE A PRESIDENT OF THE OPPOSITE POLITICAL
PERSUASION SUCCEED IN MEETING ONE OF THE
BIGGEST CHALLENGES OF OUR TIMES.

I THINK PHASE 2 OF OUR

INFLATION FIGHT IS WORKING. IT HAS A

LOT GOING FOR IT, DESPITE OBSTRUCTIONISM

ON THE PART OF ORGANIZED LABOR. AT THE SAME TIME, WE HAVE THE STIMULUS OF THE TAX CUTS REQUESTED BY PRESIDENT NIXON AND ENACTED BY THE CONGRESS. THIS SHOULD ULTIMATELY MEAN THE CREATION OF THOUSANDS OF NEW JOBS.

CERTAINLY ONE OF OUR KEY PROBLEMS -- AND ONE OF THE CHALLENGES OF BOTH POLITICAL PARTIES -- IS THE RESTORATION OF OUR ENVIRONMENT. WE HAVE ALREADY TAKEN GIANT STEPS TOWARD CLEANER AIR THROUGH PASSAGE OF THE CLEAN AIR AMENDMENTS OF 1970. NOW WE MUST FOCUS ON THE NEED TO CLEAN UP THE NATION'S WATERWAYS. WE MUST TAKE EVERY FEASIBLE ACTION NECESSARY TO MAKE OUR LAKES AND STREAMS CLEAN AGAIN. IN SUM, WE MUST ENTER UPON A NEW "GET TOUGH" ERA IN THE

AND OPEN SPACES -- SO THAT THESE ELEMENTS WILL, AS THE PRESIDENT PUTS IT, "ONCE AGAIN BE THE BIRTHRIGHT OF EVERY AMERICAN."

THERE ARE, OF COURSE, MANY
OTHER URBAN ILLS -- CRIME, POVERTY,
UNEMPLOYMENT, INADEQUATE HOUSING AND
TRANSPORTATION. THESE MUST BE ATTACKED
ON A REGIONAL BASIS, RATHER THAN IN
PIECEMEAL FRAGMENTED FASHION.

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS CAN WORK
TOGETHER AS ONE IN ATTACKING CRIME,
IMPROVING TRANSPORTATION AND HOUSING,
FINDING JOBS FOR THE UNEMPLOYED THROUGH
METROPOLITAN AREA JOB CENTERS.

NEW ATTITUDES ARE ALSO NECESSARY AT OTHER LEVELS OF GOVERNMENT.

STATE AND FEDERAL OFFICIALS

MUST COME TO REALIZE THAT THE PROBLEMS

OF THE CITY GO FAR BEYOND SPECIFIC SLUM

AREAS AND SOCIAL ILLS. CITY METROPOLITAN

AREA GOVERNMENTS MUST BE GIVEN THE

RESOURCES -- MONEY AND AUTHORITY -- TO

SOLVE THE LARGER PROBLEMS OF THE WHOLE

COMMUNITY.

THE KEY TO SUCH LOCAL PROBLEM-SOLVING.

AND THERE MUST BE A CUTTING OF CONTROLS

FROM WASHINGTON AND STATE CAPITOLS IF

LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ARE TO HAVE THE

FLEXIBILITY TO GET THE JOB DONE.

THERE IS STILL ANOTHER KEY
PROBLEM WHERE INITIATIVE MUST BE TAKEN
AT THE FEDERAL LEVEL. THAT IS THE
PROBLEM OF HEALTH CARE. PROGRESS IS

BEING MADE. WITH BIPARTISAN SUPPORT,
THE CONGRESS LAST YEAR ENACTED THE MOST
COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH MANPOWER
LEGISLATION IN THE NATION'S HISTORY.
THIS NEW HEALTH MANPOWER PROGRAM IS
DESIGNED TO WIPE OUT THE ESTIMATED
SHORTAGE OF 50,000 DOCTORS BY 1978 AND TO
INCREASE THE NUMBER OF NURSES BY 400,000
BY 1980.

BUT THE HEALTH MANPOWER SHORTAGE
IS ONLY PART OF THE CHALLENGE THAT FACES
US. THE FACTS ARE THAT OUR ENTIRE
HEALTH DELIVERY SYSTEM NEEDS IMPROVING.

ONE OF THE MAJOR PARTIES
WOULD MEET THE CHALLENGE BY PUTTING THE
FEDERAL GOVERNMENT IN CHARGE OF THE
ENTIRE HEALTH DELIVERY SYSTEM AND
UNDERWRITING ALL HEALTH CARE THROUGH

THE FEDERAL TREASURY. MY PARTY WOULD EXPAND THE GOVERNMENT ROLE OF FINANCING CARE FOR THE HELPLESS AND NEEDY WHILE IMPROVING BASIC HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR ALL OTHERS. EMPLOY EMPLOYERS WOULD PAY THE BULK OF THE HEALTH INSURANCE PREMIUMS FOR THE WORKING POPULATION. CATASTROPHIC ILLNESSES WOULD BE COVERED UP TO \$50,000 FOR EACH FAMILY MEMBER. THE PLAN ALSO WOULD STRESS PREVENT!VE MEDICINE -- KEEPING PEOPLE HEALTHY INSTEAD OF SENDING THEM INTO HOSPITALS WITH MINOR AILMENTS AND THUS ESCALATING THE NATION'S HEALTH CARE BILL.

MY PARTY BELIEVES THE HEALTH
CARE PROBLEM CAN BEST BE MET BY IMPROVING

THE PRESENT SYSTEM, NOT BY SCRAPPING IT AND ERECTING A FEDERAL BUREAUCRATIC STRUCTURE IN ITS PLACE.

WE HAVE BEEN TALKING SOLELY ABOUT CHALLENGES ON THE DOMESTIC SCENE. LET US TURN NOW TO THE FOREIGN ARENA.

THE CHALLENGE IN FOREIGN

AFFAIRS IS TO BUILD A FOUNDATION FOR

FUTURE PEACE WHILE REPELLING EFFORTS BOTH

ON THE RIGHT AND ON THE LEFT TO SHUNT

AMERICA OFF INTO A NEW POSTURE OF

ISOLATIONISM. WE MUST MAINTAIN OUR

POSITION OF LEADERSHIP IN THE WORLD IF

THE WORLD IS TO HAVE ANY CHANCE TO LIVE

IN PEACE.

A NEW QUALITY OF REALISM NOW DOMINATES AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY. WE HAVE AGREED TO ACCEPT MAINLAND CHINA AS A

SOVEREIGN NATION, ADJUSTING OUR POLICIES IN ASIA TO MEET CHANGED ECONOMIC AND POLITICAL CONDITIONS THERE. FOLLOWING OUR MILITARY WITHDRAWAL FROM VIETNAM, WE WILL CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SUPPORT UNDER THE NIXON DOCTRINE FOR OUR NON-COMMUNIST FRIENDS IN ASIA.

IN OUR RELATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION, NEW REALISM ON BOTH SIDES HAS RECOGNIZED A MUTUAL INTEREST IN REDUCING THE RISK OF NUCLEAR WAR. THERE ARE SIGNS THAT AN AGREEMENT ON THE DEPLOYMENT OF NUCLEAR MISSILES WILL RESULT FROM THE STRATEGIC ARMS LIMITATION TALKS. SHOULD THESE TALKS INDEED PROVE SUCCESSFUL, THEY WILL SHOW THAT WITH HARD BARGAINING AND DILIGENT NEGOTIATION WE CAN AVOID A NEW UPWARD SPIRAL OF THE NUCLEAR ARMS RACE.

THE FOREIGN RELATIONS OF THE
UNITED STATES HAVE CHANGED DRASTICALLY
WITH PRESIDENT NIXON'S

VISIT
TO CHINA AND HIS PLANNED TRIP TO THE
SOVIET UNION ON MAY 22. TO PROJECT OF THE PROPERTY OF T

IN ANNOUNCING HIS VISIT TO MOSCOW, THE PRESIDENT REFERRED TO "RECENT ADVANCES IN BILATERAL AND MULTILATERAL NEGOTIATIONS INVOLVING THE TWO COUNTRIES." IT IS SAFE TO ASSUME THIS INCLUDED THE SALT TALKS.

SOURCES CLOSE TO THE TALKS
INDICATE A GOOD PROSPECT FOR A LIMIT ON
OFFENSIVE MISSILES.

FROM STRENGTH CARRIED ON BY THE
ADMINISTRATION AT SALT HAS EARNED THE
RESPECT OF THE RUSSIANS. THE PROSPECTS
FOR AGREEMENT TODAY ARE RELATED, IN MY
VIEW, TO OUR OWN DECISION TO PROCEED
WITH STRATEGIC WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT -INCLUDING THE ABM SYSTEM -- DURING THESE
TALKS.

WE ARE TURNING FROM AN ERA OF CONFRONTATION TO AN ERA OF NEGOTIATION.

BUT THERE IS NO QUESTION IN MY MIND THAT NEGOTIATION WILL PROVE FRUITFUL ONLY IF WE NEGOTIATE FROM A POSITION OF STRENGTH.

THIS IS THE LESSON WHICH IS LOST ON THE NEO-ISOLATIONISTS.

WE ARE ACHIEVING SUCCESS IN
FOREIGN AFFAIRS BECAUSE WE ARE CONTINUING

1

TO SHOW THE WORLD THAT WE ARE DETERMINED
TO DISCHARGE AMERICA'S RESPONSIBILITIES.
WE DID NOT WITHDRAW TROOPS FROM
EUROPE IN THE ABSENCE OF AN AGREEMENT FOR
MUTUAL TROOP WITHDRAWAL.

WE STOOD UP TO RUSSIA IN THE SYRIA-JORDAN CRISIS IN OCTOBER OF 1970.

WE REINFORCED THE SIXTH FLEET TO COMPENSATE FOR RUSSIAN MOVES.

WE ARE NOT GOING TO LET RUSSIAN EXPANSIONISM IN THE INDIAN OCEAN GO UNANSWERED.

CURRENTLY WE ARE RESPONDING TO
THE CHALLENGE POSED BY THE NORTH VIETNAMESE
INVASION OF SOUTH VIETNAM. THIS WAS A
CHALLENGE THAT COULD NOT GO UNANSWERED.
WE COULD NOT ABANDON OUR ALLY IN
THE FACE OF AN INVASION THAT BLATANTLY

VIOLATED THE GENEVA ACCORDS OF 1954 AND THE "UNDERSTANDINGS" WHICH LED TO THE U.S. BOMBING HALT OF 1968. WE COULD NOT ALLOW THE INMASION TO GO UNCHECKED WHILE THOUSANDS OF U.S. TROOPS STILL ARE IN VIETNAM.

WHAT AMAZES ME IS THE FACT THAT SOME MEMBERS OF CONGRESS CONDEMN THE PRESIDENT FOR GOING TO THE AID OF SOUTH VIETNAM WITH AIR AND SEA POWER INSTEAD OF CONDEMNING THE NORTH VIETNAMESE FOR INVADING THE SOUTH.

IT IS ALSO DISHEARTENING THAT
THE UNITED NATIONS HAS UTTERED NOT ONE
WORD OF PROTEST CONCERNING THE INVASION
STAGED BY NORTH VIETNAM AGAINST ANOTHER
SOVEREIGN STATE.

IN MY VIEW, THE VERBAL ATTACKS
MADE ON THE PRESIDENT BY CRITICS OF HIS
VIETNAM POLICY ARE COMPLETELY
IRRESPONSIBLE. FOR THOSE WHO LABEL
THE VIETNAM WAR IMMORAL TO COMPLETELY
IGNORE THE IMMORALITY OF THE NORTH
VIETNAMESE INVASION OF SOUTH VIETNAM
IS ABSOLUTELY INCREDIBLE.

WHERE DOES THE FAULT LIE FOR
THE PRESENT ESCALATION OF FIGHTING IN
THE VIETNAM WAR? IT CERTAINLY DOES NOT
LIE WITH A PRESIDENT WHO HAS REDUCED THE
NUMBER OF U.S. TROOPS IN VIETNAM FROM
543,000 TO 85,000 AND IS INTENT ON
REDUCING THE NUMBER TO 69,000 OR LESS BY
MAY 1. IF WE ARE TO PROPERLY ASSIGN THE
BLAME, WE MUST LOOK ELSEWHERE. WE MUST
LOOK AT THE AGGRESSOR, NORTH VIETNAM, AND

ITS CHIEF MILITARY SUPPLIER, THE SOVIET UNION.

THERE IS A SIMPLE REMEDY FOR
THE UPSURGE IN FIGHTING IN VIETNAM. LET
THE NORTH VIETNAMESE STOP THE INVASION,
THE U.S. STOP THE BOMBINGS, AND LET BOTH
SIDES COME TOGETHER AGAIN AT THE PEACE
TABLE IN PARIS. THE PRESIDENT WOULD
WELCOME THIS OPPORTUNITY TO RESUME THE
NEGOTIATIONS.

THE CHALLENGE THAT FACES US IN
FOREIGN AFFAIRS IS THAT WE CONTINUE TO
ASSERT WORLD LEADERSHIP IN THE FACE OF
NEO-ISOLATIONISM, WELL-MEANING BUT
MISTAKEN PACIFISM AND RADICAL-LED PROTEST
MOVEMENTS AIMED AT HELPING THE OTHER SIDE.
THESE, THEN, ARE THE CHALLENGES
THAT FACE THE MAJOR POLITICAL PARTIES AND

THE NATION IN THE SEVENTIES.

WE MUST PUT THE NATION ON A NEW COURSE, TAKE HER IN NEW DIRECTIONS THAT POINT TOWARD A NEW ERA OF GREATNESS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE.

WE MUST LAY A FOUNDATION FOR PROSPERITY WITHOUT WAR AND WE MUST BUILD A NEW STRATEGY FOR PEACE.

OUR GOALS ARE CLEAR. OUR
PURPOSE IS STRONG. WITH THE HELP OF THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE, WE CANNOT FAIL.

Reading Copy Office Copy

ADDRESS BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.
REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S., HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

OLINICA PATROLOGIC SOCIETY AL

3:15p.m. Monday, april 24, 1972

FOR RELEASE AT STATE DAY

It is a pleasure to be here tonight. In this atmosphere, I feel like a statesman and not a politician.

But actually a man must be a good politician if he is going to be a statesman, and that is the basic thrust of what I am going to talk about tonight.

My subject is New Directions for the Seventies--challenges facing the political parties and the Nation in the 1970's. The challenges that face the nation are indeed the challenges facing the political parties. The political party that is most successful during the Seventies will be the party that best meets the challenges of our times and sells the American people on its stewardship.

In a political sense, there is one problem that currently underlies all of the others. That problem is making Government sufficiently responsive to the people. If we don't make government responsive to the people, we don't make it believable. And we must make government believable if we are to have a functioning democracy.

We have all seen many Americans become increasingly skeptical of our political system—and I speak now not only of the young but of countless older Americans. They question whether it matters if they do not go to the polls. And this kind of questioning threatens our democratic system.

There is an answer to this questioning--and that answer is to make government work in a way that people can see and feel.

The other party may come forward with its own ideas but I personally feel the best cures for popular lethargy and voter apathy lie in returning power to the people and restructuring the Federal Government.

I am talking specifically about no-strings sharing of Federal revenue with state and local governments and about an overhaul of Federal cabinet departments.

(more)

This is not very sexy stuff, but it's what is needed to close the gap between promise and performance in the relationship between government and the people.

Federal revenue sharing is a continuing financial transfusion that can save our federal system and bring new strength to government at the grassroots level.

Money is power, and the idea is to put more of the money where more of the power ought to be—at the local level. The idea is to put the money where the problems are, and in that way to solve them.

If we can solve problems instead of just talking about them, people will believe in government.

This is why we need a reorganization of the very framework of the Federal Government—to make it better able to deal with the problems of our people. Under the plan I have in mind, six of the present 11 cabinet departments would be consolidated into four new departments: Human Resources, Community Development, Natural Resources, and Economic Affairs. Hearings have been conducted in the Congress, and it is safe to predict that at least the new Community Development Department will see the light of day this year.

I said earlier that the only way to make the American people believers in their government is to lick our problems. Surely one of the biggest problems of all is the present welfare system, which is like pouring money through a sieve.

We must reform our antiquated and demeaning welfare system. The present system is a scandal. It just isn't working. Nobody is for a system that makes it more attractive to be on welfare than to work.

The answer, I think, is the Administration's new Family Assistance Plan--a plan tied to the work ethic, a plan that encourages families to stay together, a plan that would put a floor under the income of every family in America. It is the key to taking people off welfare rolls and putting them on payrolls. It is the means to a life of dignity for low-income Americans.

When we talk about moving people from welfare rolls to payrolls, it is only natural we should speak also of what I call "the new prosperity"--prosperity in peacetime.

Seldom in the history of the United States have we had peace and prosperity at the same time. Prosperity has usually come with a wartime economy, a booming defense industry. We are now trying to achieve prosperity at the same time that we end our involvement in a costly and tragic war.

What are we dealing with? We are seeking to bring under control an inflation that roared ahead almost unchecked between 1965 and 1969. We are seeking to stimulate an economy that has been throttled back as we have fought inflation, have partially shut down our defense industries and have cut our fighting forces by a million men.

The challenge that faces the two major political parties in the Seventies is whether we make inflation-fighting work while at the same time stimulating the economy to bring about peacetime prosperity.

We are making progress toward price stability and economic prosperity despite political in-fighting and the natural reluctance of some Americans to see a President of the opposite political persuasion succeed in meeting one of the biggest challenges of our times.

I think Phase 2 of our inflation fight is working. It has a lot going for it, despite obstructionism on the part of organized labor. At the same time, we have the stimulus of the tax cuts requested by President Nixon and enacted by the Congress. This should ultimately mean the creation of thousands of new jobs.

Certainly one of our key problems—and one of the challenges of both political parties—is the restoration of our environment. We have already taken giant steps toward cleaner air through passage of the Clean Air Amendments of 1970. Now we must focus on the need to clean up the nation's waterways. We must take every feasible action necessary to make our lakes and streams clean again. In sum, we must enter upon a new "get tough" era in the effort to restore clean air, clean water and open spaces—so that these elements will, as the President puts it, "once again be the birthright of every American."

There are, of course, many other urban ills--crime, poverty, unemployment, inadequate housing and transportation. These must be attacked on a regional basis, rather than in piecemeal fragmented fashion.

Local governments can work together as one in attacking crime, improving transportation and housing, finding jobs for the unemployed through metropolitan area job centers.

New attitudes are also necessary at other levels of government.

State and federal officials must come to realize that the problems of the city go far beyond specific slum areas and social ills. City metropolitan area governments must be given the resources—money and authority—to solve the larger problems of the whole community.

Federal revenue sharing is the key to such local problem-solving. And there must be a cutting of controls from Washington and State capitols if local governments are to have the flexibility to get the job done.

There is still another key problem where initiative must be taken at the Federal level. That is the problem of health care. Progress is being made. With bipartisan support, the Congress last year enacted the most comprehensive health manpower legislation in the nation's history. This new health manpower program is designed to wipe out the estimated shortage of 50,000 doctors by 1978 and to increase the number of nurses by 400,000 by 1980.

But the health manpower shortage is only part of the challenge that faces us. The facts are that our entire health delivery system needs improving.

One of the major parties would meet the challenge by putting the Federal Government in charge of the entire health delivery system and underwriting all health care through the Federal Treasury. My party would expand the government role of financing care for the helpless and needy while improving basic health insurance coverage for all others. Employers would pay the bulk of the health insurance premiums for the working population. Catastrophic illnesses would be covered up to \$50,000 for each family member. The plan also would stress preventive medicine—keeping people healthy instead of sending them into hospitals with minor ailments and thus escalating the nation's health care bill.

My party believes the health care problem can best be met by improving the present system, not by scrapping it and erecting a Federal bureaucratic structure in its place.

We have been talking solely about challenges on the domestic scene. Let us turn now to the foreign arena.

The challenge in foreign affairs is to build a foundation for future peace while repelling efforts both on the Right and on the Left to shunt America off into a new posture of isolationism. We must maintain our position of leadership in the world if the world is to have any chance to live in peace.

A new quality of realism now dominates American foreign policy. We have agreed to accept Mainland China as a sovereign nation, adjusting our policies in Asia to meet changed economic and political conditions there. Following our military withdrawal from Vietnam, we will continue to provide support under the Nixon Doctrine for our non-Communist friends in Asia.

(more)

In our relations with the Soviet Union, new realism on both sides has recognized a mutual interest in reducing the risk of nuclear war. There are signs that an agreement on the deployment of nuclear missiles will result from the Strategic Arms Limitation Talks. Should these talks indeed prove successful, they will show that with hard bargaining and diligent negotiation we can avoid a new upward spiral of the nuclear arms race.

The foreign relations of the United States have changed drastically with President Nixon's upcoming visit to China and his planned trip to the Soviet Union in late May. The President also has consulted with our Free World partners in advance of his trips to the summit in Peking and Moscow.

In announcing his visit to Moscow, the President referred to "recent advances in bilateral and multilateral negotiations involving the two countries." It is safe to assume this included the SALT Talks.

Sources close to the Talks indicate a good prospect for limiting anti-ballistic missile systems on both sides and a fair prospect for a limit on offensive missiles.

I am convinced the bargaining from strength carried on by the Administration at SALT has earned the respect of the Russians. The prospects for agreement today are related, in my view, to our own decision to proceed with strategic weapons development—including the ABM system—during these Talks.

We are turning from an era of confrontation to an era of negotiation. But there is no question in my mind that negotiation will prove fruitful only if we negotiate from a position of strength. This is the lesson which is lost on the neo-isolationists.

We are achieving success in foreign affairs because we are continuing to show the world that we are determined to discharge America's responsibilities.

We did not withdraw troops from Europe in the absence of an agreement for mutual troop withdrawal.

We stood up to Russia in the Syria-Jordan crisis in October of 1970. We reinforced the Sixth Fleet to compensate for Russian moves.

We are not going to let Russian expansionism in the Indian Ocean go unanswered where the retiring the Soviet Union and the world is that we will not allow the other superflows to gain any adventages and world to be superflowed.

Currently we are responding to the challenge posed by the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietname. This was a challenge that could not go unanswered.

will ated the Geneva Accords of 1954 and the "Understandings" which led to the U.S. bombing halt of 1968. We could not allow the invasion to go unchecked while thousands of U.S. troops still are in Vietnam.

What amazes me is the fact that some members of Congress condemn the

What amazes me is the fact that some members of Congress condemn the President for going to the aid of South Vietnam with air and sea power instead of condemning the North Vietnamese for invading the South.

It is also disheartening that the United Nations has uttered not one word of protest the invasion staged by North Vietnam against another sovereign state.

In my view, the verbal attacks made on the President by critics of his Vietnam policy are completely irresponsible. For those who label the Vietnam War immoral to completely ignore the immorality of the North Vietnamese invasion of South Vietnam is absolutely incredible.

Where does the fault lie for the present escalation of fighting in the vietnam War? It certainly does not lie with a President who has reduced the number of U.S. troops in Vietnam from 543,000 to 85,000 and is to reduce the number to 69,000 or less by May 1. If we are to properly assign the blame, we must look at the aggressor, North Vietnam, and its chief military supplier, the Soviet Union.

There is a simple remedy for the upsurge in fighting in Vietnam. Let the North the W.S. Atop the boundary both sides come together again at the peace table in Paris. The President would welcome this opportunity manuto resume the negotiations.

the challenge that faces us in foreign affairs that we continue to assert world leadership in the face of neo-isolationism, well-meaning but mistaken pacifism and radical-led protest movements aimed at helping the other side.

These, then, are the challenges that face the major political parties and the nation in the Seventies.

We must put the nation on a new course, take her in new directions that point toward a new era of greatness for the American people.

We must lay a foundation for prosperity without war and we must build a new strategy for peace.

Our goals are clear. Our purpose is strong. With the help of the American people, we cannot fail.