

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--

M Office Copy

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

January 9, 1968

The President currently is working on the fiscal 1969 budget, which as I understand it will be submitted to the Congress about Jan. 29 in an entirely new format.

The new budget ostensibly will be a consolidation of the three budgets formerly presented to Congress by the President--the Administrative Budget with which most of us are familiar, the National Income Accounts Budget and the Cash Budget.

I would sound a note of caution concerning the new budget for fiscal 1969. It should be remembered that the Johnson Administration has a habit of changing the rules of the game whenever the score starts to go against it. Too often in the past we have found the Johnson Administration tending to fuzz up what it does not conceal and making estimates fantastically far from the mark.

The budgetary record of the Johnson Administration has been abysmally poor--and the proposed budget for fiscal 1969 must be viewed in the light of that record.

Let us not forget that President Johnson forecast a fiscal 1968 deficit of \$8.1 billion in January, 1967, only to raise that deficit estimate in August to \$23.6 billion with a tax increase and \$29 billion without it. Currently, as you know, the outlook is for a \$19 to \$20 billion fiscal 1968 deficit without a tax increase--pared down as a result of congressional pressure for spending reductions.

Let us not forget, either, that President Johnson predicted a fiscal 1967 deficit of only \$1.8 billion in January of 1966 but wound up that fiscal year with an actual deficit of \$9.9 billions.

This scorecard indicates you have to take a Johnson deficit estimate and multiply by at least three.


This is President Johnson's budgetary record as he persists in pursuing his mistaken guns-and-butter policy. Whether looked upon as promises or projections, the most recent annual forecasts made by the President in his budget documents appear hardly to be worth the paper they are written on. If a housewife managed the family budget that way, her husband would say she was suffering from a Credibility Gap.

This is tragic in a time when the federal budget--a financial report to the American people--should be looked upon as the most important financial document in the world.

President Johnson's budget should be a model of integrity. It affects the lives and pocketbooks of all Americans and the financial underpinnings of the western world. Its standards should be the highest.

The Johnson Administration's budgetary record can only fill us with misgivings.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Official Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

-- FOR RELEASE UPON
ADJOURNMENT OF THE CONGRESS --

END-OF-SESSION STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, R-MICH.

The 90th Congress compiled a good record during its first year of existence. It was constructive and productive--and, very importantly, it was responsible.

First of all, the Congress deserves a vote of taxpayer thanks for cutting federal spending this fiscal year by \$4.1 billion in an attack on inflation and high interest rates. The Johnson-Humphrey Administration still will incur a huge deficit, now estimated at \$19.8 billion, but without a Republican-led campaign to force spending cuts it would have been far worse.

Congress refused to go along with President Johnson's plans to increase income tax bills by 10 per cent. That was a wise decision. Not only are the American people already heavily burdened with taxes, but there is good reason to believe a federal income tax increase at this time might damage the economy.

The 90th Congress passed some good legislation. Republicans and Democrats together launched a massive, regional attack on air pollution, laid the groundwork through House action for a nationwide War on Crime, revamped and extended the Teacher Corps, greatly improved federal and state meat inspection, acted in the House to give more responsibility and control to the states in using federal school aid, passed a Comprehensive Health Act allowing states and local communities to use federal funds in line with their own priorities to fight rats, communicable diseases and drug addiction, increased Social Security benefits, sought to improve the operation of Medicare, tightened up on Medicaid, and revised the welfare laws to put able-bodied welfare recipients to work.

Where legislation was clearly in the national interest, Republicans joined hands with Democrats to pass it. House Republicans succeeded in giving some programs New Direction. We fought what we thought was bad for the country.

Republicans represented a unified force in the House. In the 24 instances where House Republican Policy stands were put to the test on a rollcall vote, 96 per cent of the Republican members present and voting supported the party policy position. On these 24 rollcalls, the GOP position prevailed 18 times.


The Democratic majority was so divided in the House this year that I am not surprised the President again is calling for a rubber-stamp-sized majority for his party in the Congress.

There were, of course, areas where Congress fell short. The President should have proposed and Congress should have approved a measure to improve our handling of national emergency strikes. ~~Strong anti-crime legislation, as backed up by House Republicans, should have been written into law this year.~~ Election reform and congressional reform bills pushed by Republicans should have been passed but were sidetracked by House Democratic leaders. This should have been a Reform Congress.

But, on the whole, the 90th Congress did a good job.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District Papers
Radio, E. TV 1/12/67 M Office Copy*



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

FOR RELEASE
Wednesday, Jan. 17, 1968, and thereafter

Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids today said he has fresh hope the Congress will approve his bill to require railroad freight cars to be equipped with reflectors as a safeguard against nighttime auto-train collisions.

Ford cited a recent statement indicating support for his bill by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). He quoted Ernest G. Cox, assistant director of DOT's Motor Carrier Safety Office, as saying the use of reflective materials on the sides of freight trains should be considered.

Cox made the statement at a recent train grade crossing safety symposium sponsored by DOT, the Texas Transportation Institute and Texas A. & M. University.

Ford's bill and a companion measure introduced in the Senate by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., are pending in the commerce committees of the Congress.

Ford has introduced his freight car safety bill for years without success. He now senses the chance for action if full Department of Transportation endorsement can be obtained.

The Ford bill has the backing of the Interstate Commerce Commission but has been opposed by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget.

Ford has repeatedly pointed out that ICC studies show a large percentage of highway-railroad crossing accidents occurring when motor vehicles run into the sides of trains.


"Reflecting or luminous material would make railroad cars easier for drivers to see at night and would reduce the number of accidents where autos run into trains after dark," Ford said. "Now that there are indications of Department of Transportation support for my bill, I have new hope that it will be passed."

Ford first introduced the bill after a fatal car-train accident at an unguarded crossing in the Fifth Congressional District.

Under Ford's bill, a railroad would be fined \$100 for each violation of the reflector requirement. The regulation would be laid down by the ICC within one year after passage of the bill.

###

*Distribution: Fifth Dist. Papers,
Radio, and TV*



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

FOR RELEASE
Wednesday, Jan. 17, 1968, and thereafter

Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids today said he has fresh hope the Congress will approve his bill to require railroad freight cars to be equipped with reflectors as a safeguard against nighttime auto-train collisions.

Ford cited a recent statement indicating support for his bill by the U.S. Department of Transportation (DOT). He quoted Ernest G. Cox, assistant director of DOT's Motor Carrier Safety Office, as saying the use of reflective materials on the sides of freight trains should be considered.

Cox made the statement at a recent train grade crossing safety symposium sponsored by DOT, the Texas Transportation Institute and Texas A. & M. University.

Ford's bill and a companion measure introduced in the Senate by Sen. George McGovern, D-S.D., are pending in the commerce committees of the Congress.

Ford has introduced his freight car safety bill for years without success. He now senses the chance for action if full Department of Transportation endorsement can be obtained.

The Ford bill has the backing of the Interstate Commerce Commission but has been opposed by the Department of Commerce and the Bureau of the Budget.

Ford has repeatedly pointed out that ICC studies show a large percentage of highway-railroad crossing accidents occurring when motor vehicles run into the sides of trains.

"Reflecting or luminous material would make railroad cars easier for drivers to see at night and would reduce the number of accidents where autos run into trains after dark," Ford said. "Now that there are indications of Department of Transportation support for my bill, I have new hope that it will be passed."

Ford first introduced the bill after a fatal car-train accident at an unguarded crossing in the Fifth Congressional District.

Under Ford's bill, a railroad would be fined \$100 for each violation of the reflector requirement. The regulation would be laid down by the ICC within one year after passage of the bill.

#

distribution : Full, 1/17/68

M Office Copy



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 17, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

The American people have the will and the strength to meet their every crisis at home and abroad. Where Republicans differ with the President is on the means and the method.

President Johnson obviously still believes that the solution to all of America's problems lies with the federal bureaucracy.

The goals the President outlined are admirable. But the American people will not follow the route he has mapped for achieving those objectives--the road of irresponsibly large federal outlays in a time when the dollar is under attack both at home and overseas.

The President's approach is to spend more and tax more.

This Congress will insist that federal spending be held to reasonable levels--because this is the best way to fight inflation, halt the rise in interest rates and let Americans make real wage gains.

The President cited the urgency of a nationwide attack on crime. The Administration should have moved with utmost speed to launch a war on crime last year.

The President never once spoke of building a Great Society. I am not surprised. In recent months we have been plagued by riots, near-anarchy, and rampant crime in the streets.

The President said nothing about fulfilling his 1966 State of the Union pledge to send Congress a proposal for improved handling of national emergency strikes.

It is strange, too, that the President did not urge a Clean Elections Law.

The President's statement outlining a cautious approach to Vietnam peace talks was the most realistic comment in his entire message. We must remember that more than 20,000 Americans were killed in battle in Korea while talks went on at Panmunjom. This should be a sobering thought for us all.

#

Distribution: Full, 12:30 p.m., 1/23/68

M Office Copy




--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 23, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

The United States Government should demand that North Korea release the U.S. Navy intelligence ship, the Pueblo, forthwith. If the vessel was cruising in international waters, as was apparently the case, there is no justification whatever for the action taken by the North Koreans.

#

Distribution: Full, 11:10 a.m., 1/24/68 *Office Copy*



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 24, 1968

In announcing his retirement, Rep. Charles A. Halleck can look back with great satisfaction upon a long career of distinguished service to his party and the Nation.

I personally will be ever grateful to Charlie Halleck for the valuable counsel and assistance he has given me since I became Republican leader of the House in January, 1965. Charlie Halleck, as one would expect, conducted himself like the fine gentleman and staunch fighter for Republican principles that he is.

When he leaves the House at the end of this term, his 17th, Charlie Halleck will be remembered as a highly capable Majority Leader in 1947-48 and 1953-54 when the GOP controlled the House and as a vigorous Minority Leader from 1959 to 1965.

All Republicans will be sorry to see Charlie Halleck depart the political arena. But we know he will maintain his keen interest in the Nation's affairs in retirement, and we certainly intend to continue making use of his many talents.

#

Distribution: Full, 11:30 a.m., 1/24/68

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 24, 1968


Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

If all sensible attempts at diplomacy fail, the United States must take whatever military action is necessary to recover the U.S. Navy intelligence ship, Pueblo. We must be concerned first and foremost with the lives and safety of the ship's crew, and therefore we must exhaust all diplomatic means at our command before taking military measures. This approach having been fruitless, we will be forced to take whatever military actions are most appropriate in response to this act of piracy by North Korea. The North Koreans had better believe that the United States is not to be trifled with. I am fully in accord with the decision to send the carrier Enterprise and other U.S. ships to the scene as a show of force. Above all, the credibility and prestige of the United States must be maintained. The silence at the White House has not been helpful in this regard.

###

Distribution: Full, 12:45 p.m., 1/25/68

Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 25, 1968

Remarks by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Prepared for Delivery on the Floor of the House, Thursday, Jan. 25, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks. Mr. Speaker, a page one story in the New York Times this morning reveals that organized crime has moved into Wall Street through the device of loan-sharking. I ask unanimous consent that the New York Times story be printed in the Congressional Record immediately following my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, the testimony now being given before a committee of the New York Legislature on loan-sharking and organized crime points up the need for swift action by the Congress to swing federal investigators into action against loan-sharking--one of the principal sources of revenue for the crime syndicates.

We have a vehicle for that purpose in a bill due to come to the House floor shortly--the Truth-In-Lending Bill which yesterday was granted a three-hour open rule by the House Rules Committee.

The Truth-In-Lending Bill is urgently needed, and there will be Republican support for it in the House as in the Senate. As reported out of committee, however, the legislation would not touch upon the tremendous problem of loan-sharking.

I wish to announce that Republicans will offer an amendment to the Truth-In-Lending Bill to give additional protection to the man who has to borrow money. Our amendment will zero in on the lending of money at illegally high rates of interest. It will unleash federal agents in a drive to rid the country of the scourge of loan-sharking and to weaken the financial underpinnings of organized crime.

It seems safe to predict that the House will overwhelmingly approve this amendment. There now is no federal loan-sharking statute on the books.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican loan-sharking amendment has been carefully prepared by Rep. William B. Widnall, senior Republican on the Banking and Currency Committee, and Rep. Richard H. Poff, member of the Judiciary Committee and chairman of the House Republican Task Force on Crime.

(more)

The loan-sharking proposal first was offered in a bill introduced last December by all members of the Task Force, the senior Republican on the Judiciary Committee, Rep. William M. McCulloch, and me.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican amendment to the Truth-In-Lending Bill would make it a violation of federal law for anyone to lend money at illegal rates of interest. The interest rate involved would be deemed illegal whenever it exceeded the rate permitted in a particular state. Federal penalties of a \$10,000 fine or 10 years in jail would apply whenever such a loan interfered with or affected interstate commerce, or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collecting the loan or interest on it crossed state lines.


Mr. Speaker, evidence of the infiltration of Wall Street by loan sharks and mobsters underscores the urgency of immediate action to bring the full force of federal investigative power into play against loan-sharking and all it entails.

Mr. Speaker, the House Republican Task Force on Crime has spent months in preparing this loan-sharking legislation. The legislation resulting from this group's efforts deserves the careful consideration of the House. The loan-sharking amendment merits ringing endorsement.

#

Distribution: Full, 10:10 a.m., 1/29/68

Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
January 29, 1968

President Johnson is overcommitting the American people in his 1969 budget.

He is trying to do too much domestically at a time when the Nation is sorely overburdened by the Vietnam War and the people are shouldering a growing tax load at the state and local levels.

This is the fifth Johnson budget which fails to set spending priorities. That is a mistake. We can move this country ahead even in time of war, but we should do it without pushing the country to the edge of bankruptcy. This budget must be reduced.

President Johnson says he wants to fight inflation but he is going off in all directions at once. He talks of taxing more to fight inflation but at the same time he seeks to spend more. There is no joy for the taxpayer in the President's budget and not much reassurance for the Nation. America deserves a better deal.


The better way to fight inflation and high interest rates is to use restraint in federal spending. There is no belt-tightening in this budget--the kind we need to avoid a tax increase.

Johnson uses the old theme that every bit of his \$10.4 billion spending increase is unavoidable and that his budget can't be cut. That's absurd and incredible. He said the same about his 1968 budget, yet Congress reduced it substantially. Small wonder the American people just don't believe this Administration any more. That's the kind of presidential talk that dug and then widened the credibility gap.

Nowhere in this budget is there an attempt to re-tailor federal programs and raise the level of efficiency in the federal government.

This is an unbelievable budget.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Office Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
February 1, 1968

President Johnson declares in his 1968 Economic Report issued today: "Now... restraint is essential to our economic health." I could not agree with him more.

The question is what kind of restraint.

The President proposes to increase federal spending by \$10.4 billion in fiscal 1969, to tax the American people an additional \$12 billion, to incur a fiscal 1969 deficit of \$20 to \$30 billion without an income tax increase and an \$8 to \$15 billion deficit with one. Where is the restraint?

The President says in his Economic Report: "Sharply rising Federal spending was a strong expansionary force in the economy between mid-1965 and mid-1967." He says nothing about the fact that the steep climb in Federal spending during that period was an inflationary force. He says nothing about the fact that Federal spending should have been sharply reduced beginning in late 1965 and early 1966 because the economy had become over-heated and a price rise spiral had been touched off by the Administration's over-expansionary policies.

Some of the current observations in the President's Economic Report are clearly more accurate than his review of the past. He states that "because of the already high level of defense outlays, total Federal expenditures are too large to be piled on top of private normal demand without overheating our economy. It is because private demand has now returned to normal after its temporary weakness that we now need new measures of fiscal restraint."

I agree with the President that the total expenditures he proposes for fiscal 1969 are too huge to be piled on top of private spending. His proposed budget clearly is inflationary and must be substantially reduced.

The President describes demand in the private sector as "normal." We certainly do not need an income tax increase to dampen normal demand. In fact, leading economists are predicting that the economy will slow down after mid-year without a tax increase.


The following conclusion is inescapable from the President's own Economic Report: The first place that restraint must be applied if the economy is to be restored to health is in the federal government--in the White House itself.

I applaud the President's appeal for wage and price restraint on the part of labor and management. I believe he would be more successful in such efforts if he himself would demonstrate a sense of responsibility through genuine restraint in federal spending.

#

*Distribution: 11:15 a.m., 2/5/68
Full*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
February 5, 1968

The Johnson Administration apparently is getting ready to "confess" to North Korea that the Navy intelligence vessel, the Pueblo, intruded into North Korean territorial waters.

This comes as a shock to members of Congress who have relied upon earlier statements by the Administration and by our ambassador to the United Nations, Arthur J. Goldberg, flatly asserting that the Pueblo had not intruded upon the territorial waters of North Korea.

What is the truth? Members of Congress have called for a full congressional investigation of the Pueblo affair. A congressional investigation must include testimony by the skipper of the Pueblo and the members of the crew upon their release. This apparently is the only way the Congress can learn the truth about the course of the Pueblo.

The explanations given by Secretary of Defense McNamara for the lack of protection and lack of U.S. response to the North Korean seizure of the Pueblo indicates that capture of other U.S. intelligence ships by fifth-rate Communist powers could become almost an everyday occurrence.

Such an explanation for the lack of protection for the Pueblo and lack of resistance to capture demands a thoroughgoing review and overhaul of our policy regarding operation of U.S. spy ships.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District Special
Radio & TV*

2/2/68 and 2/5/68

M Office Copy

FOR USE WEDNESDAY, FEB. 7, 1968, AND THEREAFTER--

Rep. Gerald R. Ford today announced Army plans for renovating the Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station at Fort Wayne and ultimately locating it in Detroit's projected new federal building.

Brig. Gen. Frank L. Gunn, commanding officer of the Army Recruiting Command, informed Ford that renovation of the existing quarters for the station will begin early next month. The work will start, he said, immediately after an Air Force Recruiting Detachment now sharing a Fort Wayne building with the Army is moved out.

Longrange plans, Gen. Gunn told Ford, are to relocate the examining station in the new Detroit federal building in 1972.

In a letter to Ford, Gen. Gunn said: "This headquarters is aware of the undesirable condition of the buildings at the Detroit Armed Forces Examining and Entrance Station, and all possible action is being taken to make the best use of the facility until a better one can be provided."

Gen. Gunn said the interior of the Fort Wayne building will be painted and window air conditioning units will be installed so that windows will not have to be opened for ventilation.

Mothers of Grand Rapids area men receiving pre-induction physical examinations at Fort Wayne had complained that their sons were exposed to the cold while waiting to be examined.

They also had complained that personnel handling the inductees had sworn at their sons.

Gen. Gunn asserted: "The policy of this command is that all examinees processed through the Detroit AFEES, or any other one of the 74 AFEES's throughout the Continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii and Puerto Rico, will be treated with dignity and consideration and their rights as examinees will be observed. Known violations are promptly dealt with."

Ford commented: "It appears that the Grand Rapids area complaints which I have brought to Gen. Gunn's attention have really produced results. I am pleased that corrective action is being taken. It is a wrenching experience for a young man to be taken into the military from civilian life. As Gen. Gunn has said, the least we can expect is that he be treated with respect and consideration."

#



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 90th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 114

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, FEBRUARY 8, 1968

No. 19

CRIME IN AMERICA AND THE REPUBLICAN ANSWER

A Report to the American People

Mr. GERALD R. POFF, Mr. Speaker, earlier this afternoon, the distinguished ranking minority member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), made some excellent observations concerning the President's crime message and the recommendations contained therein. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) has been informed of the special order taken by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. Poff) and he does know the sentiments that will be expressed in general by Members of the committee and Members of the Republican task force. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch), who has had great experience in the field, is cosponsor of a number of the Republican bills which will be discussed. His leadership has contributed greatly to the overall Republican effort in this field.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the President sent his message on crime to the Congress. He told the Congress that—

Thousands of Americans are killed or injured each year by criminal acts. Many thousands more are unable to use the streets of their cities without fear, or to feel secure in their homes or shops.

Property valued at almost \$4 billion is lost through crime every year. Millions of dollars are taken from the productive economy by organized racketeers—money that should be in the pockets of the poor, or in the bank accounts of honest businessmen.

For decades our system of criminal justice has been neglected.

For decades the conditions that nourish crime have been gathering force.

Republicans ask the President why he has waited until now to take action? We ask why he has ignored the findings and recommendations of his own Crime Commission until now?

I think that every Member of Congress knows that crime is our No. 1 domestic problem. The fact and fear of crime stalks our Nation. Since 1960 the reported rate of crime has increased over 88 percent. This alarming increase cannot be attributed to population growth, which has increased only 10 percent since 1960.

Republicans believe that the administration must account to the Nation for these figures. All levels of government—

local, State, and National—share responsibility for the safety of our Nation.

Control and prevention of crime is not solely a responsibility of government. In the first and last analysis it is the responsibility of every American. Crime cannot and will not be controlled without the support and assistance of all responsible citizens. Americans need effective and sustained leadership to mobilize and properly channel their concern into constructive effort. The greatest failure of the Johnson administration is its failure to provide Americans with this much needed leadership. No program can fill a leadership gap.

Republicans welcome the President's pledge to fight crime. But we express both disappointment and concern over inadequacies of the President's proposed program. The President has failed to fully recognize the problems of crime in America and effectively respond to the challenge. His proposed program is much like a prize fighter with dazzling foot work, but no punch.

I am concerned that an analysis will show that the President has given the Nation a political document and not a much needed plan for national action.

Crime must be brought under control and substantially reduced. The Republican Party is committed to solving this problem which each year grows as a deepening crisis. While the Johnson administration slept, Republicans have developed and introduced specific legislative proposals designed to control and prevent crime and lawlessness. I believe these Republican proposals offer great promise for alleviating the problems of crime.

Indeed, the fact that the President has recommended the enactment of two proposals which were developed, drafted, introduced, and overwhelmingly supported by House Republicans—the Cramer antiriot bill and the Rallsback appeals bill—is but a sampling of the commitment and ability within our party to solve this problem of crime.

Others from our side of the aisle will discuss other instances where Republican leadership has substantially improved administration antirime legislation in this and previous Congresses.

I thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding to me.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.


Recognizing the hour, Mr. Speaker, I shall be as brief as the subject will permit.

I believe it is fair to say that insofar as the President's crime message delivered to the Congress yesterday is an indication that he not only is concerned about but also that he finally means to do something about the problem of crime in this country, all Republicans will welcome the message.

Until now I think it is further fair to say that the administration has been content to rely principally upon oration and outrage. The legislative measures that have been proposed have been until now too few, too narrow, and too slow in coming. It is apparent that there has been some change in the climate now and with it hopefully a recognition that what has been offered so far has been inappropriate and inadequate to meet the challenge. I suggest that it is too early to attempt to make a definitive analysis of the President's proposal. We do not attempt to assume either a negative posture or positive posture with respect to the specific proposals itemized by the President. What we do mean to make plain now is that the sense of urgency conveyed by the entire message cannot help but produce the priority treatment of crime measures which is so urgently needed in the Congress this year. This is all to the good. Whatever the motives behind the President's new posture, the end result will benefit all Americans. By embracing some Republican ideas he has at the very least laid a predicate for a meaningful dialog on an issue that troubles every thoughtful American regardless of party.

Those who heard the President's message and who had an opportunity to read it since recognize, I think, its distinct Republican flavor. It contained much of Republican origination and Republican orientation. Of the 22 proposals specifically explained by the President, four have such a Republican orientation. The immunity legislation which the President called upon the Congress to enact is legislation previously endorsed by the

(more)



Republican task force on crime. I might add it was urgently proposed by the President's own Crime Commission several months ago.

Second, as has been indicated already, the legislation which passed the House last year making it possible for the Government to take an appeal on a motion to suppress evidence or confessions was legislation offered by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

Again I think it is important to remember that it was the distinguished minority leader who first in the January 1966 Republican state of the Union message suggested that a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice would make a proper shop for the conduct of basic research in new techniques in law enforcement and in prisoner rehabilitation. The President in his message adopted the essence of that suggestion and then went forward to suggest an expansion of the program currently conducted in this area by the FBI at Quantico.

Finally, and most conspicuously, the President has called now for the adoption of an antiriot bill. Those who have observed the Congress will recall the chronology of this legislation. It was first proposed as an amendment to the Civil Rights Act of 1966 by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER). That amendment was adopted in the face of a substitute by an overwhelming vote.

And, as all will recall the legislation, after it passed the House, went to the other body where it died that year. I think the date upon which the bill was debated is significant. That date was July 19, 1967. And, in order to demonstrate that the President's recommendation of the antiriot bill is something of a new approach insofar as the administration is concerned, I think it is well to remember that the distinguished chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives during the course of that debate, made it plain at that time that the Attorney General of the United States, the chief law-enforcement officer of the United States, a member of the President's Cabinet, was opposed to the antiriot bill. In order, Mr. Speaker, that this may be made crystal clear, I would like to quote from the daily CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 19, 1967, at page H9940 a portion of the statement made by the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of the House of Representatives, the gentleman from New York (Mr. CLEGG). He stated in part as follows:

The distinguished Attorney General on "Meet The Press" last Sunday said he was opposed to this bill . . . And in the conversation that I had with the Attorney General in my office yesterday he repeated to me that he was opposed to the bill.

Mr. Speaker, "yesterday" would have been July 18. July 18 was 4 days after the first outbreak of the Newark riots and, now, some several months later, for the first time the President is recommending the adoption of antiriot legislation.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I shall be happy to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio.

(Mr. TAFT asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAFT. Mr. Speaker, while I was not serving in the Congress of the United States at the time of the original hearings which were held on the anti-riot proposal of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CRAMER), I wonder if I am not correct in my recollection of the hearings that were held at that time, and out of which this bill grew, relating to the interstate activities of the Ku Klux Klan and other organizations of that type, which were repeated over and over again by the various witnesses who appeared before the Committee on the Judiciary?

Mr. POFF. In very large measure that is true. And, the author of the amendment, during the course of the debate, was careful to call attention to the fact that it was aimed at such activities; that it had a broad application; it had a worthy application then as it has a worthy application now. And, the startling thing is that the President of the United States has only recently become aware of the merits of such application.

Mr. Speaker, if I may continue for just a moment, while I say it might be premature to make an analysis of certain proposals in the President's message, it would be appropriate to take note of some of the omissions in the President's message.

Last year the Republican task force on crime proposed a series of bills and endorsed other bills in the general law enforcement area to most of which the President made no reference. I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to extend at this point in the Record an excerpt from the report of the task force.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWT). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The excerpts referred to follow:

I. ORGANIZED CRIME

1. *Electronic surveillance*—a bill which outlaws all wiretapping and electronic eavesdropping except by law enforcement officials under Court approval and continuing Court supervision during national security investigations and investigations of certain organized crime type cases. The Task Force believes that enactment of this legislation would be the single most important step in combatting organized crime. The McCulloch-Ford bill (H.R. 13275, October 3, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force, follows the blue-print for such legislation fashioned by the Supreme Court in the *Berger* case.

2. *Witness immunity*—a bill to expand the power of the Government to compel the testimony of hostile witnesses by granting them immunity from prosecution when they plead the Fifth Amendment during the investigation and during the trial of certain organized crime cases. Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act (H.R. 11267, June 29, 1967), co-sponsored by the Task Force contains this provision.

3. *Loan-sharking*—a bill (H.R. 14373, December 11, 1967) which would make it a federal crime to lend money at rates of interest prohibited by State law whenever such a loan interferes with or affects interstate commerce or whenever any part of the loan transaction or efforts at collection cross State lines. In addition to the Chairman and members of the Task Force, this bill is sponsored by the Minority leader, the ranking Minority member of the Committee on

Banking and Currency and the ranking Minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary.

4. *Obstruction of investigation*—a bill which would make it a federal crime to interfere with or obstruct investigations by federal agents by the intimidation of potential witnesses. Legislation of this nature was passed by the Congress and enacted into law during the First Session. It was first proposed by Rep. William Cramer (R-Fla.), a Task Force member, in 1960, and is contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

5. *Felony statements*—a bill which makes the rules of evidence in perjury prosecutions less rigid and more realistic. This is contained in Title II of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act and was recommended by the Katzenbach Crime Commission.

6. *Profits from Criminal activities*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has been earned from illegal racket activities in legitimate businesses. This is the Criminal Activities Profits Act (H.R. 11268, June 29, 1967) co-sponsored by the Task Force.

7. *Funds unreported for tax purposes*—a bill which makes it a federal crime to invest money which has not been reported for income tax purposes in legitimate businesses. This is H.R. 11269, co-sponsored by the Task Force, and principally aimed at organized crime.

8. *Joint Congressional Committee on Organized Crime*—a bill creating a permanent bi-partisan Committee of both Houses of Congress to investigate organized crime and report its extent, impact and effect to the American public. This is H.R. 9054, first proposed by Rep. Cramer.

II. INVESTIGATIONS AND PRETRIAL PROCEDURES

1. *Motions to suppress*—a bill creating in the Government a limited right to appeal to a higher Court the granting of a defendant's motion to suppress confessions and other evidence. H.R. 8684, proposed by Rep. Thomas Rallsback (R-Ill.), a member of the Task Force, is such a bill and such a provision is contained in Title I of the Task Force sponsored Criminal Procedures Revision Act. The bill has passed the House.

2. *Searches incident to arrests*—a bill to codify, and make less confusing, the existing law of search and seizure where lawful arrests are involved. Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act contains a provision to this effect.

3. *Searches pursuant to warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants for property which constitutes evidence of the offense in connection with which the warrant is issued. This is in conformity with a recent Supreme Court decision (*Warden v. Hayden*). It is the subject of H.R. 8653, proposed by Rep. Rallsback, and contained in Title I of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act.

4. *Execution of search warrants*—a bill to permit the issuance of search warrants authorizing the officer executing it to enter the place to be searched without announcing his identity and purpose where the Judge or Commissioner has determined that physical evidence sought is likely to be destroyed or when danger to the officer exists. This is one of the provisions of the Criminal Procedures Revision Act, patterned after H.R. 8652, sponsored by Rep. Rallsback.

III. THE POLICE

1. *Survivorship and disability benefits*—a proposal to provide Federal survivorship and disability benefits for local police and non-federal law enforcement officers who are killed or injured while assisting federal officers in the apprehension of, for example, bank robbers, kidnapers and AWOL military personnel. The Survivorship Program originally proposed was broadened to include a disability program in a bill introduced by Chairman Poff and endorsed by the Task

(over)

force. This legislation passed the House this year.

IV. THE COURTS

1. *Bail reform*—a proposal to re-examine and amend the Bail Reform Act of 1966 to allow the Courts more discretion in granting or denying release on personal recognizance to defendants who are found to be a danger to the community or in revoking the release of those who have committed other crimes after release.

2. *Federal Magistrates*—a bill to abolish the present U.S. Commissioner system and to replace it with a lower-tier of judicial officers, U.S. Magistrates, who are empowered to handle minor trials and otherwise perform routine Court functions that presently occupy the time of Federal judges that ought to be devoted to more serious matters. S. 945, proposed by Senator Tydings (D-Md.) and Scott (R-Pa.) is such a bill.

V. DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

1. *The District Anti-Crime bill*—an omnibus anti-crime bill dealing with special law enforcement proposals for the District of Columbia. H.R. 10783 passed the House on June 26, 1967, by a vote of 355 to 14.

2. *Appropriations and personnel*—proposals to increase the authorized strength of the District of Columbia Police Department, to increase the staff of the District Ball Agency and to provide for personnel to supervise the activities of defendants released on personal recognizance prior to trial.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, these bills, we think, enjoyed a large measure of support from every echelon of Government and the entire community which deals with the problem of criminal justice in America. The subjects they address include the prevention of crime, methods of apprehension, arrest, interrogation and prosecution of the suspect, and rehabilitation of the convicted criminal.

We suggest that the President and his advisers will want to examine this list of bills and hopefully give bipartisan support to those which they consider meritorious.

Further omissions in the President's message, I believe, should be underscored. First of all I was disappointed to learn that the President did not take the opportunity to endorse the legislation which passed the House last year on June 6, 1967. That legislation originally was known as the safe streets bill; finally under amendment in committee it became known as the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Act. The President did recommend again the passage of the safe streets bill, but seemed anxious to insist that the bill which is passed by the Congress be the bill which he proposed to the Congress.

The Republican amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], we believe, made a significant improvement in the legislation, and we trust that the president will see fit to lend his endorsement and pronounce his endorsement in the other body.

At that point I believe parenthetically it should be said that we Republicans agree with the President when he makes the point that essentially law enforcement is a responsibility of State and local governments. And we do agree, because we share the concern of all thoughtful people that too much concentration of too much power at the Federal level of government tends toward the development of a national police state, and all

patriotic Americans abhor that possibility. It was because we have such fears that the Cahill amendment was attached to the safe streets bill.

The original safe streets bill, the Members will recall, vested complete authority in the Attorney General of the United States to administer the funds authorized and appropriated by the Congress under this legislation, and to allocate money among the several States, or communities in the States, as he in his sole discretion saw fit.

The Cahill amendment, on the other hand, conceived with a block-grant approach, returned primary control of the funds and operation of the program to the State and local authorities where it belonged.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I wish to subscribe to and endorse the most excellent summary made by the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, regarding the law enforcement and criminal justice assistance act passed by the House of Representatives in August of last year. I am sure the gentleman joins with me in deploring the fact that this excellent legislation, commended by the National Association of Attorneys General, by virtually all agencies concerned with law enforcement and criminal justice, this excellent House bill, has languished without effective action in the U.S. Senate.

One further point I deem it most important to make here: I regret that the President in his crime message has charted a course of retreat in support for local and State law enforcement, and criminal justice instrumentalities.

The President a year ago in February of 1967 indicated in his crime message to the Congress of that date that—

Our best estimate is that the federal investment under this act—

The Crime Control Act—

in its second year would be approximately \$100 million.

Then Attorney General Ramsey Clark, in testimony on March 15 of 1967, before the House Committee on the Judiciary, said:

For fiscal year 1969 \$300 million will be asked to commence a sweeping action program.

It was with great disappointment that I found the President in his state of the Union message and again in his crime message retreating from \$300 million to \$100 million in his recommended support of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act for its second year; namely, fiscal year 1969.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his most meaningful contribution.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GERALD R. FORD. Let me say most emphatically that certainly the country is the beneficiary because the Republican task force on crime is headed by the gentleman from Virginia, I, and my colleagues, are grateful for his

many contributions and his leadership.

I also would like to add, I am now reliably informed that 49 of the 50 Governors have endorsed the House version of the anticrime bill that was passed in 1967. This is the legislation which grew out of the Cahill amendments to the committee bill. This endorsement by 49 out of our 50 Governors should insure the support of the administration for this legislation.

Mr. POFF. The gentleman has anticipated my speech and put it infinitely more eloquently than I could.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MacGREGOR. I would like to give credit at this time to some of the very able supporters of the efforts and leadership of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL], specifically to Republican Congressman Biester of Pennsylvania, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. RALPH RACK], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. McCloskey], who were the prime architects in supporting the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. CAHILL] in developing and gaining wide support from Republicans and Democrats alike for the excellent Law Enforcement Assistance Act of 1967.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. TAFT. I would like to ask the gentleman a question with regard to the Law Enforcement Assistance Act—or, if you want to call it, the safe streets bill. I think there may be a lack of understanding as to the impact of this bill.

The impact of this bill, as I understand it, is one of funds—the funds that go to the training of law enforcement officers; how those funds are distributed, and how they can be most effective.

I certainly share the gentleman's assessment of the Cahill amendment and the direction that we hope any final legislation will take.

I think there is in the minds of the public a concept that there is something over and beyond mere assistance in the financing of police training and other law enforcement activities and research. I think we should point out that the very guts of the bill is what we are talking about here.

This is the impact of the bill. There is no special activity or special magic that the Federal Government brings to this situation.

Mr. POFF. I am glad the gentleman has brought out that point. All those who are knowledgeable in the field agree, and this includes the President's own crime commission, that the chief need is improved training and better and more police officers at the State and local levels. This is exactly the target of this legislation.

Continuing now, if I may briefly, Mr. Speaker, to comment upon the more conspicuous omissions in the President's crime message, a similar amendment to that just discussed was offered to the Juvenile Delinquency Act adopted in the House last year and again that amendment was of Republican origin.

I hope that the President did not mean, be anything that he said in his message, to disavow or reject that amendment to

(more)



that legislation.

"Another measure that the President did not mention is the amendment adopted by an overwhelming vote by the House only last week while the House was debating the truth-in-lending bill.

That amendment, as you will recall, was aimed at organized crime involvement in the nefarious practice of loan sharking.

I am hopeful that the President's failure to mention this amendment was intended to indicate his support of that amendment.

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I would like to bring to the attention of the House that it was through the efforts of the gentleman in the well that the amendment which make loan sharking a Federal crime was added to the truth-in-lending bill. I think that this was an activity for the great benefit of the United States, that the gentleman in the well perfected this amendment to make loan sharking a Federal crime, and secured its attachment to the truth-in-lending bill.

I am interested to note that the President in his message said:

Organized crime is big business in America.

I think this is something that Republicans in this House and the Republican task force on crime have been saying loudly and clearly for some time. He went on to say that—

Its sinister effect pervades too many corners of America today—through gambling, loan sharking, corruption, extortion, and large movement of narcotics.

I am hopeful also, with the gentleman in the well, that the President's omission to say anything about specific legislation in regard to loan sharking indicates that he will support the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman for his kind comments.

May I reciprocate by saying how fortunate the task force is to have a member with the distinguished background that he has enjoyed at the bar and on the bench.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I saw some consternation on the faces of those who remain as I walked in with these eggs. I want to assure you I am not planning to pelt anyone with them. I would like, rather, to pass out some bouquets to the chairman of our crime task force, who has been tirelessly and thoughtfully exploring the scope of this issue, which is so important to the American people.

This task force has been working hard for a long time, and I am proud to have been a member of it. I think it will continue to work hard for some time to come. While this is not a partisan issue, it is an issue of the people—really the people's greatest issue. It certainly is the kind of issue that should have the attention of us all, regardless of party, regardless of our particular concerns in this field.

I think we all welcomed the President's message this week. We welcomed the assessment of this very shrewd politician that this is a major issue. We welcomed an indication that he was putting the prestige of his office behind a leadership posture which would be more constructive in the reduction of this issue and the reduction of the terrible concerns of the American people for the safety of the streets.

I was pleased to note the President's comments about the so-called safe streets bill and his hope that the Congress would address itself to a resolution of the impasse which resulted from the Senate's unwillingness to accept the House version, at least as it appears to the present time. I know that with the weight of the President behind a resolution of this impasse, we are going to make some progress, progress that is desperately needed.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that the President's message and his great emphasis on the fact that the Attorney General is the man to call if one is concerned about crime indicates also that we will find a new vigor in the expressed attitudes of the Attorney General toward the problems of organized crime, particularly in the wiretapping area. Many of us have been concerned about where we were headed there. Certainly, organized crime is one very legitimate concern of the Federal Government.

It involves a network, a countrywide network, and one which is interstate commerce of the most nefarious sort.

We look forward to some new approaches, to some new vigor in the fight against organized crime, if the President's message means what we all hope it does, because in the final analysis, this battle cannot be fought with words. It has to be fought with leadership of the highest order, it has to be fought with determination, and it has to be fought by all sides of our political system, by all parts of our Government.

I know the Republican task force on crime will indicate its efforts and its best thought to continuing the battle we have now been fighting for a year, in cooperation with the President if possible, but, regardless of partisanship and regardless of the possibilities of cooperation, at least to the fullest extent of our capabilities.

Mr. Speaker, again I commend the speaker in the well for the remarkable contributions he has made, for his diligence, for his thoughtfulness, and for the leadership he has given to our task force.

Mr. POFF. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman.

I know all on the task force agree with me when I say that the gentleman brings a great reservoir of talent to our efforts.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CONABLE. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest that the gentleman from Mississippi would be welcome on the Republican task force on crime. He has only to make one modest change.

Mr. Speaker, we all appreciate the character of the gentleman's contributions to the fight against crime.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, will

the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. MacGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, today a clergyman from St. Paul, Minn., visited me in my office. He is one of a number of Minnesota clergymen who has made a commitment to do more in the contest against the growing incidents of juvenile delinquency both in his city and in the State of Minnesota.

He commended me on my appearance a week ago Friday night at Macalester College in St. Paul as the final banquet speaker at a meeting of clergy and laymen concerned about juvenile delinquency.

I gave him a copy of the President's crime message of yesterday. He sat in my office while I was on a long distance telephone call, and read from the message, and later quoted to me the following words of the President of the United States:

I propose the passage of the Juvenile Delinquency Prevention Act.

This clergyman said to me: "Congressman, do you think it will pass?" I said: "It already has passed the House of Representatives, in September of last year. To be sure the House in its wisdom rewrote the bill recommended by the administration. It tailored the bill to the Republican philosophy of the proper role for the Federal Government in the fight against juvenile delinquency, and it passed the House of Representatives by an overwhelming majority." The clergyman look at me and said: "I find no reference to that fact in the President's message. Could you tell me why?" I said: "Sir, you have not addressed your question to the right party. I cannot look into the mind of another man."

I said: "I will make available to you the full text of the bill as passed by the House in September of last year, the bill which will make a meaningful contribution to the fight against juvenile delinquency, which will do so in a proper and most humanitarian way. I will also send you a copy of the debate in the House of Representatives, so that you may understand the reasons for the rejection by the House of Representatives of the administration recommendations and the adoption of those put forward under the leadership of individual Republican Congressmen serving in the House."

He said: "I hope you will. Is it not too bad that you do not have a voice equal to that of the occupant of 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue, so that the entire country would understand that excellent progress legislatively in the Congress has already been made on this problem of juvenile delinquency prevention?"

Hopefully, Mr. Speaker, attention can eventually be drawn to the impasse which exists in the U.S. Senate, and whatever reasons there may be for the delay, that those reasons will disappear, and inaction will end and action will take place in our other Chamber across the other side of this building.

All Americans deeply concerned about the growing rise of crime and juvenile delinquency should indeed be demanding that our sister Chamber take the same sort of constructive action which was taken here in the House of Representatives last August and last September.

(over)

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman.

Before I conclude I should like to say that the thing in the President's message which disappointed me most was his insistence once again upon the wiretap bill which he first proposed. As the Members of this body will recall, the President would permit wiretaps for the gathering of evidence only in national security cases, and he would decide or allow the appropriate authorities of the Executive establishment to decide when the national security was involved and what constituted national security cases.

The legislation which the task force has endorsed, which has been introduced in this body and in the other body, would permit wiretapping only in those cases where the law-enforcement officer was able to convince an appropriate judge that the evidence could not be acquired by other techniques, to convince the judge that a crime had been committed or was being committed, to convince the judge that a court order was necessary to acquire evidence of a crime specifically named in the legislation.

Legislation of this kind has received almost universal endorsement. The concept enjoys the approval of the three previous Attorneys General, of the Judicial Conference of the United States, of the majority of the President's own Crime Commission, and of every national law enforcement association in the United States which has pronounced upon the subject.

The Attorney General of the United States today stands almost alone in his opposition to that legislation.

The urgency of that legislation is greater today than it was before Monday of last week. On that day the Supreme Court rendered two decisions which jointly had the effect of nullifying the utility of the gambling tax statutes under which so many of the organized criminals of this country have been brought to the bar of justice. Now that law enforcement officers are stripped of that means of assembling evidence it is all the more important that this carefully devised legislation be considered promptly and favorably by both Houses of the Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I am encouraged to hope that the President will have the opportunity during this session of Congress to receive on his desk a bill which will incorporate as one of its essential features the legislation introduced by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. McCulloch) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. GENALD R. FORD), and a number of other Members on this side of the aisle. If such legislation is a part of the bill before the President, I believe he will see fit to sign it. I cannot believe that the President could bring himself in the present state of things to veto such legislation. With that thought in mind, I trust that our committees in both the House and the other body will move promptly.

Mr. SMITH of New York, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POFF. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. SMITH of New York. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I must agree with the gentleman that I could not see the President bring himself to veto that kind

of legislation when he reaffirmed again the statement he made last year, in his message about crime this year, in which he said:

Public order is the first business of Government.

Mr. POFF. I thank the gentleman and my colleagues for their patience.

Mr. RHODES of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, we welcome President's Johnson's support in what we hope will be an all-out effort to combat and control crime. The need for such an effort has been carefully documented. Each day brings new statistics that show a skyrocketing rise in crime. Each day brings fresh evidence that something must be done to reverse the alarming trend toward lawlessness.

One of the primary duties of Government is to establish and maintain law and order. Our very survival as a free and effective society depends upon how successfully we are able to implement this basic concept.

In the first session of the 90th Congress, Republicans sponsored and supported legislation that must be enacted if we are to win the battle against crime. A bill that would establish a Federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies was passed by the House with the overwhelming support of the Republican Members. Similarly, a Republican-sponsored bill that would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in, or using the facilities of, interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot, was also passed by the House.

Unfortunately, this essential legislation was not adopted by the Senate during the first session. We are hopeful that, with the new-found interest and support of the President, this legislation can be enacted into law without further delay.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD at this point the House Republican policy committee statements of July 12, 1967, and August 2, 1967, that deal with this important legislation. As chairman of the policy committee, I believe that these statements carefully set forth the need for this legislation and the reasons we urge its early enactment.

The statements referred to follow:

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE ANTI-RIOT LEGISLATION, H.R. 421, JULY 12, 1967

The House Republican Policy Committee urges the prompt enactment of H.R. 421. This Republican sponsored legislation (the Cramer bill) would impose criminal penalties upon persons traveling in or using the facilities of interstate commerce with the intent to incite a riot.

Last year in response to a growing public demand for assistance in maintaining law and order in the streets and urban centers of our land, Republican anti-riot legislation was adopted in the House of Representatives, as an amendment to the proposed Civil Rights Act of 1966, by a vote of 389 to 25. That legislation was permitted to die in the Senate. Now, as a result of continuing pressure and leadership by Republican Members, this vital legislation is being brought to the House Floor as an independent measure.

The proposed legislation represents the legitimate exercise of Federal criminal power under authority based on the commerce clause of the Constitution. Historically, certain types of conduct have been prohibited

by Federal Statute when the facilities of interstate commerce are used. For example, there is the Mann Act, the prohibition against the interstate transportation of strike breakers, the Federal Kidnapping Statute and the Anti-Racketeering Act.

H.R. 421 is not intended to and does not limit the right of dissent and peaceful demonstration. Legitimate activities by those who travel in interstate commerce to participate in public gatherings or other lawful demonstrations are not affected. However, those persons who use facilities in interstate commerce, or who travel from one State to another or from a foreign country to a State, in order to incite or attempt to incite riots, violence, looting, vandalism, arson, bombing, and physical assaults would be subject to prosecution.

This bill would supplement, not supersede local law enforcement. Certainly the most effective means of riot control rests with the State and local police. However, by assuring Federal jurisdiction over "out-of-State" inciters, State and local authorities will be substantially assisted in keeping the peace and protecting the public safety.

H.R. 421 would provide a new and effective law-enforcement weapon in riot situations like those that have occurred in Cleveland, Cincinnati, Dayton, Boston, Buffalo, and Waterloo. Many of the summertime riots have been traced to troublemakers who travel about this Nation inciting riots. It is imperative that we rid interstate commerce of these agitators and riot-mongers. The law-abiding citizens in the area where the riots occur may suffer grievous personal injury and untold property damage unless this additional protection is afforded them.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN POLICY COMMITTEE STATEMENT ON THE LAW ENFORCEMENT AND CRIMINAL JUSTICE ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1967, H.R. 5037, AUGUST 2, 1967

The events of recent weeks have starkly dramatized the crisis in law enforcement in this country. The very ability of government to maintain law and order and to provide personal safety has been challenged. Local law enforcement, criminal justice, techniques of correction and rehabilitation must be updated and improved.

H.R. 5037, the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act of 1967, properly amended, could be an important step in the establishment of a federal program to provide assistance to local law enforcement agencies. Unfortunately, the Administration bill that was originally submitted contained the standard Great Society formula. It stifled local initiative and direction and placed maximum federal control in the hands of the Attorney General.

In an effort to improve the bill, the Republican Members of the Judiciary Committee obtained a number of amendments. For example:

(a) An appropriate judicial review is provided in cases where the Attorney General cuts off funds.

(b) Congressional oversight on the operation of the data bank has been established.

(c) The open-end authorization was eliminated, thereby insuring essential legislative review of this Act.

(d) The direct Federal payment of regular police salaries has been banned.

The present emergency demands that meaningful and appropriate Federal assistance be given to state and local law enforcement agencies. However, this crisis must not be used as a vehicle to place Federal control over state and local police administration and to lay the foundation for a centralized Federal police force. Therefore, additional and essential safeguards on the broad powers of the Federal Administrator should be adopted.

Law enforcement and criminal justice administration are primarily local responsibilities. Crime is essentially a local problem

(more)

that must be dealt with by state and local governments. Even the Attorney General has stated, "We would hope to have all the States really working for a fully comprehensive plan for the State." Any provision or measure that would upset or reverse this historic concept must be avoided. The recent riots have reemphasized the basic fact that the State and its designated agencies must have the primary responsibility for coordinating the law enforcement effort within a state. Certainly, experience under the "poverty" program has demonstrated that failure to coordinate Federal activities with state activities creates serious financial and administrative problems.

In a letter dated June 8, 1967, the National Governors' Conference noted that "the state holds the primary responsibility for establishing the coordinating machinery needed for intergovernmental assistance programs." It was then suggested that H.R. 5037 be amended so that where a state has a plan for an appropriately balanced distribution of aid to local law enforcement activities, the Attorney General shall make all grants to the state agency designated by the Governor to administer such plan. On July 18, 1967, Governor Nelson A. Rockefeller also urged the adoption of an amendment that would "assure that the State can effectively coordinate application for assistance." Governor Rockefeller pointed out, "If comprehensive crime control envisioned by H.R. 5037 is to be effective, it is essential that the legislation recognize the primary role of the State, especially in developing a statewide comprehensive plan."

We support an amendment of this type. We believe it will provide essential state coordination and eliminate the Federal Government's power to dominate and control local law enforcement. We reject the Democratic Majority's contention that "... the Attorney General should have the maximum discretion in promulgating regulations and in administering the authorized programs to determine the population size that would be most appropriate for participation in the light of all considerations relevant to the particular programs."

We believe that an appropriate allocation formula should be adopted. In the present bill, the only limitation on the Attorney General's discretion to distribute funds, is the prohibition "that not more than 15 percent of the funds appropriated or allocated for any fiscal year to carry out the purposes of this Act shall be used within any one State."

Certainly, there must be a statutory assurance that there will be a meaningful amount of funds available for every State.

We believe that serious consideration should be given to the establishment of a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice which in turn would be authorized to establish regional training institutes. In order to have a real impact on our law enforcement problems, the education and training of law enforcement and criminal justice personnel and research must be emphasized. Improved training of local and state law enforcement personnel in riot prevention, riot suppression and riot control is needed. New techniques for combating organized crime must be developed. These objectives can be accomplished through an Institute similar to the National Institute of Health or the National Academy of Science. Moreover, the improved methods for crime detection, prevention, prosecution, and rehabilitation can be developed and taught in this manner without the danger of domination by the Federal Government.

Mr. McCLODY. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, as I stood before this House, I praised certain portions of the President's message on crime. Indeed, I do find much to commend in the President's recommendations, particularly those regarding a National Institute of Law En-

forcement and Criminal Justice. If created, it could conduct research into the application of advanced scientific and technological devices for improving law enforcement, as well as for improving police training and education at Federal, State, and local levels. However, at the risk of sounding self-laudatory, I wish to remind the President—and the public—that such proposals were first put forward by Members of this House and were embodied in the substitute amendment which I offered to title III of the omnibus anticrime bill.

In fact, when one examines the President's 22 proposals to "insure public safety," one finds that they consist almost entirely of recommendations previously made by Republican Members, or are a rehash of the administration's past proposals. Careful scrutiny of the President's February 7 message reveals his concurrence with Republican thinking on the crime problem. For example:

The President urges the prompt passage of the Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice Assistance Act—formerly heralded by the misnomer "Safe Streets and Crime Control Act of 1967." I agree that final action should be taken on this bill—a measure which was considerably improved by a series of Republican-offered amendments passed by this House last August.

The President asks for a "major assistance program" for the purposes of educating and training the Nation's law-enforcement personnel, as well as the initiation of a comprehensive research program to be conducted through a National Institute of Law Enforcement and Criminal Justice—virtually the sum and substance of my amendment to title III of the anticrime bill.

The President seeks a \$100 million authorization for the crime bill—an amendment offered by my Republican colleague from Minnesota (Mr. McGARRETT) would have provided an increased authorization.

The President desires controls on the hallucinatory drug, LSD—a measure first suggested by my Republican colleague from Nebraska (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

The President also asks for riot control legislation—legislation which my Republican colleague from Florida (Mr. CRAMER) and many other Republican Members, including myself, have been urging for years.

The President wants to make it a Federal crime "to engage in gambling as a substantial business affecting interstate commerce." I refer him to the legislation first sponsored by my Republican colleague from Virginia (Mr. POFF)—and others—which would accomplish precisely this purpose.

The President wants legislation to permit the Federal Government to appeal pretrial orders granting motions to suppress evidence. I suggest that he examine a bill first introduced last session by my colleague from Illinois (Mr. RAILSBACK).

As you will note, Mr. Speaker, many proposals made in the President's crime message reveal a decidedly Republican attitude on the subject of crime.

If imitation is the sincerest form of flattery, the Republicans modestly ac-

cept the role of pacemakers for the present administration. But we are not "beguiled" nor will the American public be deceived.

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that in this election year of 1968 the President has suddenly awoken to a national crisis in crime.

He is eager to share the blame for this disgraceful crisis.

He implores that it not be made a partisan issue in the forthcoming election.

His wish is understandable! But the escalation of crime in this country is an issue.

Not because anyone makes it an issue. But because the senseless, spiraling, rise of crime in this land has struck fear and frustration into the hearts of the good men and women of this Nation.

It is an issue because the present administration has failed to comprehend and cope with it.

It is an issue and a culpability the administration cannot escape or share.


The people of this county know who was manning the watch when the ship of state ran aground on this rocky shoal.

The President's election year message is a sorry excuse for the dangerous course he has been setting throughout his administration. Every statistic is an indictment of his public stewardship—every line a confession of his failures to preserve to the people even the basic freedom—freedom from the fear of criminal tyranny in the streets of our cities and the homes of our land.

Crime is an issue in 1968, because the President did not make it an issue of his concern in 1967, or 1966, or 1965, or 1964—when all America was crying out for some protection for the honorable and decent citizens against the violent and corrupt criminals who seemed to enjoy unbelievable favor in the administration of justice during these years.

The folly of this foolishness has come home. The day of reckoning is here. That is why crime is an issue, and the President cannot escape it, or wish it away.





CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
March 26, 1968

Master Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

At last we have a high Johnson Administration official telling us what everybody but Lyndon Johnson seems to know. You cannot have both guns and butter when you are fighting a \$30 billion-a-year war.

I wish to commend Undersecretary of the Treasury Joseph W. Barr for his frank testimony Monday before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee in which he said the United States cannot have both guns in Vietnam and butter at home. Barr is honest and forthright, and he certainly should not be "either fired or impeached," as he said he feared he would be for his comments.

Barr also was candid enough to admit what Republicans have pointed to repeatedly as one of the basic causes for our present financial woes--that the Johnson Administration has badly underestimated its military spending. He was frank enough to say that with that kind of military spending we could not reasonably expect to accomplish all of our social welfare goals all at once.

Now we have a fresh widening of the Credibility Gap by the chief spade-wielder himself, President Johnson.

Recently the President talked about initiating an "austerity program" here at home as the answer to the Nation's financial troubles. Yet he repeatedly implies that he really has no plans to hold spending on the home front to the level required if we are to put our fiscal house in order. Last night he told the AFL-CIO he was "not going to sit by" and let his social welfare programs be "torn down in a partisan political election year." If President Johnson's programs are torn down, it will be because he has so badly mismanaged the economy that the dollar has eroded in value and is constantly under attack.

When will the President prove as straightforward as Undersecretary Barr? When will he admit that--as financial writer Joseph F. Slevin puts it--he made a "big miscalculation" in 1966 when he refused either to hold down domestic spending or seek an anti-inflationary tax boost? When will he seriously move to remedy the situation which traces to that big miscalculation? When will the working man realize that President Johnson's spending programs have so fed inflation as to wipe out the worker's wage gains?


It is not too late for Lyndon Johnson to start being honest with the American people. Mr. Barr has set him a good example.

#



Distribution: Full 9:30 a.m. 4/1/68

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
April 1, 1968

All of the excitement generated by President Johnson's decision not to seek re-election has obscured the significance of his statements regarding Vietnam.

It seems clear to me that the President has made a major policy decision of great importance to the American people and to the world--namely, that it does not make sense for the United States to greatly increase its troop commitment in Vietnam. I applaud that decision. I think it is sound. I think it reflects a realization by the President that any future increases in allied troop strength in Vietnam should come from South Vietnamese manpower. I endorse that view.

I join the President in the hope that we can move toward an early and honorable peace in Vietnam. If, indeed, his order to halt the bombing of the North will not endanger our troops in the South and will lead to productive peace talks, then it is a good decision. However, it must be remembered that the United States suspended its bombing of Hanoi and Haiphong for 17 days without announcement prior to the Communist Tet offensive of Jan. 31. Hanoi's answer was a savage attack on some 30 South Vietnamese cities. The difference now is that the President's announcement has put Hanoi on center stage in the arena of world opinion.

Regrettably, if peace talks begin now, the United States and South Vietnam will be approaching the bargaining table at a time when most of South Vietnam's countryside is in Communist hands as a result of the Tet offensive.

I hope all Americans unite behind the President in his moves toward peace in Vietnam. But it is difficult to see how the President's decision not to seek re-election will dissolve the basic differences between the President's supporters and those individuals backing Sens. Robert F. Kennedy and Eugene McCarthy.

It now can be expected that Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey will contend with Kennedy and McCarthy for the Democratic presidential nomination. There are those who will recall that when Sen. Kennedy first proposed a coalition government for South Vietnam with the Communists being given a share of the power, Humphrey said this was like putting the fox in the coop with the chickens.


So the scene has changed, but then again it has not changed. Unless the President and Vice-President Humphrey now favor a Kennedy-McCarthy type solution in Vietnam, the division within the Democratic Party remains.

#

Distribution: Full

*10:30 a.m.
4/2/68*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
April 2, 1968

President Johnson now has a singular opportunity to begin putting this Nation's fiscal house in order.

Having decided against an attempt to seek reelection, he is free to act without regard to political considerations. He is in perfect position to launch the "austerity program" he recently declared is urgently needed in this country.

I ask that the President reconsider the position he took on management of our fiscal affairs in his address to the Nation on radio and television Sunday night. In that speech he indicated that he will simply sit back and wait for Congress to make reductions in his budget for fiscal 1969.

If the fiscal situation at the federal level is as critical as the President and his advisers have painted it, then the country cannot wait for Congress to act.

I urge instead that the President immediately outline and implement the austerity program he recently declared to be so necessary if the United States is to maintain any semblance of prosperity. This means the President should impose immediate lower spending limitations on each department and agency.

The President on his own can order a sweeping hold-down in all federal spending unrelated to the Vietnam War. In view of the fact he will not be seeking reelection, he should have no difficulty in imposing a ceiling on federal spending immediately--a ceiling which would remain in effect at least throughout the rest of his term in office.

President Johnson has sought to eliminate some of the divisiveness in this country over Vietnam by removing himself as a candidate for reelection. Let him now act to slow inflation and the continuing deterioration in the value of the dollar by cutting his own budget. He would be doing the American people a great service.

#

distribution: Full 12:30 p.m. 4/3/68

M Office Copy



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
April 3, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., re: Hanoi response

The public announcement by Hanoi Radio that North Vietnam is willing to "make contact with U.S. representatives" obviously is a response to the peace initiative launched by President Johnson last Sunday night.

I am hopeful that it is a step--however tiny--toward peace. It is, nevertheless, only a beginning--and a small beginning--in the long trek toward an honorable peace in Vietnam.

Certainly all Americans should unite behind President Johnson in his efforts to bring about an honorable settlement of the Vietnam conflict. I do not think it is helpful for any American to criticize the President for not having ordered a complete halt in the bombing of North Vietnam. He could not have done so without endangering the lives of U.S. fighting men in forward positions near the so-called Demilitarized Zone.


It is true, however, that the President's description of the bombing limitation was vague and led to some confusion. It now turns out that the 20th parallel is the bombing halt line. Had the President made this clear last Sunday night, it would also have become clear that he was proposing a carefully staged de-escalation of the Vietnam War as urged by Rep. F. Bradford Morse and a number of other House Republicans last July 10. In my view, the peace initiative currently underway is a bipartisan peace initiative based on a Republican peace plan which was suggested almost a year ago. I am pleased that we have had some response to it from Hanoi.

We must be ever mindful that in Korea the fighting continued for nearly two years while negotiations were being conducted at Panmunjom. More Americans were killed after the talks began than before. This should temper any optimism until we see more meaningful results--although all Americans hope this is the first step toward peace.

#

Attribution: Full 1100 p.m. 4/11/68

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE IN FRIDAY P.M.'s--
April 12, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

The Congress closes up shop for Easter recess with a significant record of legislative achievement behind it and prodigious tasks ahead of it.

These are times in which we are grappling with three great crises--Vietnam, racial turmoil and the threat of fiscal chaos.

We in the Congress should unite behind the President in his current efforts to gain an honorable peace in Vietnam and simultaneously should make sure our fighting men in Vietnam receive all the weapons and equipment they need while the war continues.

We are making progress in dealing with racial turmoil. Congress this week enacted a landmark open housing bill. It was more than that. It also was far-reaching legislation pointed at various aspects of racial strife.

The psychological impact of the open housing provision may help avert riots this summer. However, this provision is not a magic key which will automatically open the door to better housing for Negroes. Economic circumstances will continue to be a dominant factor.

This means that Congress should turn its attention to the Percy-Widnall plan to create a National Home Ownership Foundation aimed at helping low-income families own a home and giving them the pride and dignity that go with home ownership. This Republican proposal holds great promise for the future of America.

The depressed economic condition of millions of Americans also means that Congress should enact the Republican Human Investment Act, the plan extending tax credits to industry for providing the hard-core unemployed and the underemployed with on-the-job training for good-paying jobs requiring special skills. This kind of legislation has been endorsed by the National Advisory Commission on Civil Disorders.

These are affirmative steps which Congress should take to build a better America for all our citizens. We need to take these affirmative actions after adopting the deterrents enacted as part of the Civil Rights Act of 1968--provisions making it a federal crime to use interstate facilities to incite, encourage or take part in a riot, or to transport or manufacture firearms or explosives for use in a riot or to teach the use of such weapons in a riot, or to interfere with any fireman or law enforcement officer engaged in performing his

(more)

duties during a riot. While these deterrents may not prevent riots, they are needed and helpful in prosecuting those engaged in riot activity.

It is noteworthy that the basic incitement-to-riot provision is Republican-sponsored legislation which was first passed by the House on July 19, 1967, without Administration support and left to languish in the Senate until it was incorporated in the Civil Rights Act of 1968.

The Civil Rights Act of 1968 was the most significant piece of legislation passed by the House prior to Easter Recess. It passed only because of Republican help. In the most real sense, all civil rights legislation is bipartisan.

The only other major legislation passed by the House was the Truth-In-Lending Act, which enjoyed bipartisan support and contained the only important anti-crime statute enacted by the House this year. This was the federal anti-usury provision, which was aimed at loan sharks with crime syndicate stripes. Loan-sharking is a major source of the funds which feed the crime syndicates. As a result of Republican initiative, federal law enforcers now can help shut off this source of crime syndicate income. Of course, the Truth-In-Lending Act was basically consumer legislation--an excellent statute which reveals interest costs in loan and credit transactions.


Unfortunately, we still have no Law Enforcement Assistance Act on the books, and this is one of the great unfinished tasks of this Congress. The House passed such legislation last year but the Senate has yet to act. I find it strange that the President and the majority party are not acting with greater urgency in view of the fact that the national crime rate has gone up 83 per cent since 1960.

The Congress and the Johnson-Humphrey Administration still must resolve, too, the problems which add up to the greatest financial crisis to face this Nation since the depression years. Inflation still steadily reduces the value of the dollar. Johnson-Humphrey Administration spending threatens a \$20 billion deficit in fiscal 1969, following upon an estimated \$20 billion deficit for fiscal 1968. Doubts abroad about the dollar threaten an ultimate collapse of world trade, and the two-price system for gold has only bought us time.

Congress must come to grips with runaway federal spending immediately upon its return from Easter recess--and must take a hard look at the revenue side of the ledger as well. Republicans will legislate in the best interests of the Nation. Democrats must face up to the fact that they are the majority party and have triggered the sharp spending upturn which has produced financial crisis. The economic well-being of every American will turn on our actions.

It is a tremendous work load that will greet members of Congress after the Easter recess. We must be equal to the challenge.

####



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Office Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
May 3, 1968

Hanoi-Paris Comment

I am delighted that initial Vietnam peace talks now can get under way.

Paris is a good site from the standpoint that conditions will be favorable for complete press coverage. It is important that the American people be kept informed as to the progress--or lack of it--made during the talks. I hope that later we can move quickly from preliminary talks into genuine peace negotiations.

* * *

Taxes and Spending

Republicans are dismayed that the President is apparently unwilling to agree to responsible compromise on spending and taxes. His adamant attitude is hardly the way to meet the fiscal crisis which confronts the Nation. There must be a solution that will be joined in by members of both parties who realize the gravity of the situation.

#



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
May 6, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., House Republican Leader


The country must have action to deal with the financial mess created by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The best way to meet the fiscal crisis we face is to cut the President's proposed fiscal 1969 spending by \$6 billion.

There will be a tax increase if the President exerts real leadership on behalf of fiscal responsibility and agrees to a greater reduction in federal spending than that approved by the House Appropriations and Ways and Means Committees.

#

Distribution: Full 5/8/68

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

--FOR RELEASE IN WEDNESDAY PM's--
May 8, 1968

**NEWS
RELEASE**

President Johnson has blamed the Democratic-controlled 90th Congress for home mortgage interest rates that have reached what he called "the highest point in 50 years."

I am certainly not an apologist for the Democratic majority in the Congress. If the President wants to berate the Democrats in Congress for not passing an income tax increase up to this time and say that this is the reason for high interest rates on mortgage funds, I really should not demur.

But I nevertheless feel the American people should be given the facts with regard to high interest rates on home mortgage money. So I called the Federal Housing Administration.

In signing legislation which removes the 6 per cent interest rate ceiling on FHA and VA loans, President Johnson said that while the "need for homes is always there, no mortgage credit was to be found." "We could have avoided this if we could have passed a tax increase." He said that by refusing to approve a tax increase Congress has let interest rates go from "5½ per cent to 7 per cent and even 8 per cent--the highest point in 50 years."

An FHA spokesman informed me that conventional interest rates last were 5½ per cent in early 1966 and increased steadily from that time on. They have fluctuated between 6½ and 7 per cent for the last six months to a year and are 7½ per cent now, he stated. This means that conventional interest rates on home mortgage funds have been at least 6½ per cent for about 12 months. The FHA spokesman said they were "higher in the latter half of 1966 when the bottom dropped out."

FHA interest rates were 5½ per cent from Feb. 7, 1966 through April 11, 1966; 5.75 per cent from April 12, 1966, through Oct. 2, 1966; 6 per cent from Oct. 3, 1966 through May 7, 1968; and now 6.75 per cent by administrative action taken Tuesday.

The President rejected the idea of an income tax increase in 1966, when the interest rate spiral started--nor did he at that time try to hold down federal spending as a curb on inflation and steadily rising interest rates. He first proposed an income tax increase in his January 1967 State of the Union Message--but did not send Congress a specific tax increase proposal until August 1967. By that time conventional interest rates were--in the words of the FHA spokesman--"fluctuating between 6½ and 7 per cent" and the FHA and VA rates were 6 per cent.

I don't like to defend the Democratic majority in the Congress, but I do wish the President would get his facts straight before he gets out his bull whip... even to use on his own party.

###

Distribution: Full


M Office Copy



FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
Thursday, May 9, 1968

With agreement by House-Senate conferees on a \$6 billion reduction in President Johnson's fiscal 1969 spending plans we have taken a big step toward a slowing of inflation and a return to responsible government. This may mean that Congress will regain control of the federal budget. I feel sure that if the cuts to be made mandatory in the fiscal 1969 budget are made judiciously and through a re-ordering of priorities, no essential human needs program will suffer. For my part, I will reluctantly accept the 10 per cent tax surcharge in order to get the spending hold-down. Had the Johnson-Humphrey Administration employed the kind of fiscal restraint urged by Republicans for years, Congress would not now even be considering an income tax increase.

#####



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Office Copy

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
May 17, 1968

Statement of Rep. Gerald R. Ford

The House-Senate Conference report on the Truth-in-Lending Bill will probably be before the House next week.

It is urgent and essential that the American public be made aware of the impending enactment of the Republican loan shark amendment to the Truth-in-Lending Bill. Because other features of the compromises reached between the Senate and House on the Truth-in-Lending Bill have received wide attention, there is a danger that those who are being victimized by loan sharks may not know about the new protection soon to be a part of Federal law. Likewise, those who further the interests of organized crime by serving as low echelon agents of loan shark operation should realize that, for the first time, extortionate extension of credit will be a Federal crime.

Republicans believe that the contribution we have made to the Truth-in-Lending Bill constitutes a major breakthrough in the war against organized crime. The breakthrough is in two parts: First, the amendment authored and supported by Republicans during the House debate and perfected in the Senate-House Conference defines the crime of loan-sharking. This will give the Federal government an investigative and enforcement jurisdiction which it has not had before. In addition, the new provisions make it possible for federal agents to assist State and local law enforcement officials in their prosecution of loan-sharks.

A second legal milestone is the witness-immunity provision incorporated in the Republican loan-shark amendment. This strikes at the Achilles' heel of organized crime. The President's Crime Commission and other proponents of criminal law reform long have recommended modernization of our antiquated and conflicting statutes on witness immunity.

The Truth-in-Lending Bill is designed to protect the typical consumer through disclosure of legal credit terms. The Republican loan-shark amendment is designed to protect the victim of a racket. Although the poor are often the prey of the loan-shark, the person who has suffered financial reverses, the person who has

(more)


physical ailments, the person who has encountered setbacks in his small business, the person who has been drawn into gambling, the person who is addicted to narcotics are also ruthlessly and regularly victimized by the loan shark.

The President's Crime Commission said in February 1967 that loan-sharking is the second most lucrative activity of the multibillion dollar empire of organized crime.

But nothing was done to cure this cancerous growth until the House Republican Task Force on Crime drafted and proposed Federal loan-shark legislation. This was endorsed at the start of this session by the House Republican Policy Committee, which urged that the anti-loan-shark provision be incorporated in the pending Truth-in-Lending Bill. This was done with overwhelming support on the House Floor.

I am confident it will receive equally overwhelming approval next week.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

m Office Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
May 22, 1968

Remarks by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, Minority Leader, House of Representatives, on the Conference Report, S. 5, Truth-in-Lending.

Mr. Speaker, recently the American consumer has enjoyed many fine hours here in the Congress and more particularly here in the House of Representatives. I feel confident, however, that today marks the consumer's finest hour.

I am proud of the role that the Minority played throughout the committee hearings, the floor debate and the long, arduous House-Senate conference sessions. But it is not my purpose today to extol the virtues of the Minority's contributions to the truth-in-lending bill, for throughout the years of debate on this legislation, partisan divisions have rarely, if ever, occurred.

Although much of the controversy and most of the headlines have centered around the conflict of periodic versus annual disclosure on open-end credit, in my opinion, the contributions of House Members of both parties in adding many entirely new features to the Senate-passed bill far outweigh the importance of the final compromise on revolving credit. The House added and was able to retain in conference strong, effective and equitable language on administrative enforcement, credit advertising, loan-sharking, first mortgages, garnishment, as well as provisions dealing with abuses primarily related to extensions of credit for home improvements.

During the House floor debate on the truth-in-lending bill, the non-record votes on revolving credit on the so-called \$10 exemption were overwhelming in support of the position taken by a majority of the Committee on Banking and Currency. I have been advised that the House Conferees were united throughout the conference sessions with the Senate on these two points, and I was delighted that the House Conferees were equally united in support of retaining several amendments offered by Republicans when the bill was debated here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I became personally involved with the Republican loan-shark amendment and I want to commend the Chairman of the House Committee on Banking and Currency, Mr. Patman, the Congresswoman from Missouri, Mrs. Sullivan, and the ranking Minority Member, Mr. Widnall, for their success in coming back to the House with a very effective title dealing with extortionate extensions of credit. In this


(more)

connection, the contributions of the House Republican Task Force on Crime, as well as Congressmen Poff and McDade, cannot be exaggerated.

Recent testimony has indicated that loan-sharking is the second most important source of revenue to organized crime. Annual revenue to organized crime has been estimated to be at least \$20 billion. By amending Title 18 of the U.S. Code so as to define and make a federal offense the extortionate extension and financing of credit, finally we are recognizing both the seriousness and the vast extent of this criminal activity. Moreover, the language providing immunity to witnesses will send tremors through the high councils of organized crime when their highly paid legal counsels advise them of the direction taken by Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I consider the conference report on the Consumer Credit Protection Act one of the most important achievements of the 90th Congress. The vast protection it affords all citizens -- especially low-income families and individuals -- should provide ample evidence that the Congress has and will continue to act on its own initiative in matters involving human equity.

#



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
June 5, 1968

STATEMENT OF REP. GERALD R. FORD (R-MICH.)

This is shocking and terrible. My first impulse was to call it unbelievable but, unfortunately, it is all too believable in our country today.

Of course I pray for Senator Kennedy and his family, and for all those wounded with him in Los Angeles. We had better all pray for America as well. Surely there can be no further quibbling about the urgent need for tougher law enforcement legislation. Public peace and safety must be our primary concern.

The suspect reportedly in custody must be zealously protected while the most thorough investigation and prosecution of this tragedy are carried forward. Perhaps we can uncover what evil forces and horrible hatreds are attacking the foundations of our nation.

#

Mailed all Weeklies - PM of June 13, 1968

M Office Copy

Special to Kent and Ionia County Weeklies

For Use The Week of June 16-22 and Thereafter

Crime
Crackdown
Coming
--

BY JERRY FORD

The violence and lawlessness so prevalent in America today must be halted.

All our civil rights and freedoms become meaningless without effective police protection backed by citizen cooperation, an atmosphere of safety and security on our streets, order in our cities and throughout the land.

With passage by the Congress of the "Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968" we finally are moving toward restoration of law and order in America.

This legislation points up how determined Congress is to deal with lawlessness in our Nation.

As proposed by the Administration last year, this legislation started out simply as a program of Federal grants to improve local law enforcement.

The House of Representatives last August adopted amendments emphasizing control of organized crime and riots and shifting responsibility for administration of the program from the U.S. Department of Justice to the states.

The Senate recently expanded and toughened the measure. House supporters of a strong anti-crime bill--I among them--were happy to accept the Senate bill.

So the final version of the Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968 which I voted for and which was sent to the President provided for an increase in grants to \$100 million the first year and \$300 million the second year to aid state and local law enforcement; modification of recent Supreme Court rulings which limited the use of identification procedures and confessions in tracking down and convicting criminal suspects; authority for Federal, State and local law enforcement agencies to use wiretapping and electronic surveillance devices to fight crime but only with the sanction and supervision of the courts; and a ban on mail order sale of hand guns and on the sale of such guns to minors and out-of-state residents.

If the ban on mail order sale of hand guns is inadequate, then Congress should immediately look affirmatively at proposals for additional gun controls.

(more)

But it should be remembered that California has a tough gun control law and that the gun used to assassinate Sen. Robert F. Kennedy was passed along to the alleged assassin after an original under-the-counter sale.

There now is a revulsion against violence in this country stemming from the assassination of Sen. Kennedy. It may be that this swelling of popular feeling against violence spells the beginning of the end of the kind of violence we have been experiencing in this country. It would be helpful and it may well follow that all law-abiding Americans now will condemn the use of violence to attain any political, economic or social objective. This would, in effect, "ostracize" the practitioners of violence and could prove highly effective in discouraging the use of violence.

It is also helpful that the U.S. Supreme Court has upheld the right of police to "frisk" suspicious persons for dangerous weapons. This is the first time the Court has held that police can detain and search such persons without the "probable cause" mentioned in the Constitution's Fourth Amendment. I heartily applaud the Court's decision. It is vitally important when you consider that 355 law enforcement officers were killed on duty from 1960 through 1966, and that there were 23,851 assaults on police officers in 1966 nationwide.


So we now have "a lot going for us" in our determination to reverse the crime rate that has climbed 88 per cent in the last seven years--the Omnibus Crime Control Act, a strong measure fitting the times; the Supreme Court ruling upholding the right of police to stop and "frisk" suspicious persons; and the strong upsurge of popular sentiment against violence of any kind.

I believe we now will see a crackdown on crime and, ultimately, the restoration of law and order in America.

#

*distribution: Full 10:00 a.m.
6/20/68*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
June 20, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., House Minority Leader.

The President's signing of the omnibus anti-crime bill is a victory for the American people and the Republican Party. This legislation represents the enactment into law of a multitude of anti-crime measures long sought and vigorously fought for by Republicans in Congress.

The National Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act is a vehicle for the restoration of law and order in America and for a reversal of the sharp upward spiral in lawlessness which has pushed the national crime rate up 88 per cent in the last seven years.


The omnibus crime bill is good legislation. Its wire-tapping provision is good legislation. Giving law enforcement officials the authority to use the wire-tapping tool against major criminal activity under court order provides our lawmen with a valuable weapon against organized crime, as well as espionage and subversion.

The President is badly mistaken in seeking repeal of the wire-tap provision and refusing to use it against the crime syndicates. He has completely distorted the wire-tap provision, and this is most unfortunate. He has sought to mislead the American people into believing that even the most scrupulously law-abiding citizen is not safe from electronic surveillance. The truth is that the anti-crime bill outlaws all wiretapping and electronic surveillance except as authorized by the federal courts in cases involving major crimes and the national security.

The American people can feel certain that a new Republican President and a Republican Attorney General will use these new anti-crime provisions to root out the evils of organized crime and those who seek to destroy our government by espionage.

The American people want an end to the widespread lawlessness that has plagued this country under the Johnson-Humphrey Administration. The Law Enforcement Assistance and Criminal Justice Act of 1968 will help to accomplish exactly that.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

Remarks by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., House Republican Leader, prepared for delivery on the floor of the House on Thursday, June 20, 1968.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 15414, a bill to impose spending restraints on the Federal Government and to increase Federal revenues through a 10 per cent surcharge on the incomes of individuals and corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 15414 for just one reason: Our Nation is in deep trouble, financially; our fiscal situation demands that we act to slow down inflation, handcuff the robber who is picking the pockets of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, until recently I opposed the Johnson-Humphrey Administration's 10 per cent income tax surcharge. I hoped with all my heart we could avoid a tax increase. I have always felt that if the Johnson-Humphrey Administration had scaled back its spending plans beginning in 1965-1966 as an offset to the swift rise in Vietnam War expenditures we could have avoided a tax increase and could have preserved relative price stability.

But the Johnson-Humphrey Administration spurned all Republican pleas for a re-ordering of priorities, and the majority in the Congress repeatedly defeated Republican economy moves on record votes. This brings us to the position in which the American people find themselves today.

Where do we stand?

We have nearly 5 per cent a year price inflation.

We have 10 per cent a year wage inflation.

We have only a 4 per cent a year increase in productivity.

We have a 6 per cent a year upward push in unit labor costs.

Some of our interest rates are the highest in a hundred years; the interest on home mortgages is the highest in 50 years and so we recently had to lift the ceiling on FHA and GI interest rates.

We have \$20 to \$25 billion federal budget deficits.

Every rise in prices stimulates an increase in wages, and every increase in wages sets the stage for further increases in prices.

People at home and abroad are losing confidence in the dollar as inflation becomes a way of life in America and the purchasing power of the dollar steadily drops.

(more)

The dollar is a mainstay of the international monetary system. Loss of confidence in the dollar has weakened that system. A collapse of world trade threatens unless the dollar is shored up. Because the dollar no longer is as good as gold there has been a run on the U.S. gold supply. Our gold has been dangerously reduced and is vulnerable to still greater losses.

Finally, we face the danger of a major recession if not a depression. The flowering of inflation carries with it the seeds of economic destruction. This is the bloom that dooms the boom. The inflation that is now in a trot threatens to gallop, and galloping inflation will be followed by recession from natural causes.

In short, the Nation is suffering the consequences of federal fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I for one am unwilling to accept the consequences of continued federal fiscal irresponsibility. I am unwilling to accept \$20 to \$25 billion federal deficits back to back--just as I was unwilling to participate in the reckless spending which has brought us to our present pass.

Mr. Speaker, we are all aware of the perilous fiscal situation in which the Nation finds itself today, and we all know we must do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 15414 gives us the opportunity to do something about it.

Mr. Speaker, I believe H.R. 15414 is a most vital piece of legislation. I cannot conceive of its being rejected by the Congress because I believe what is at stake here is the economic health of every American, and primarily the poor.

To continue on our present course is to follow the road to disaster.

Tax increases are painful. Nobody likes a tax increase. But the alternative to the package before us is far worse. Galloping inflation and a major recession--that is the alternative.

Let the American people consider the consequences of the trotting inflation we now are plagued with--and then ask themselves if the Congress is not acting properly in approving the package before us today.

Consider the fact that the real income of the average American worker has not improved in the slightest in the last two or three years. The weekly earnings of the average worker in non-farm employment actually were a little lower in 1966 than in 1965, and again somewhat lower in 1967 than in 1966--when his wages are adjusted for consumer price increases and the rise in Social Security and income taxes.

As for the millions of poor in America, most of the benefits provided for

(more)

them in the anti-poverty and related programs have been wiped out by the effects of inflation.

How destructive is the inflation we now are experiencing?

The past year's increase in the cost of living is the sharpest year-to-year rise in more than 16 years.

The cost of living has gone up 20 per cent since the 1957-59 period.

The Eisenhower dollar now is worth 83 cents.

Interest rates on home mortgages have climbed to 7 or 8 per cent--and the President recently warned of a rise to 10 per cent unless we act here today.

If we fail to act affirmatively today, this Nation is certain to suffer another credit crunch as bad as that of 1966, or worse.

There is no need to go back seven or eight years to show that inflation is badly hurting the American people, the little people who don't know about hedges against inflation and just sit tight while their savings are washed away.

The cost of living has gone up 10 per cent just since January 1965 and is reaching new all-time highs each month.

What the average housewife paid \$10.89 for in January 1965 she now pays \$12 for.

The January 1965 dollar now is worth less than 91 cents.

A \$10 bill acquired in January 1965 now is worth \$9.08.

A savings account with \$500 in it as of January 1965 now is worth \$454.13 in principal, nearly \$46 less.

A \$10,000 insurance policy of three years ago now is worth \$9,083, a depreciation of \$917.

A retired American with an income of \$2,500 three years ago finds that his income has shrunk to \$2,295.50, a loss of \$204.50.

This is what is happening among the 224 million citizens of this country because the Johnson-Humphrey Administration triggered an inflationary spiral in 1965-66 with mistakes in fiscal strategy, excessive spending and downright deception.

The hour is late--very late. The argument can be made that we are trying to lock the barn door after the horse has been stolen. But I think it still is possible to catch the horse and put a halter on him. We cannot abruptly stop inflation because if we did we would stall the economy. But we can slow it down by bringing federal spending under control and increasing federal revenue.

If we place sharp restraints on federal spending now, tax relief will be possible in the future.

(more)

I personally find the tax increase portion of the bill before us extremely distasteful. In my view, a tax increase following upon consumer price increases punishes the American people for an offense properly chargeable not to them but to the party in power.

I think the spending restraints H.R. 15414 will impose on the Johnson-Humphrey Administration and future administrations are more meaningful than the tax increase in terms of restoring the economic health of this Nation.

Basically, I take the tax increase to get the spending restraints.

There are those who argue that the tax increase will aggravate the inflation problem by adding to production costs and leading to further price increases, and that these price increases in turn will trigger demands for greater wage increases.

Whether this will be the immediate consequence of the tax increase can only be the subject of speculation. But we can feel certain that a tax increase will dampen consumer demand. It also can be expected that the combination of a spending hold-down and a rise in federal revenue will help to bring down interest rates over the long term.

The President has called for an austerity program. Let's give it to him. Certainly it is needed.

Let us be completely honest about the legislation we deal with today. A tax increase is politically hazardous. It makes a politician gag if not choke.

We in my party feel we are not to blame for the mess in which the Nation finds itself. For that reason I demanded earlier this year that the majority party come up with a majority for the tax and spending cut package in order to get Republican support for it. The majority party appears to have done so. I therefore urge as many of my colleagues as find it possible to do so to vote for H.R. 15414. It is a step toward a sound dollar, an economically healthy America, and genuine progress for all our citizens.

#

*Distribution: Radio & TV
7/18/68 McKissack & Bailie
except W.D.'s*

M Office Copy

For Release on Thursday, July 25, 1968.

Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids is not about to hang an Employment Service shingle above the door of his office in the U.S. Capitol but he is glowing with pleasure over his latest job assist.

The story begins with graduation ceremonies at Gallaudet College, famous school for the deaf in Washington, D.C., where David Othal Riker of 1948 Burlingame Avenue S.W., Wyoming, proudly received a bachelor of arts degree in mathematics in June. His parents, Mr. and Mrs. Othal N. Riker of Wyoming were equally proud.

Nobody who has full possession of all his faculties can appreciate the trepidation with which Dave began his quest for a position as a mathematician with a Federal agency. Fortunately, it occurred to him to ask Congressman Ford's help.

When Dave walked into Ford's office a few days after his graduation, Ford immediately promised to do everything in his power to help him line up a position.

Since Dave cannot hear and can lip-read only a little, he and Ford staff members carried on extensive "conversations" on sheets of note paper. Together they tackled the task of contacting the various Federal agencies through their coordinators for employment of the handicapped.

Dave and Rep. Ford were discouraged at first. The National Aeronautics and Space Administration people were "working on something" for Dave but it didn't look promising. The Department of the Navy, the Department of Commerce and the Goddard Space Flight Center were among the "possibles" on Dave's list.

Ford staff members spent many hours making inquiries and setting up appointments.

The Department of Commerce prospect fell through. Dave twice visited the Goddard Space Flight Center but that did not prove out. Then happiness hit. Dave received word from Earl L. Payne, coordinator for employment of the handicapped at the Defense Department, that a job was waiting for him at the Pentagon. He reported for work the very next day.

Dave now is working as a mathematician in the Office of the Comptroller for the Assistant Secretary of Defense.

"I have no problems," he wrote confidently. "I am enjoying the job very much."

(more)

-2-

As for Ford, he was delighted that he could help. He was especially pleased when Dave's sister, Mrs. Kenneth Gager of Rockford (11181 - 13 Mile Rd. NE, RD 3), wrote and thanked him for the assistance given to Dave.

"I was talking to my mother yesterday, " Mrs. Gager wrote, "and she was telling me about the phone calls and other services performed for Dave and I must say it is wonderful to know there are people around who will help other people."

"Dave has had a hard time of it, all through his life, "Mrs. Gager continued, "not only because of his hearing handicap but because of other circumstances. Therefore, to think that he has come this far is really an accomplishment, and we all hope and pray that he will continue to progress as he has the last several years. He deserves every good thing that comes his way and I'm sure he appreciates all that you are doing for him. Again, many thanks to you all for your kindness and thoughtfulness."

Dave does indeed deserve all good things. A thumbnail biographical sketch shows that he was one of the top 10 students in his graduating class at Lee High School in Wyoming and won the Top Salesman Award and Best Achiever Award in the Junior Achievement of Grand Rapids Program. Since that time he has worked as a printer and pressman in Grand Rapids and in Maryland, worked on the Gallaudet College newspaper as business manager and was also business manager of the college's Student Body Government and its ice hockey team.

A fine, clean-looking chap, Dave has a secret and unusual hobby. He's something of a judo expert. Maybe he'll give mathematics at the Pentagon a new twist.

#

*Distribution: 5th Dist. Members 7/25/68
5th Dist. Members
Radio } 7/26/68
TV } Air Special*

M. Office Copy

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford re: Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968

For Fifth District News Media

A greater opportunity to meet hospital construction needs has opened up for Kent and Ionia County communities as a result of legislation I sponsored in the 90th Congress.

A bill I introduced in April 1967 has been enacted as part of the 1968 Housing and Urban Development Act, just approved by Congress. This legislation makes FHA-type loans available for hospital construction by insuring the mortgages of nonprofit hospitals.

The federally-insured mortgage also may be used to cover the cost of major items of equipment needed to operate the hospital.

Community leaders in Grand Rapids tell me that hospital construction needs there will total an estimated \$35 million over the next 10 years. It was at their urging that I drafted and sponsored the FHA-loans hospital construction bill. I managed to keep it in the omnibus housing bill only by exerting every possible effort.

This new program of FHA-type loans for hospital construction will not supplant the familiar Hill-Burton program of federal grants for such projects. It will supplement Hill-Burton. It recognizes the fact that funds for hospital construction are in constantly short supply and that, nationwide, there is a minimum need for an estimated \$3.7 billion worth of hospital facilities.

My program fills an unmet need. Nonprofit hospitals have found mortgage lenders reluctant to provide construction loans on such terms that the loan could be paid back without an undue increase in hospital charges and fees. My program will make longterm mortgage financing possible for nonprofit hospitals.

I believe communities in Michigan and throughout the United States will benefit in improved health care as a result of this new program.

The new Housing Act also contains another provision of special interest in Kent and Ionia Counties. It establishes a national flood insurance program which will make flood insurance available to families and small businessmen in areas frequently troubled with flooding.

(more)

The people of Grandville may be among the first to become eligible for this new flood insurance because the Army Corps of Engineers has already completed a study of Grandville as a "flood-prone area."

The flood insurance coverage will be limited to one-to-four family residential properties and to smaller businesses such as the typical neighborhood family enterprise.

The insurance will be a joint venture between the Federal Government and the private insurance industry. The Government will make payments to the participating insurance companies in high flood-loss years, and the companies in turn will pay the Government a premium in low flood-loss years.

The Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 is landmark legislation. There are some features I do not like, but on balance the pluses outweigh the minuses.

The main thrust of the bill is a new Republican concept which enlists private resources to help provide decent homes for more than six million American families now living in slums or dilapidated rural dwellings.

The measure will establish the National Home Ownership Foundation which was conceived by Sen. Charles Percy, R-Ill., and supported by me. Eventually it should attract many billions in private funds into low-cost housing and rehabilitation.

There are 13 million American families with incomes under \$5,000 a year. They represent 28 per cent of all the families in the country. Not all of them live in unsatisfactory quarters, but the latest housing survey shows that 6,353,000 housing units in America are substandard. These units should be replaced or renovated.

I think we should help those who cannot decently house themselves, making certain that housing produced with Government assistance be devoted only to low-income families. And the major emphasis must be on federal guarantees, guidance and support rather than on big federal outlays.


But we must help slum dwellers and the rural poor obtain decent housing. We must act if we are to build a sound future for all Americans.

#

July 26, 1968

NOTE TO EDITOR OR NEWS DIRECTOR:

At the time of this mailing, the conference report on the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1968 (final version), had been approved by the Senate and was to be approved by the House Friday afternoon or Monday. This statement is for release upon approval of the legislation by the House.



--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives.

I have pledged my personal help and assistance to Jim Collins of Dallas, candidate for election to the House in the Third Congressional District of Texas.

I believe Jim Collins will win the special election August 24, and that this will be the forerunner of Republican victories throughout the country in November.

When Jim comes to Washington immediately after that special election, I will do everything in my power to see that he is given committee assignments of direct benefit to his congressional district. It is worth noting that he will have a five months' head start on all of the House members newly elected in November. Seniority is important in the Congress, and Jim Collins' seniority will certainly benefit his constituents.

I know Jim Collins and what he stands for. Jim is the kind of man Texas needs in the way of new and competent leadership.

Congress is coming back into session after the conventions to consider some most important matters. We need Jim Collins in the House of Representatives working for good government when that time comes. It is important to his constituents in Texas to have responsive and responsible representation when the House reconvenes.

Jim Collins will be a most valuable congressman. I will personally welcome him to Washington after the August 24 special election.

###

*Distribution: Fifth District
Daily - Aug 18
Weekly - Aug 15*

M Office Copy

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford

For Release the Week of August 18-24, 1968
and thereafter

New Law
Bars Age
Job Bias

BY JERRY FORD

In this time when so many Americans worry so much about growing old, it seems appropriate to report that a new Federal law prohibits employers and labor unions from discriminating against workers on account of age.

Although the law is very new, the U.S. Labor Department states that already there are workers in the age bracket covered--40 to 65--who have been hired for jobs that were closed to them before the law against age discrimination went into effect.

I am pleased to say that I strongly supported this legislation when it was before the Congress.

The new law does not mean that an employer must hire a person in the 40 to 65 age group regardless of any and all circumstances. But an employer may only refuse to fill a vacancy with an otherwise qualified older worker in cases where age is "a bona fide occupational qualification necessary to the normal operation of the particular business."

Labor unions may no longer shut out workers in the 40-65 age bracket from membership or refuse to refer older members to employers simply because of their age. Employment agencies also are barred from discriminating against older job seekers.

The Age Discrimination in Employment Act applies to some 350,000 employers, employment agencies which serve them, and to labor organizations across the country. It involves employers with 25 or more workers and labor organizations with 25 or more members in industries affecting interstate commerce.

The U.S. Labor Department anticipates investigating 20,000 to 25,000 complaints regarding age discrimination in employment in the 12 months ending next June 30.

Following guidelines laid down by Congress, the department will seek to

(more)

-2-

remedy all justifiable complaints through mediation. Cases will be taken to court only where all other attempts to settle the issue fail.

The new law against age bias in hiring and firing is aimed at promoting the employment of older Americans.

There are 37 million Americans in the age 40-65 age bracket. An average of 850,000 persons in this group are unemployed. These 850,000 account for 27 per cent of all the unemployed in this country and 40 per cent of the longterm unemployed.

The fact that these people are jobless results in an unemployment compensation bill of \$750 million a year.

For years some employers have been shunning the older worker on the ground that he or she is physically weaker, has a high rate of absenteeism and is not adaptable to change. But study after study has shown that older workers generally have lower absenteeism rates, change jobs less frequently, and do their jobs more enthusiastically than younger workers.

#

*Distribution: Full Aug. 21, 1968
Release 10:30 a.m.*

M Office Copy



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
August 21, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Representatives.


The sympathies of all Americans are with the freedom-loving Czechs so crudely suppressed by Soviet military might, but the United States should not become involved in this Communist family fight.

The brutal aggression ordered by Soviet leaders has shattered the dream world spun by some Americans in the spirit of Glassboro. Once again Red Russia has been exposed as an enemy of freedom and an enslaver of people.

The invasion of Czechoslovakia by Russia and other Warsaw Pact powers is a clear violation of Czech sovereignty. It has again been made clear that the Soviet Union is an imperialistic power which looks upon its Communist neighbors as its colonies.

The United States should move with extreme caution in this situation, but certainly it would be appropriate to demand an immediate explanation from the Soviet Union in the world forum of the United Nations.

###



August 22, 1968
**CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD**
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Office Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--

Rep. Jerry Ford Plays Cupid
In Trans-Atlantic Romance

The fellow who first remarked that the course of true love seldom runs smooth might have added: If you have a problem, take it to your congressman.

That's what sweet young Maureen Szymczak of Grand Rapids did when she ran into bad luck with love last Spring. With the help of Rep. Gerald R. Ford, wedding bells will ring for her in October.

For Maureen, love was a grand adventure that happened to her in Europe in the summer of 1967. It budded and bloomed in Munich when she remained on the continent after a three-week Grand Rapids Junior College tour in 1966.

She lived in Europe for a year and a half, first visiting with a sister married to a U.S. serviceman stationed in Bremerhaven and then working in Copenhagen. She vacationed in Greece and Spain during the summer of 1967 and then found work at a hotel in Munich, Germany when she ran out of money.

It was at the hotel that she met Giancarlo Vanin, an Italian who was an on-the-job trainee in hotel administration.

"I was working as a chambermaid," she said, "and I literally met Giancarlo over my mop and pail."

They fell madly in love, and when Maureen returned to Grand Rapids last Christmas and then enrolled at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo it was with plans for a Fall, 1968 wedding.

Maureen and Giancarlo agreed that he should come to Grand Rapids on a visitor's visa in August so he could meet her family and they could be married in September at St. James Catholic Church. After their marriage, they would travel to Munich where Giancarlo would resume his training in hotel administration.

But then the blow fell. Giancarlo was turned down cold when he went to the American consulate in Munich and applied for a visitor's visa so he could go to Grand Rapids to marry Maureen. The official at the consulate told him he would have to apply for an immigrant visa under the quota system, a procedure which would take years because of the long waiting list.

(more)

Maureen wrote to the Immigration and Naturalization Service Office in Detroit but received no help.

Then she appealed to Congressman Ford, detailing how the American consulate official in Munich insisted there was no assurance that Giancarlo would marry during his visit to the United States and that he would return to Europe with his bride.

Ford went to work on the case. Four months, seventeen letters, three telephone calls and one notarized statement later, the American consulate informed Ford that a visitor's visa had been granted to Giancarlo. With Ford's assistance, Maureen and Giancarlo had finally satisfied the consul that they would in fact be married in Grand Rapids and would then leave for Europe.

Bubbling over with happiness, Maureen wrote Congressman Ford:

"I would like to sincerely thank you for your assistance in helping my fiance obtain the visa. We are so thrilled and excited. It's hard to believe he actually has it! It's a nice feeling to know that when you have a problem you can take it to your congressman--and get results!"

Expressing his gratitude, Giancarlo wrote Ford: "I want you to know that all my life I will never forget you. I will never forget what you did for me. I will never forget the man who with his help gave me the opportunity to go to America and marry the girl I love so much."

A daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Szymczak, 731 Stocking, N.W., Maureen will be married to Giancarlo Vanin at 6 p.m. Oct. 17 at St. James Catholic Church with Msgr. Walter Grill reading the Nuptial Mass. There will be a reception at St. Hyacinth's Club.

True to the word given the American consul in Munich, Germany, Maureen and Giancarlo will make their home there for four months after the wedding and then will live for two or three years in Rome where Carlo will complete his hotel management training. They plan ultimately to live in America.

Mrs. Szymczak hasn't met her future son-in-law yet but already she is proud of him.


"He speaks five languages," she said. "I am very happy for Maureen although I am sad at losing her." "You should have seen all the letters they wrote to each other after she came home last Christmas. This just has to be the real thing."

And that is how the course of true love was made smooth by a congressman.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District
Weekly - Aug. 22, 1968
Daily - Aug. 25, 1968*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--

Rep. Jerry Ford Plays Cupid
In Trans-Atlantic Romance

*Setup
meeting betw.
Ford & the couple
Call G.R. Press*

The fellow who first remarked that the course of true love seldom runs smooth might have added: If you have a problem, take it to your congressman.

That's what sweet young Maureen Szymczak of Grand Rapids did when she ran into bad luck with love last Spring. With the help of Rep. Gerald R. Ford, wedding bells will ring for her in October.

For Maureen, love was a grand adventure that happened to her in Europe in the summer of 1967. It budded and bloomed in Munich when she remained on the continent after a three-week Grand Rapids Junior College tour in 1966.

She lived in Europe for a year and a half, first visiting with a sister married to a U.S. serviceman stationed in Bremerhaven and then working in Copenhagen. She vacationed in Greece and Spain during the summer of 1967 and then found work at a hotel in Munich, Germany when she ran out of money.

It was at the hotel that she met Giancarlo Vanin, an Italian who was an on-the-job trainee in hotel administration.

"I was working as a chambermaid," she said, "and I literally met Giancarlo over my mop and pail."

They fell madly in love, and when Maureen returned to Grand Rapids last Christmas and then enrolled at Western Michigan University in Kalamazoo it was with plans for a Fall, 1968 wedding.

Maureen and Giancarlo agreed that he should come to Grand Rapids on a visitor's visa in August so he could meet her family and they could be married in September at St. James Catholic Church. After their marriage, they would travel to Munich where Giancarlo would resume his training in hotel administration.

But then the blow fell. Giancarlo was turned down cold when he went to the American consulate in Munich and applied for a visitor's visa so he could go to Grand Rapids to marry Maureen. The official at the consulate told him he would have to apply for an immigrant visa under the quota system, a procedure which would take years because of the long waiting list.

(more)

Maureen wrote to the Immigration and Naturalization Service Office in Detroit but received no help.

Then she appealed to Congressman Ford, detailing how the American consulate official in Munich insisted there was no assurance that Giancarlo would marry during his visit to the United States and that he would return to Europe with his bride.

Ford went to work on the case. Four months, seventeen letters, three telephone calls and one notarized statement later, the American consulate informed Ford that a visitor's visa had been granted to Giancarlo. With Ford's assistance, Maureen and Giancarlo had finally satisfied the consul that they would in fact be married in Grand Rapids and would then leave for Europe.

Bubbling over with happiness, Maureen wrote Congressman Ford:

"I would like to sincerely thank you for your assistance in helping my fiance obtain the visa. We are so thrilled and excited. It's hard to believe he actually has it! It's a nice feeling to know that when you have a problem you can take it to your congressman--and get results!"

Expressing his gratitude, Giancarlo wrote Ford: "I want you to know that all my life I will never forget you. I will never forget what you did for me. I will never forget the man who with his help gave me the opportunity to go to America and marry the girl I love so much."

A daughter of Mr. and Mrs. Charles Szymczak, 731 Stocking, N.W., Maureen will be married to Giancarlo Vanin at 6 p.m. Oct. 17 at St. James Catholic Church with Msgr. Walter Grill reading the Nuptial Mass. There will be a reception at St. Hyacinth's Club.

True to the word given the American consul in Munich, Germany, Maureen and Giancarlo will make their home there for four months after the wedding and then will live for two or three years in Rome where Carlo will complete his hotel management training. They plan ultimately to live in America.

Mrs. Szymczak hasn't met her future son-in-law yet but already she is proud of him.

"He speaks five languages," she said. "I am very happy for Maureen although I am sad at losing her." "You should have seen all the letters they wrote to each other after she came home last Christmas. This just has to be the real thing."

And that is how the course of true love was made smooth by a congressman.

#

*Distribution: Full
Galleries - 4:45 p.m. Aug. 23, 1968
Mailing - Aug. 23, 1968*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--
August 23, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Minority Leader of the U.S. House of Reps.

The eyes of the world are focused on Czechoslovakia, where freedom-loving Czechs are gallantly resisting Soviet oppression. Meantime, in Biafra, women and children are dying by the thousands as innocent victims of starvation in the Nigerian civil war.

President Johnson has called upon the United Nations Security Council to condemn the Soviet-led invasion of Czechoslovakia and to demand withdrawal of the troops--and I applaud that action. But at the same time the White House is silent about the famine in Biafra caused by the Nigerian Government's refusal to allow relief supply planes to fly into Biafra over Nigerian territory.

While some supplies have been flown into Biafra by the International Red Cross despite the Nigerian Government's attitude, the relief thus afforded has been pitifully small. Now it is reported that the Nigerian Government will allow Red Cross planes to fly into Biafra if they first land in Nigerian federal territory, presumably to be searched for arms.


If this report is accurate, President Johnson should immediately move to implement airlifts of food and other supplies to Biafra. The United States should be in the forefront of nations going to the aid of the million refugees said to be starving in the Calabar area of Biafra.

At the very least, the Johnson Administration should immediately seek clear-cut Nigerian Government permission for Red Cross food airlifts into Biafra. This probably could be done through the British, who reportedly are giving arms aid to the Nigerian federal government and therefore must have considerable influence in Lagos.

We are not talking here about intervening in a civil war. This is not a question of military assistance or involvement. This is a matter of human decency--a need to put food into the mouths of starving people.

Here is an opportunity to demonstrate America's great compassion to the world at the very moment when the Soviet Union is exhibiting the cruelty that results from a fear of basic freedoms. Let us respond to this cry for help from the starving. Let us do what we know to be right.

#



--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--

The way is open for Michigan to launch a statewide water pollution control program if the voters so decide on Nov. 5, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids declared today.

Ford said obstacles posed by a Johnson Administration bill changing the rules on payment of the Federal Government's share of sewage treatment plant costs have been eliminated.

"The Administration proposals have died in the House Public Works Committee, and the Senate abandoned them in the bill recently passed in that body," Ford said.

Ford vigorously attacked the Administration water pollution control amendments after Michigan officials testified against them and said they would wreck Michigan's plans for going ahead with a large-scale water pollution control program.

Gov. George Romney and the State Legislature propose a \$335 million bond issue for pollution control, including the pre-financing of half of the Federal cost-share of the program. The Administration water pollution control amendments would have banned pre-financing of the Federal cost-share of such programs.

The Administration bill also would have restricted Federal aid to communities in major metropolitan centers, which meant that only 14 of Michigan's 83 counties could have expected Federal assistance and 229 of 335 communities needing money for pollution cleanup would have been excluded.

The Administration further proposed to make taxable the State revenue bonds sold to finance such programs as Michigan's, figuring the Federal Government would come out ahead by paying the extra interest costs out of Federal taxes on the bonds.

Michigan and New York protested bitterly, and now the fight is won, Ford said.

"I feel this is a personal victory in view of the strong objections I voiced to members of the House Public Works Committee," Ford declared. "Now I am told

(more)

that Congressman (John) Blatnik, the chairman of the Water Pollution Control Subcommittee, plans to bring out a completely non-controversial bill."

State officials in Lansing are not completely satisfied with the water pollution control bill passed by the U.S. Senate, although it abandons the Administration approach. These officials point out that the Senate bill pledges payment of the Federal cost-share over a 30-year period but places a ceiling on amounts that can be committed for state programs. They said this legislation would not destroy Michigan's program but would slow it down.

The existing Federal program permits state pre-financing of the Federal cost-share but does not guarantee Federal payment.


Michigan officials said they want legislation which guarantees payment to the states of the Federal cost-share but does not hamstring state programs with unrealistic ceilings on Federal funding.

"I feel sure this entire problem will be worked out to Michigan's satisfaction," Ford said. "I certainly am going to do everything I can to see to it that Michigan is in a position to go ahead with the kind of water pollution control program the people want."

Besides fighting the water pollution control amendments Michigan found objectionable, Ford recently introduced legislation to prohibit the dumping of spoilage from dredging operations into Lake Michigan and other navigable waters.

#

*Distribution: House Galleries 5:00 p.m. 8/30/68
Mailing 8/30/68*



M

CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

Office Copy

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
August 30, 1968

(Note to Correspondents: Mr. Ford is campaigning in Alaska on behalf of Rep. Howard Pollack. He dictated this statement over the telephone for release through his Washington Office.)

Americans are appalled by what happened in Chicago, both inside and outside of the Democratic National Convention.

First of all, it appears that some leaders of the antiwar demonstrators who tried to march on the convention Amphitheatre deliberately sought a confrontation with the police. But this does not excuse the indiscriminate use of force and the flouting of basic American rights and freedoms. The blame for that rests squarely on the Democratic Party political bosses who ran the convention--Mayor Richard J. Daley and outgoing Democratic National Committee Chairman John Bailey. And it should be noted that Vice-President Hubert H. Humphrey did little but say that it was regrettable.


The American people know who was responsible for this shocking spectacle--the Democratic Party hierarchy. Who handicapped newsmen who were simply trying to do their job? Daley and Bailey. Who gave the orders which resulted in newsmen and convention delegates being beaten or otherwise manhandled? Daley and Bailey. Violence not only was done to the physical persons of newsmen and others at Chicago but to the basic American right of petition and freedom of the press.

If the FBI investigation of these outrages proves inadequate, I will seek an investigation by the appropriate committee of the U.S. House of Representatives.

#

*Distribution: 5th District
Hearings - Aug. 29, 1968
Hearings - Sept. 3, 1968*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

For Use the Week of Sept. 1-7 and thereafter

Engineers
Report On
Lake Dumping

BY JERRY FORD

Would you believe that the Army Corps of Engineers and others dug more than 1 million cubic yards of polluted material out of Lake Michigan harbors last year and then dumped it back into the lake?

That's the story in a report I obtained from the Corps of Engineers the other day after I became aware of the Federal Government's role in polluting Lake Michigan.

I have been lighting fires under the Federal Government for contributing to Lake Michigan pollution, and it seems my efforts already are paying off.

For instance, the Corps of Engineers report on Lake Michigan dumping indicates that disposal of polluted material in the open lake this year will total only 359,000 cubic yards. I say "only," because this is a sharp drop from the grand total of more than 1 million cubic yards of polluted dredging spoil tossed back into the lake last year.

Meantime I have introduced a bill that would prohibit the dumping of any dredging spoil back into Lake Michigan. From the standpoint of cost and other considerations, it may be that material shown not to be polluted should be exempted from the proposed ban. But I think we should start out with the idea of banning all Lake Michigan dumping and force others to make a case for exceptions.

I am happy to report that the material dredged out of Grand Haven and Holland harbors in both 1967 and 1968 was classified by the Army Corps of Engineers as "not polluted." As a matter of fact, the worst instances of Lake Michigan pollution from dumping of dredging material occur in connection with Calumet, Green Bay, Indiana and Milwaukee Harbors.

In a letter to me accompanying his report, Col. F. E. Anderson, Jr. of the Corps of Engineers, asserted that "most of the grossly polluted dredging

(more)

-2-

spoil" goes into diked disposal areas instead of back into Lake Michigan. He emphasized that Corps of Engineers construction of diked spoil areas is being done only on a pilot basis for study purposes. There are no funds, he said, to build full-scale diked disposal areas at polluted harbors.

My comment is that the dumping of any polluted dredging spoil into Lake Michigan is a destructive activity. It helps to destroy one of our most precious resources -- water. It should be stopped.


We all know that the fight against water pollution costs money. But think of all the projects of dubious value on which federal funds are being lavished at present. Then ask yourself whether more should not be done about water pollution instead.

Polluting of Lake Michigan with dredging spoil is only part of the Lake Michigan problem, of course, and only a fraction of the overall water pollution problem facing communities throughout the State of Michigan.

What is required is that all of us assign top priority to the fight against water pollution and lend our support to a massive federal-state-and-local campaign to clean up our streams and lakes.

This is not just a Federal problem by any means. It is everybody's problem.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

September 3, 1968

Congressman Gerald R. Ford announced today that five all-expense college scholarships with a career in the armed services of our country are available to young men of Kent and Ionia Counties.

"The Fifth District in 1969 will be entitled to two appointments to the Military Academy at West Point, one to the Naval Academy at Annapolis, and two to the Air Force Academy at Colorado Springs," Ford said.

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


Appointments will be based on the results of an open, competitive Civil Service examination. The examination will be held on Saturday, October 5, and will be given at Grand Rapids, Lansing, and many other cities in the United States and abroad for those residing temporarily away from home. An examination will also be conducted on Saturday, November 9, for those who cannot report for the October examination.

Ford said that young men who will have graduated from high school by June, 1969, are unmarried, and under 22 years of age at the time classes begin, are eligible for consideration of appointment to one of the Service academies. Those he appoints must have a legal residence in the 5th District.

Applications may be obtained from Ford's Grand Rapids office at 425 Cherry Street, S.E. (telephone GLEndale 6-9747), and from his Washington office in the Capitol Building. Applications should be filed by September 20 but may be considered if received as late as October 25.

Rep. Ford emphasized that the opportunities offered qualified young men who choose these four-year courses lead not only to a bachelor's degree in science but also to a commission in one of the Services. "Young men in Kent and Ionia Counties," Congressman Ford stated, "should seriously consider the opportunities for training and a career offered by the United States Military, Naval, Air Force, Merchant Marine, and Coast Guard Academies. These appointments offer a wonderful educational opportunity and an honorable career in the service of our country. I urge all qualified young men who are interested in this worthwhile profession to obtain further information and an application form as soon as possible."

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
September 9, 1968

Statement by House Minority Leader Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich.

Like the legendary Roman hero Horatio of the Bridge, Hubert Humphrey apparently is the last to learn that his administration has gone off and left the gallant defenders of Israel's independence without adequate arms to match the massive Russian buildup in the Middle East.

The Vice-President addressed the Convention of B'Nai Brith here yesterday and apparently endorsed the position taken by the Republican Leadership of the Congress and the 1968 Republican Platform that Israel should promptly receive the latest supersonic jet aircraft from the United States. Does the Vice-President agree with the steadfast policy of the Johnson-Humphrey Administration in denying this necessary protection to Israel on the specious grounds that the Russians may still be persuaded to limit the Middle East arms race?

Since the tragic event in Czechoslovakia, it should be apparent even to those who have repeatedly ignored the brutal facts of Soviet power politics that Moscow will make maximum use of its conventional military force in international affairs.

Senator Dirksen and I long ago warned that the Soviet Union was converting its 1967 military defeat in the Middle East into a strategic success by rapidly resupplying its Arab clients with the most modern weapons and military personnel. Together with other Republicans in the Congress and the Republican Coordinating Committee we have repeatedly urged the Johnson-Humphrey Administration to move quickly to redress the imbalance of power at this vital crossroads of the World.

I am happy that the Vice-President, now that he is the Democratic nominee, has seconded our Republican cause to make good on the long-standing and non-partisan American commitment to Israel's security which the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was the first to weaken in the 1967 showdown. But I believe Mr. Humphrey owes it to the American people to explain whether or not he is openly repudiating the present Middle East policy, or non-policy, of the Administration to which he owes his candidacy.

(more)

-2-

The record of the Republican Party and its candidates, Richard Nixon and Spiro T. Agnew, is consistent and crystal clear on this score. Not alone for Israel's sake, but in the interests of the United States and the Free World, further Russian penetration of the Middle East cannot go unanswered forever. If the Vice-President really favors providing Phantom jets to Israel, he should argue his case at the White House today. All that is required is President Johnson's approval, and Hubert Humphrey is his political protege.

#

Distribution: Michigan P.M. 9/19/68

Asilias 9/24/68
Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Minority Leader of the U.S. House
of Representatives.

M Office Copy

For Use the Week of Sept. 22-28 and thereafter

Ford Pledges
Personal Support
In Pollution Fight

BY JERRY FORD

I will vote Nov. 5 for the \$335 million state bond issue to fight water pollution.

Clean water is vital to every man, woman and child in Kent and Ionia counties and throughout the State of Michigan.

I am dedicating myself to the fight for clean water in Michigan and as part of that effort I am supporting the bond issue proposal on the November ballot.

Although no tax increase is involved, I would not presume to tell any other resident of Kent and Ionia counties how to vote on the bond issue question.

But I suggest we all consider that unless we act to halt pollution we will kill our rivers and make mammoth cesspools of our lakes.

We should consider that Lake Michigan is aging at 300 to 500 times its normal rate because of pollution...

That more than 900 miles of once-high-quality streams in Michigan are now degraded by untreated or improperly treated municipal wastes discharged into them...

That at least 150 Michigan communities currently are violating the state pollution control law, primarily for lack of funds.

The route to clean, usable water is really pretty simple. Keep the filth and pollution out of the water in the first place.

Unfortunately, keeping pollutants out of the water also is pretty expensive. It means building sewage collection systems, constructing sewage treatment plants, and getting others to treat industrial wastes, build power plant cooling towers and contain the threat of chemical pesticides.

If we in Michigan are to control municipal pollution adequately--even by 1980--we must build 210 new municipal sewage treatment plants, build sewers for an additional 3.5 million people and improve 126 existing sewage treatment facilities.

The \$335 million state bond issue will help do this and will provide \$50 million for small, hard-pressed communities without sewers.

There is much that must be done to clean up Michigan's waters. The \$335 million bond issue would be a giant step in the right direction.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
October 9, 1968

M Office Copy

**NEWS
RELEASE**

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, House Minority Leader

In a last ditch effort to get the dominant Democratic Majority to schedule the Clean Elections and Congressional Reform legislation for Floor consideration during this 90th Congress, the Republican Members have kept the House of Representatives in continuous session for over twenty-four hours. During this historic session, there have been some 36 quorum roll calls and six roll call votes.

In order that the record may be absolutely clear with respect to this important matter, the following pertinent information must be noted.

During this Congress the House Republican Members, Leadership and Policy Committee have done everything that they can to get the Congressional Reorganization and Clean Elections legislation to the House Floor. In the 89th Congress and again in this Congress, the Republican Policy Committee repeatedly urged prompt action on both Clean Elections and Congressional Reorganization legislation. The very first action of the House Republican Policy Committee this year on July 30, 1968, was to adopt a statement demanding prompt consideration of the Election Reform Bill and legislation that would permit television debates between presidential candidates.

Significantly, it was only after a great deal of prodding by the Republican Members of the House Administration Committee that the Election Reform Act of 1968, H.R. 11233, was finally reported from Committee. And prior to being reported, the weak Election Reform proposal recommended by the Johnson-Humphrey Administration was shelved in favor of the strong measure that was initially developed by the Republican Members. It was only through the incorporation of a number of Republican provisions that honest reporting of campaign contributions and expenditures and streamlined enforcement procedures were ensured.

Despite the continuing efforts of Republican Members, the House Democratic Leadership refused to schedule this vital legislation for Floor action. The Congressional Reform Bill and the Clean Elections Bill were left to languish in the Rules Committee. The prospects of legislative action prior to the 1968 election were very dim indeed.

(more)

This sorry situation was described in an October 3, 1968 Washington Post Editorial entitled, "Obsolescence on the Hill." This editorial stated:

"It is deeply ironical that the Congress which has so signally failed to meet its obligations, has also smothered the legislation designed to modernize some of its procedures...Though it is a mild reform bill, the reactionary forces in the House seem determined to kill it. Along with it in limbo is the constructive election reform bill."

This then is the reason that in what appears to be the last week of the 90th Congress, the Republican Leadership has used an extraordinary, parliamentary device in an attempt to break this essential legislation loose. And we promise that when the American voters in the November election elect a Republican Majority in the House of Representatives, the "straitjacket of obsolescence" will be unstrapped and these bills will have a high priority in a Republican Agenda for the 91st Congress.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District
Weeklies - 10/11/68
News - 10/14/68*

M. Office Copy

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford

For Release by Kent and Ionia County News Media on Oct. 17, 1968.

Extent of flooding hazards in the Grand Rapids area will be studied intensively by the Army Corps of Engineers, Rep. Gerald R. Ford reported today.

Ford said the Corps will gather data which then will be available to the public and to State and local agencies. It is expected the study will be completed within 12 months and will cost about \$24,000.

Information to be put together by the Corps will describe basic flood hazards in the Grand Rapids area -- frequency of flooding, the areas involved, relative height of the flooding, measurements of water velocity.

"This will be an important study," Ford said. "The information to be assembled by the Corps of Engineers will be useful as a basis for all kinds of planning decisions. The extent to which flooding hazards in Kent County have increased has not been fully recognized."

Funds for the study were contained in the Federal Government's fiscal 1969 budget, Ford said.

#

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, issued 11 p.m. Oct. 31, 1968

M office Copy

"We must rely on the President's judgment that the bombing ~~halt~~ halt will not result in greater American casualties. We can only hope that the cessation of the bombing will lead to real progress toward a peace settlement. I don't think we should read too much into this development, although there may be some indication that bargaining at Paris now will begin in ~~an~~ earnest. I would not like to believe that the timing of the bombing halt has anything to do with Tuesday's election. This development does indicate to that a policy of firmness toward Hanoi--the policy of Johnson and Nixon--produces better results than the policies advocated by Hubert Humphrey.

#####



*Distribution: Full 10:15 a.m.
11/4/68*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
November 4, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Republican Leader, U.S. House of Reps.

We have botched up Vietnam again. In only three days since the bombing halt we have our ally, South Vietnam, hurt and angry. We have made our enemy's homeland a sanctuary--we have confused the Paris peace talks--we have the war back in domestic politics--and again America is humiliated before the world.

Yesterday Richard Nixon told the Nation that if he is elected tomorrow he will work arm-in-arm with our President and Secretary of State to help the President win his gamble for peace.

I am delighted with that assurance. Even as President-Elect, Richard Nixon can help us move forward again. But we will be far better off when we get a clean sweep in Washington.

We must have a new team in Washington. We have to stop fumbling every international ball we put into play. There is no hope for a better day with Hubert Humphrey. He is one of the architects of failure. No matter how hard he tried, he would just give us more of the same.

This is an over-riding reason why everyone who has had enough of trouble at home and trouble abroad ought to vote tomorrow for Richard Nixon for President.

#

*Distribution: Full 10:30 a.m.
11/6/68 7/11 Office Copy*



--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
November 6, 1968

The 1968 election results represent a great advance for the Republican Party. We would have won control of the House of Representatives as well as the White House except for complications resulting from the third-party candidacy of George Wallace and the President's order of a bombing halt just five days before the election. Those observations aside, there is no doubt in my mind that the 91st Congress will far more accurately reflect the wishes of the American people than the 90th and will be still more in line with the thinking of the people than the rubber-stamp 89th Congress. It will reflect the fact that the Republican Party has moved upward almost miraculously in the people's favor since 1964. We will continue to grow in strength. I believe that in 1970 the people will see the wisdom of turning control of the Congress over to the Republican Party. Apparently this changeover was too much to hope for in '68. I personally know of nothing we could have or should have done differently in our congressional campaigns.


#

Distribution: Fifth District

11/14/68

3:30 p.m. Air Mail

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
November 14, 1968

**NEWS
RELEASE**

Veterans and their dependents in the Grand Rapids area soon will be as close to the Veterans Administration Regional Office in Detroit as they are to their telephone, Congressman Gerald R. Ford announced today.

Congressman Ford said, effective November 22, 1968, a new VA FX telephone system linking the Grand Rapids area with the Detroit Regional Office will be put into operation.

He emphasized that the cost of such calls will be no more than the cost of a call to their next door neighbor -- there is no long distance charge.

Under the FX system, Congressman Ford explained, a veteran can pick up the telephone in his home, shop, or office, dial a local Grand Rapids number, 456-8511, and talk with a VA representative in the Detroit Regional Office where files for Grand Rapids veterans are located.

Calls may be made Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m.

VA representatives in Detroit will provide assistance on all VA programs, including education and training, insurance, compensation and pension, vocational rehabilitation, medical care, and G.I. loans, as well as on veterans benefits administered by other Federal agencies, the Congressman said.

Congressman Ford noted that the telephone company information service will carry the Veterans Administration FX number as a local listing and it will appear in future telephone directories.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District
Mailed 3:30 p.m.
11/15/68*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--
November 15, 1968

The Ionia Recreation Area will swell to more than 3,000 acres as the result of a fresh Federal grant, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids announced today.

Ford said the Michigan Conservation Department will receive \$169,477.50 in Federal funds to add 941 acres of land to the existing 2,115-acre area.

Ford noted that this will bring the total Ionia Recreation Area acreage to 3,056.

He said the ultimate goal is to expand the area to perhaps 3,500 acres, according to the U.S. Department of Interior.

With the new grant, the Federal Government has put \$520,049 of matching money into the recreation area, Ford said. Since this money is matched by the State, total investment in Ionia Recreation Area land to date is \$1,040,098, Ford noted.


He said the Interior Department indicated there will be one final allocation of funds to the State Conservation Department for purchase of still more Ionia Recreation Area land.

The original Ionia project was approved in April 1967.

The area is used for hunting, hiking, camping, nature study, canoeing and winter sports.

The federal funds for the project come from the Federal Land and Water Conservation Fund. That Fund is built up from sale of the annual \$7 Golden Eagle Permit which admits a carload of people to all Federal areas, other Federal outdoor recreation entrance and user fees, the sale of Federal surplus real property, and the Federal motorboat fuels tax.

#



A surveillance radar system estimated to cost \$270,000 will be installed at Kent County Airport by the Federal Aviation Agency, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids announced today.

It will be two years before the system is in operation, he said.

Ford said FAA Administrator David D. Thomas notified him that funds had been earmarked for the project. The FAA now will prepare the specifications and seek bids. The contract will be awarded about next June, the FAA told Ford.


It then will take about 18 months for delivery of the equipment and another 90 to 180 days for FAA to install it, Ford said.

The surveillance radar system will be a big safety plus for Kent County Airport, Ford declared. He noted that it is used by air traffic controllers to separate aircraft approaching the Grand Rapids area. It is particularly useful in bad weather.

The FAA approves an airport for surveillance radar when a survey shows at least 20,000 annual instrument approaches by aircraft landing at the airport and at least 1,000 itinerant operations.

#

*Distribution: 9th District
Air Mail 3:20 p.m. 11/21/68 M Office Copy*



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--
November 22, 1968

A new bathhouse estimated to cost roughly \$66,750 will be built in Long Lake Park with the help of federal funds, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids announced today.

Ford said the Kent County Road and Park Commission will receive a \$33,378.48 Land and Water Conservation Fund Grant from the Interior Department. The federal funds are to be matched by Kent County.


The new bathhouse will replace an old Long Lake Park bathhouse building. The park is due north of Grand Rapids between 16 and 17-Mile Roads.

The federal grant for the project comes from a fund built up with revenues from sale of the \$7 Golden Eagle permit which admits a carload of people to Federal recreation areas, other Federal outdoor recreation entrance and user fees, the sale of Federal surplus real property, and the Federal motorboat fuels tax.

#

*Distribution: Fifth District
Air Mail 6:00 p.m.
11/25/68*

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER


**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--
November 26, 1968

Pine Rest Christian Hospital and Sheltered Workshop will receive a Federal grant of \$86,622 to expand a building serving retarded and mentally ill persons and to augment other services and programs, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids announced today.

Pine Rest, located at 6850 South Division in Grand Rapids, will put \$28,874 of its own funds into the project for a total investment of \$115,496 in the expansion program, Ford said. The federal funds come from the Rehabilitation Services Administration of the Health-Education-Welfare Department.

#



Davenport College of Business in Grand Rapids will launch a \$526,000 college housing program with the aid of a \$500,000 Federal loan, Rep. Gerald R. Ford of Grand Rapids said today.

Ford reported approval by the Housing and Urban Development Department of a \$500,000 loan to Davenport College to be repaid over a 30-year period at 3 per cent interest.

The Federal loan, supplemented with \$26,000 of the college's own funds, will be used to buy two apartment buildings and convert them into student housing, Ford said.

The converted buildings will provide housing for 94 men and 36 women students.

Architectural work for the conversion project will be done by Wold, Bowers, De Shane & Covert of Grand Rapids.

#


Note to Editors: If any further information is desired, it is suggested you contact Robert E. Schmiedicke, Vice-President, Davenport College of Business, 415 East Fulton Street, Grand Rapids.

Distribution: Fifth District

11:30 a.m.

Airmail 12/4/68

M Office Copy



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT--
December 5, 1968

The Grand Rapids Housing Commission will be handed nearly \$2 million in federal loan funds to buy 100 row-style homes for rental to low-income families, Rep. Gerald R. Ford announced today.

Ford said the Housing and Urban Development Department has just earmarked loan funds for purchase of the housing. The homes will be located in an area bounded by Barnett, Lafayette, Clancy and Cedar Streets.

Tempo Construction, Inc., of Grand Rapids will build the homes. The Grand Rapids Housing Commission then will buy them, using up to \$1,911,047 in federal money. That is the amount of the financial assistance contract approved by HUD.

This new-style public housing project is part of a HUD program called Turnkey.

The new program permits a local housing authority to buy housing produced by private developers on their own land.


Under the Grand Rapids contract approved by HUD, the \$1.9 million loan will cover land, construction and equipment, utilities, planning and design, space for management and maintenance and for tenant or neighborhood services and activities, contingencies, and administrative costs.

The Grand Rapids Housing Commission will sell long-term bonds to private investors and use the proceeds to repay the \$1.9 million loan to the Federal Government.

This is taxpayer-subsidized housing. The financial assistance contract provides for annual federal contributions to the Grand Rapids Housing Commission to keep the rent low on the row-style homes.

###

*Distribution: Full
Galleries: 10:00 a.m. 12/12/68 M Office Copy*



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER


**NEWS
RELEASE**

--FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE--
December 12, 1968

STATEMENT BY REP. GERALD R. FORD, REPUBLICAN LEADER, U.S. HOUSE OF REPS.

I view President-elect Nixon's cabinet as an action team chosen from among the best talent in the country. It is a problem-solving team, a cabinet blessed with a wealth of expertise in government. I call attention to the fact that Mr. Nixon has named three governors to his cabinet. I believe this is unprecedented in the history of the Nation. It is particularly noteworthy that Mr. Nixon has appointed Michigan Gov. George Romney as Secretary of Housing and Urban Development. George Romney not only has a tremendous record as an activist governor in Michigan, he also enjoys the respect and regard of our Negro citizens throughout the country. Mr. Nixon's appointment of Gov. Romney as head of HUD and Daniel Moynihan as presidential adviser on urban affairs, a non-cabinet post, indicates that the urban crisis will have top priority in the Nixon Administration. On the selection of George P. Shultz as Secretary of Labor, I would point out that labor union officials have described him as "fair and honest." The Nixon cabinet is a strong team in every respect. This means the American people can anticipate sound progressive leadership over the next four years.

#



CONGRESSMAN
GERALD R. FORD
HOUSE REPUBLICAN LEADER

M Office Copy
**NEWS
RELEASE**

FOR RELEASE ON RECEIPT
December 20, 1968

When Mrs. Florence Kent thought of her teenage soldier sons, Arthur and Darcy, spending their first away-from-home Christmas in faroff Vietnam, she felt heartsick.

Then she hit on an idea. Art was at Chu Lai; Dart, at Phu Bai. Wouldn't it be wonderful if the military authorities would bring them together on Christmas Day!

With that in mind, Mrs. Kent, of 3900 Flamingo, S.W., Wyoming, wrote to Congressman Gerald R. Ford and asked if he could help.

Ford promptly fired off a request to the Commanding General of the U.S. Army in Vietnam asking if the two young men could possibly be reunited for Christmas. Ford noted that the two boys, 18 and 19, had not only enlisted in the Army but had volunteered for duty in Vietnam.

In passing along Mrs. Kent's request, Ford noted that she is "a fine, courageous woman who raised her children (seven of them) alone, without outside help of any kind, since these two soldiers were nine and 10 years old respectively."

Days passed. Then came a wire from the commanding general informing Ford that Pfc. Darcy Kent would be transported on December 23 to the spot where his brother, Pfc. Arthur Kent, is stationed.

"The two brothers will be together for the Christmas holidays," the general promised.

In a letter to Mrs. Kent, Ford said: "Having two teenage sons who not only enlisted but volunteered for Vietnam duty as well is almost unbelievable in this time when so many are doing everything they can to avoid their military obligation. When you tell me that you raised your seven children from early childhood alone, without any outside help, I am filled with tremendous admiration for you. The fine spirit of your sons in Vietnam is a reflection of the wonderful courage and spirit of you, their mother."

Ford figures that the reuniting of Art and Dart in Vietnam at Christmastime is perhaps the best present Mrs. Kent could receive, short of having her sons back home with her.

#####



FOR SATURDAY AM'S RELEASE
DEC. 21, 1968

Statement by Rep. Gerald R. Ford, R-Mich., Minority Leader, U.S. House of Reps.

It is a terrible tragedy that thousands of Biafrans should be starving to death as a result of the Nigerian civil war, and this is doubly pitiful during the Christmas season when we talk of "peace on earth, good will toward men."

I therefore take this occasion to urge President Johnson to employ his personal influence in an effort to bring about a cease-fire in Nigeria and to greatly augment food and medical relief for the Biafrans.

It is reported that the American contribution to Nigerian war relief has been two-thirds of the international effort. I think we can and should do more--much more.

One means of quickly expanding the relief effort would be to make U.S. Government transport planes available for mercy missions to be flown by private pilots. This could be done in cooperation with the International Red Cross. Emergency sea and land operations tied in with this airlift could also be launched.

I believe the United States should scrupulously avoid any kind of military involvement in the Nigerian civil war. We should not take sides with either the Nigerian federal government or the insurgent Biafrans. But in the name of humanity we must expand our obviously inadequate contribution to the relief of starving women and children in Biafra.

#####