

The original documents are located in Box 16, folder “Press Conferences (2)” of the Robert T. Hartmann Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

PRESS CONFERENCE NO. 4

OF THE

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

(AND LUIS ECHEVERRIA, PRESIDENT OF MEXICO)

5:10 P.M. MST
OCTOBER 21, 1974
MONDAY

At the Tubac Country Club
Tubac, Arizona

THE PRESIDENT: It has been a very great privilege and pleasure, Mr. President, to have the opportunity of visiting your country today, and to discuss with you a number of very important issues. And let me just emphasize one.

You, of course, are the author and promoter of some very far-reaching action in the United Nations which we believe, as a charter for economic development throughout the world, has very great merit and very great support, and I compliment you for it. And I can assure you that I and Secretary Kissinger will work with you and others in your government in trying to find the key and the answer to the economic development of all parts of our great globe.

It is nice to have you in the United States, and I thank you for the warm welcome given to me by you as well as all the people of Mexico.

Yes.

QUESTION: I would like to address a question to both Presidents. About the issues you discussed today, was there a discussion of American access to the recently discovered oil deposits in Southern Mexico, and could you give us an estimate of the size of those deposits?

PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA: Yes, Mexico is selling to whoever wants to buy the oil at the market price in the world market. We sell our surplus oil. I hope that we can drill for more oil in Mexico in order to be able to export a greater amount.

MORE

We have sold to the United States, to Uruguay and to Brazil and to Israel, and we hope to continue to sell without making any differences among the buyers in order to contribute to satisfy the demand.

QUESTION: I would like to know, President Ford, if, during your talks, there was any mention made of the Trade Reform Act and if so, what are the repercussions that this will have for Mexico?

THE PRESIDENT: I am very happy and very pleased that you raised the question. The new trade legislation, which I hope will pass the Congress this year, will significantly increase the trade relations between Mexico and the United States, helping to balance the trade between Mexico and the United States.

The trade legislation which I have worked very hard to promote, which I believe will pass the United States Senate, and I believe the Congress, will be very helpful in making good trade relations between the United States and Mexico.

MORE

QUESTION: Can you tell us whether any progress has been made on resolving the question of migrant farmers of Mexico and the question that is involved in that?

PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA: Yes. Yes, we did discuss this point and I brought it up in the name of Mexico -- I told the President of the United States that we have definitely desisted from our intention of signing an agreement and this is due to the fact that we made a revision of the previous agreement and we saw that in practice, in the way it works, it is not good. It gives opposite results from the ones we want.

What happened at that time was that, attracted by this agreement that we had with the United States, the migrant workers, or the would-be migrant workers, would come to the border cities of the United States and then it happened that they did not receive a contract and then they stayed at the border city and increased the population or else they went illegally into the United States.

Now, with the policy of self-criticism that presently prevails in Mexico, we have reviewed this matter and we have come to realize and accept that the responsibility belongs to Mexico.

In Mexico, we need to increase the sources of employment. We need to send more out into the countryside. We need to keep them within the land. I do not know if President Ford has anything to add because we analyzed this point jointly.

THE PRESIDENT: As you can see, we discussed this matter in great depth. It has a long history. It has current problems. In fact, we have some new problems and in order to get an up-to-date reading on what should be done, how we can best help, we have decided to re-analyze through a commission that will bring up the data that involves those going from Mexico to the United States and will update data that will involve individuals who are in the United States seeking employment, trying to find the right answer, and this revitalized commission, I think, will give both of us, and our countries, better answers to solve the problem.

PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA: Now, however, there is a point that Mexico insists upon in reference to the migrant workers -- whether they are legally in the country or illegally in the country. That is, Mexico insists that they enjoy the rights and prerogatives that is granted by the law to any person.

MORE

When a person is contracted legally and comes to work in the United States, this person under contract has certain rights -- the right to a decent salary, the right to Social Security, and that is to say all the rights that are granted by the law. This is when the person comes to work legally.

Now, if the migrant worker comes in illegally, he still has some rights that must be observed -- this is basic.

QUESTION: I have a question for President Ford. I would like to ask President Ford whether the hemispheric problems were taken up and if they did take up the hemispheric problems, what is the attitude of the United States with reference to Cuba and if this attitude is to be maintained at the next Conference of Foreign Ministers.

PRESIDENT FORD: We did take up the question of the United States' attitude toward Cuba. I indicated that we have not seen any change in the attitude of Mr. Castro or any of the other individuals in the Cuban Government and inasmuch as there has been no change, no attitude that was different regarding the United States, it was not expected that our attitude would change toward Cuba.

We did discuss the meeting that is to be held in Quito, I think, on November 7th or 8th, where the matter will be brought before the OAS. But our attitude, as of the present time, is since no change in the attitude of Cuba we certainly have to retain our point of view concerning them.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, I wonder if you could answer one part of the question which was not answered, and that is, can you give us some estimate of the size of the new oil findings in Mexico?

PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA: Yes. The new oil findings in Mexico are very important. Their importance comes from the following figures. Yes, I will be happy to answer your question.

Yes, the discoveries are very important and significant, and the significance we can find in the following figures. Of the 640,000 barrels a day that are obtained throughout all of Mexico, 37 percent -- that is 241,000 barrels -- come from only a few wells. This has made it possible for us now to begin to export after having transcended the stage where it was necessary for us to import in order to satisfy our own consumption.

Therefore, this is very important for the Mexican economy, first and foremost, if we take into account the prices that prevail for oil in the world market, prices which we respect.

QUESTION: This is a question for both Presidents.

Can you give us a list of the specific agreements that you reached today?

PRESIDENT ECHEVERRIA: Actually, no. We did not come to international agreements. It was the first meeting between the President of the United States and the President of Mexico in order to get together to discuss, to analyze, very frankly, very openly, very clearly, very directly, some of the problems that have already been dealt with in this room.

For me, the most important part of our meeting is the way in which President Ford underlined to me personally and later on here during our meeting in this place the importance that he gives the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

And I thank President Ford and the people of the United States, for this opinion that has been expressed to me, because actually this is a complete change from what it was before, and this is very valuable support for this charter that is gaining ground within the United Nations, and for the already 100-some countries that are supporting the charter.

MORE

The United States had never before expressed as much interest as it has now in the approval of the Charter of Economic Rights and Duties of States.

Of course it rather matters that we still have to elucidate, that we have to define, but I feel very optimistic that we shall.

THE PRESS: Muchas gracias.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END (AT 5:35 P.M. MST)

This Copy For _____

PRESIDENT GERALD R. FORD'S NEWS CONFERENCE #4

Held in the Briefing Room
At the White House
Washington, D.C.

October 29, 1974
At 10:56 A.M. EST (Tuesday)

Official White House Transcript

THE PRESIDENT: This morning, before the press conference, I would like to announce several appointments, and then we will have the press conference subsequently.

At the outset, let me remind you that on October 8 I announced that Rog Morton would be the head of the Energy Council and that subsequently I would make several other appointments predicated on legislation enacted by the Congress and some reorganization in the Energy Administration.

Rog Morton is here. Rog, I think most of you know him. He is pretty hard to miss (Laughter), but the new appointments are as follows:

Dr. Robert Seamans, former Secretary of the Air Force, and formerly a very high-ranking official in NASA, had a great deal to do with the manned space program, will be the new Administrator of the ERDA, the Energy Research and Development Agency.

Bob, we are glad to have you on board.

Then to head the FEA, John Sawhill is resigning, and we will give him a good appointment in the Government, but the new head of the FEA will be Andy Gibson, who was an Assistant Secretary of Commerce and was in charge of the Maritime Administration, will be the new head of the FEA.



Andy, glad to have you on board.

Then, for the new Nuclear Regulatory Agency, I am nominating Bill Anders, who is currently a member of the AEC, but who will be the Chairman, once confirmed, of the new Regulatory Agency.

You are all familiar with Bill Anders' record as an astronaut and his service as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

Then, Dixie Lee Ray will be the new Assistant Secretary of State of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Matters.

Dixie Lee.

This is the new team that will be in charge of the energy program, which we will see moving ahead, I think, under Rog Morton's stewardship with the new faces and the experience of Bob Seamans, Andy Gibson, Bill Anders and Dixie Lee Ray.

I thank all of them for taking on these new responsibilities. I think they are an outstanding group of administrators with experience both outside of Government and within the Government.

So, Rog, you have got a good group, and I am proud of them, and I think they will do a first-class job. Thank you very, very much.

With those preliminary announcements, I will be glad now to respond to any questions.

Mr. Cormier.

QUESTION: Mr. President, the Government's leading economic indicators announced today show that last month they experienced the sharpest drop in 23 years. Might this sort of thing prompt you to amend your economic program to put more emphasis on fighting recession rather than fighting inflation? And if so, what steps might you take?

THE PRESIDENT: The 31-point program that I submitted to the Congress and the American people did take into recognition the problems of some deterioration in some parts of the economy, and at the same time recognized the need to do something about inflation.

It was a finely-tuned, I think, constructive program to meet both of these problems.

Now, the program is before the Congress and Congress must act on certain aspects of it. This, perhaps, will take some time and, in the interim, if there are any economic factors which justify a change, I will be open to suggestions.

But at this point, I still believe the plan or program as I submitted it is sound, both to meet the challenge of inflation and any deterioration in the economy.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in view of the Watergate and inflation and other urgent problems facing the Nation, how do you account for the voter apathy in this country? And I have a follow-up.

THE PRESIDENT: I wish I knew the answer to that, Mr. Sperling. It would seem to me that with the problems we have, particularly at home -- both Watergate and others -- that the voters should be extremely interested in the kind of Members of the House and Senate that are elected or defeated.

One of the reasons that I am campaigning is to try and get the voters off of apathy and on to interest. I happen to believe that a big public showing of voter participation would be very helpful, and I am disturbed that these forecasters say that only 42 percent of the eligible voters are going to vote on November 5.

So, if I can in any way stimulate voter interest, I intend to do so.

QUESTION: That leads to my second question; that is, do you think you are breaking through this apathy? Are you shaking up this disinterest? What is your finding?

THE PRESIDENT: From my contacts with Members of Congress or candidates who are in the various places where I have stopped, they tell me that voter interest has been stimulated by my appearance. I suspect we will get a few who don't approve of my appearance in a certain community, but I believe overall there has been an increase in voter interest as a result of my visits. And as I said, that is one reason why I intend to continue them.

Miss Thomas.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you think that Nelson Rockefeller will be confirmed as Vice President, and when?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe that Nelson Rockefeller will be confirmed. I strongly support him today, as I did when I nominated him in August. I hope and trust that the Senate and House committees, as well as the two bodies themselves, will act promptly on the nomination. I think he would make a very good Vice President.

QUESTION: Then you don't think the financial problems that have suddenly cropped up will affect the outcome?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not.

QUESTION: Mr. President, the Democratic Study Group, in an analysis they made of your voting record over the last three years you were in the House, showed you voted 86 percent of the time in support of spending proposals beyond the Nixon budget, and it amounted to some \$16.9 billion. How do you square that with your campaign argument that the Democrats are the big spenders?

THE PRESIDENT: I think their own survey, Mr. Lisagor, showed I had a much better record of saving than the Democrats did in the House of Representatives.

In other words, their own document showed that the Democrats were much bigger spenders than I was and that I was a much better saver than they were. So, I will rely on their document to prove that I am a saver and they are spenders.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you know how you came out net?

THE PRESIDENT: It is my recollection that I was about 8 percentage points better than the Democrats as a whole, so even using their figures or their document, I am a saver and the Democrats are spenders.

QUESTION: Mr. President, sir, I want to know if you are going to sign the veterans G.I. education bill that has been left at the Senate so you would not pocket-veto it, but they are ready to send it down if you are ready to say today you will sign it.

THE PRESIDENT: I worked very closely, Sarah, with the Members of that conference committee in trying to find a solution to a bill that I want to sign. The bill has not come down. It has not been staffed out by my staff. Until it arrives at the White House, I am not going to prejudge what I am going to do. I hope that we can find a way for me to sign it because I want to help the Vietnam veterans, particularly, but until it comes down to the White House, I think it is premature for me to make any decision.

QUESTION: Sir, it calls for an 18 percent cost of living increase, plus up to 23 percent, and that additional would pay for the cost of going to college. Would that be agreeable to you?

THE PRESIDENT: As I recall, that compromise is 20 percent.

QUESTION: Twenty-three percent.

THE PRESIDENT: But in addition, they did add a \$600 loan provision to the veteran. They did add nine more months of eligibility beyond what either World War II or Korean veterans got in the way of educational benefits.

So, when they, the Congress, send the conference report down to me, we will staff it out; I will make an honest judgment. I hope it is a piece of legislation that I can sign.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in your speech before Congress on the economy, you said you would do the hard work of making decisions where to cut. Could you give us some specific examples, maybe half a dozen, of the programs you would like to cut?

THE PRESIDENT: I have had one meeting with the OMB and others on that very subject, and later today, before I go to Grand Rapids, I am spending another hour with the same group. We have a long list of items where they give me certain options.

We have not made any final determination. If all of them were put into effect -- and some of them would require legislative action by the Congress -- I think the anticipated saving in fiscal year 1975 would be around \$7.5 billion.

We are going to make a maximum effort to cut at least \$5.4 billion so there is some flexibility between the 5.4 and the 7.5, and I am going to continue to work on it. When Congress comes back, we will have some recommendations.

QUESTION: Mr. President, some specifics now of some of those programs that you would put priorities to cut?

THE PRESIDENT: I would rather not give you any specifics because it is a long shopping list, and I think it is unwise for me to be categorical as long as I try to make an honest judgment on which of maybe a hundred or more proposals they have submitted to me for consideration.

QUESTION: Mr. President, a two-part question on foreign affairs.

Number one, the emergence of the PLO in the Middle East, how does this affect our position regarding the Middle East?

And the second part, also on foreign affairs, negative reports out of Japan, anti-American feeling and items like that, whether you are reconsidering going to Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the second question first.

No developments in Japan have changed my attitude. I intend to go to Japan, as has been planned for some time.

The decision by the Arab nations to turn over the negotiating for the West Bank to the PLO may or may not -- at this stage we aren't certain what impact it will have on our role in the Middle East.

We, of course, feel that there must be movement towards settlement of the problems between Israel and Egypt on the one hand, between Israel and Jordan or the PLO on the other, and the problems between Israel and Syria in the other category.

We have not had an opportunity yet to make any firm decision on what impact there will be from this Arab decision. I can only say that we think it is of maximum importance that continued movement toward peace on a justifiable basis in the Middle East is vital to that area of the world, and probably to the world as a whole.

QUESTION: Mr. President, as one who knows the House better than we do, what is your best estimate now of Republican losses or gains in the House, and what would be the level which would make your efforts seem all worthwhile?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't like to get into a numbers game. I did it on one occasion back in 1966, but I had somewhat different responsibilities then. I can only say that it is important to have a competitive relationship or ratio in the House as well as in the Senate.

It seems to me that if you have a reasonably close ratio of Democrats to Republicans, the public is better off. They get better legislation. They get better handling of appropriations. They get, I think, a better tax bill, whenever the relationship between the two major political parties is reasonably similar.

At the present time, in the House I think it is 243 to 187. I would hope that that ratio would not be seriously changed.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I would like to ask you about your energy program. Why have you dumped John Sawhill? Was his advice too blunt and politically unattractive at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all. I put a new man in charge -- Secretary Morton. He replaced the Secretary of State (the Treasury), Bill Simon, who went over to the Economic Council.

Rogers Morton and I discussed the kind of a team that he wanted and that I thought would do a good job, and the people that I have nominated fit that pattern.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I wonder if we could return to the Rockefeller affair. If you had known then, before the nomination, all that is public knowledge now about Mr. Rockefeller's financial dealings, would you still have named him to be your Vice President?

THE PRESIDENT: I think I would. Nelson Rockefeller has been a superb Governor of the State of New York. He served both Democratic and Republican Presidents in the past in the Executive Branch of the Government.

It is my judgment that he would be a very good Vice President. And, therefore, these disclosures indicate that he does believe in helping his friends, and a man of that wealth certainly, in my judgment, has that right to give as long as the law is obeyed, and as I understand it, he has.

It seems to me that his qualifications from previous public service fully qualify him to be Vice President, and therefore I fully support his nomination.

QUESTION: Mr. President, as the only living veteran of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment, how say you as to its continuance?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe the Twenty-Fifth Amendment has served a good purpose, despite my own involvement in it. But leave that aside. It was, of course, if you go back and study the history of it, actually proposed and approved for quite different reasons.

On the other hand, in the last year, certain circumstances have arisen which in my judgment may prompt the need for some changes.

I think, for example, the Congress ought to study the desirability of putting a time limitation on the time that the Congress should have for the consideration, approval or rejection. But these are matters that Congress can, in the remaining days of this session or in the next session, investigate, because of the experiences of the last year or so.

QUESTION: Mr. President, your friend, Paul McCracken, has said that we are entering a V-shaped recession, and we ought to call a spade a spade. Yet Administration officials have been avoiding the word "recession". Would you apply that term to our economic condition now?

THE PRESIDENT: Recession has been defined. I think the National Bureau of Economic Research actually is the authority on this matter. It is my understanding they are going to come up with some answer on this question in the very near future.

But let me make an observation of my own, if I might. We are facing some difficult economic circumstances. We have too many people unemployed, and we want to do something about it. And my economic package that I submitted to the Congress and the American people will do something about it.

The American people are concerned about inflation, and my economic program would do something about inflation. So, what we have tried to do, instead of getting into semantics, is to offer constructive proposals to meet the problem.

Whether it is a recession or not a recession is immaterial. We have problems. The plan I submitted is aimed at solving those problems and, therefore, I really do not care what the name is. We want solutions, and my proposal, I think, will offer that opportunity.

QUESTION: Mr. President, since Secretary Kissinger has been to Moscow, do you have any optimistic outlook now on the SALT agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe that the Secretary's discussions with the General Secretary, Mr. Brezhnev, were very constructive. Some of the differences, as I understand it, between their view and ours, have been narrowed. As a result of the progress that was made in Moscow, the announcement was made that I would meet with Mr. Brezhnev in Vladivostok the latter part of November. We hope that each step will mean more progress and that we will end up with a SALT II agreement.

QUESTION: Mr. President, your Press Secretary, Mr. Nessen, has hinted or implied that you may be considering limiting oil imports; that is, limiting imports of Arab oil if necessary to make your goal of cutting oil imports by one million a day, perhaps in the form of a dollar figure, a dollar limit on imports. Are you considering it? Is this a live possibility?

THE PRESIDENT: Our first objective is to cut the six million barrels per day import of crude oil by one million barrels. We believe that with the energy conservation recommendations we have made, that objective can be accomplished.

However, if there isn't the saving of one million barrels per day of oil imports by voluntary action, we will, of course, move to any other alternative, including the possibility of mandatory limitations, to achieve that result.

That is essential from the point of view of our economy, our balance of payments, et cetera.

QUESTION: Mr. President, if Mr. Rockefeller is confirmed, would you ask him to refrain from giving gifts as he has given in the past to public officials and other politicians?

THE PRESIDENT: My judgment would be that Mr. Rockefeller would use excellent judgment in the future in however he wishes to dispense the funds that he has available.

I think that his approach in the future would certainly be related to the experiences he has had in the past.

QUESTION: Mr. President, there is a lot of talk on the Hill that Congress might come back after the election and vote themselves a pay increase. There is also talk that if they don't do it this fall, it certainly will be voted early next year. Would you sign a bill that would provide Congress with a pay increase at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is premature for me to make any judgment. I have not talked to the Democratic or Republican leadership about the matter. I know of no specific proposal by the Congress nor by this Administration, so I don't feel that it is appropriate for me to make any judgment at this point.

QUESTION: Are you planning any other Cabinet changes, particularly in the Agriculture Department?

THE PRESIDENT: I think Secretary Butz, over a period of three or four years, has done a good job. He has been very outspoken. He is a good, hard worker and I have no plans to remove the Secretary of Agriculture or no specific plans to call for the resignation of any other Cabinet officer.

QUESTION: Mr. President, could you tell us the status of negotiations on the Nixon Administration's tapes and documents? Are they still in the White House or --

THE PRESIDENT: They are being held -- I can't give you the precise location -- but they are being held under an agreement with the Special Prosecutor's office and, of course, now there are two other elements that have developed.

One, Judge Richey has issued an injunction concerning all or some of the documents. A third involvement is a lawsuit by former President Nixon against the head of GSA, Mr. Sampson, so we think, under the circumstances, and particularly under our agreement with the Special Prosecutor's Office, they should remain intact until legal matters and any other commitments have been handled.

QUESTION: Mr. President, could we pursue the Sawhill matter for a minute, please, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't see who asked that. I can't see with the lights and without my glasses.

QUESTION: What policy differences, sir, did you and Mr. Morton have with Mr. Sawhill which precipitated his resignation?

THE PRESIDENT: As I said a moment ago, I appointed a new man to head up the Energy Council and that requires, I think, when you give a man a new assignment, the opportunity to make recommendations for those that will work with him on the Council. It seems to me that with Rog Morton being given that job, he ought to have the right, with my approval, to make changes, and that is why we made the changes. I think they are good people. Mr. Sawhill, whom I admire, will be offered a first-class assignment in this Administration.

QUESTION: Are you saying, Mr. President, that there were no policy disagreements?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there were any major policy differences. I think there may have been some differences in approach or technique, but if you give a man a job, you have to give him the people he wants to carry out that responsibility.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in Oklahoma City, you said that overwhelming victories in Congress this fall by the opposition party, being the Democrats, would seriously jeopardize world peace.

This is our first chance to question you on that. I was wondering if you would elaborate on that. Did you mean it in the sense that some Democrats accused you of demagoguery, or is this consistent with your original announced policy that you were going to try to unify the country after Watergate?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the facts that I referred to involved the conflict we had with a majority of the Members of the House and Senate over the limitations and restrictions they put on the continuing resolution.

Those limitations and restrictions on that particular piece of legislation, in my judgment and in the judgment of the Secretary of State, will make it more difficult for the United States to help the Greeks. It will make it more difficult for us to work to bring about a negotiated settlement in the Cyprus matter.

That Congressional limitation will not help our relations with Turkey.

I point out that both the United States and Turkey are members of NATO and if our relationship with Turkey is destroyed or harmed, it will hurt our interest as well as NATO's.

Secondly, we do have an agreement with Turkey as to some military installations and those installations are important for both Turkey and ourselves and if, through Congressional action, we undercut our relationship with Turkey, hurt our relations with NATO, hurt the Greeks -- because it will make it more difficult for a settlement of the Cyprus matter -- then I think the Congress has made a mistake, and if a Congress that is more prone to do that is elected on November 5, it will make our efforts much harder to execute and implement foreign policy to build for peace and maintain the peace.

As Mr. Nessen explained in a subsequent press conference, I was referring as much to Republicans as I was to Democrats who don't cooperate in giving a President of the United States an opportunity to meet the day-to-day problems that are involved in foreign policy.

A President has to be able to act. He has to be able to work with allies and with some potential adversaries, and if the Congress is going to so limit a President, whether he is a Democrat or Republican, that he has no flexibility, in my opinion, the opportunity for a successful foreign policy is harmed considerably.

QUESTION: A follow-up question, please, Mr. President.

How would overwhelming Democratic majorities in Congress undermine your policy and Secretary Kissinger's policy of detente and relations with China?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me say at the outset the Democratic leadership -- both Senator Mansfield and the Speaker of the House and other leading Democrats -- was very helpful to me in that struggle that I just described.

If you will carefully read, which I have, reread my statements both in Oklahoma City and Cleveland, I was very careful not to be critical of the Democratic leadership because they did try very hard.

The problem was the troops did not believe either their own leadership or the President of the United States.

If we have a runaway Congress that does not understand the need and necessity for the broadening of detente, that does not understand the need and necessity for a continuation of our policy vis-a-vis the People's Republic of China, then it is going to make it much harder for a President to carry out a policy of peace abroad.

Now, a runaway Congress is one that does not, at least, pay some attention to their own leadership on both sides of the aisle and to the President of the United States.

QUESTION: Mr. President, can I get back to the conversation with General Haig in early August. I know you said there was no deal or no commitment, but sometimes things are done more subtly. When he brought up as a sixth option the possibility of a pardon, did you point out to him that in your testimony on confirmation you had indicated opposition to such a move, or did you in some way indicate to him that you might be inclined -- without exactly saying so -- that you might be inclined to go along with an early pardon?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the testimony I gave before the House Committee on the Judiciary or subcommittee of that committee speaks for itself, and I will stand by that testimony.

I would like to point out, in addition, in the testimony before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I answered it as follows:

One, I did not think the American people would stand for a pardon, in answer to the hypothetical question that was asked me.

Secondly, because I was not familiar with the precise authority and power of a President to grant a pardon, I did not want to get into any of the technicalities involving that issue, but the testimony I gave before the House committee will speak for itself, and I will let it stand at that.

QUESTION: Mr. President, looking a bit further down the road on your anti-inflation program, sir, do you have any particular figures or program in mind for your 1976 budget, which is now in the process of being prepared?

THE PRESIDENT: That is another matter that I will be working with Roy Ash and his people on after we get through the long shopping list of proposed recissions, deferrals and cutbacks for fiscal year 1975.

I can assure you it will be a tight budget, a very tight budget, because we do have to hold the lid on spending, not only in the remaining months of fiscal year 1975, but we have to reassure the American people that in the next fiscal year we will be just as firm in controlling and holding down expenditures.

QUESTION: Mr. President, when you say a tight budget, do you mean a budget surplus or balanced or possible deficit?

THE PRESIDENT: Our objective will be a balanced budget. We will do the very best we can.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

END (AT 11:30 A.M. EST)

STATEMENT ON ENERGY TEAM APPOINTMENTS

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 29, 1974

IN MY OCTOBER 8 ADDRESS TO A JOINT SESSION OF THE
CONGRESS, I ANNOUNCED THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ENERGY RESOURCES
COUNCIL AND THE APPOINTMENT OF INTERIOR SECRETARY ROGERS C. B.
MORTON AS THE NATION'S OVERALL ENERGY CHIEF.

SECRETARY MORTON'S CHARTER, AS THE HEAD OF OUR
COMPREHENSIVE ENERGY EFFORT, IS TO DEVELOP A SINGLE NATIONAL
ENERGY POLICY AND A PROGRAM TO INCREASE OUR DOMESTIC ENERGY
SUPPLY.

I AM PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE THE NOMINATION OF FOUR
DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVANTS AS MEMBERS OF MY NEW ENERGY TEAM.

THEY ARE DR. ROBERT C. SEAMANS, JR., TO BE

ADMINISTRATOR OF THE ENERGY RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT

ADMINISTRATION; WILLIAM A. ANDERS TO BE A MEMBER AND, AFTER

CONFIRMATION, CHAIRMAN OF THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION;

ANDREW E. GIBSON TO BE ADMINISTRATOR OF THE FEDERAL ENERGY

ADMINISTRATION SUCCEEDING JOHN SAWHILL WHO HAS RESIGNED;

AND DR. DIXY LEE RAY TO BE ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF STATE FOR OCEANS,

INTERNATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL AND SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS.

DR. SEAMANS IS, OF COURSE, WELL-KNOWN TO ALL OF YOU
AND TO THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AS ONE OF THE TOP MANAGERS OF THE
MANNED SPACE PROGRAM AT THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE
ADMINISTRATION. MORE RECENTLY, HE SERVED WITH DISTINCTION
AS SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE.

MR. ANDERS IS A FORMER ASTRONAUT WHO HAS DISTINGUISHED HIMSELF ON EARTH AS HE HAS IN SPACE. HE IS PRESENTLY AN ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSIONER AND EARLIER SERVED AS EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE COUNCIL.

MR. GIBSON IS A FORMER ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF COMMERCE WHO PROVED HIMSELF AS ONE OF THE GOVERNMENT'S BEST MANAGERS IN REVITALIZING THE MARITIME ADMINISTRATION AND THE NATION'S MARITIME FLEET.

DR. RAY HAS BEEN WIDELY AND JUSTIFIABLY COMMENDED FOR THE RECORD SHE HAS COMPILED AS THE CHAIRMAN OF THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION. A MARINE BIOLOGIST BY TRAINING, AND A NUCLEAR EXPERT BY EXPERIENCE, SHE IS UNIQUELY QUALIFIED FOR THIS NEW STATE DEPARTMENT POST WHICH ENCOMPASSES RESPONSIBILITY FOR OCEANOGRAPHIC MATTERS AND NON-MILITARY NUCLEAR PROGRAMS.

I HOPE THAT THE SENATE WILL ACT SPEEDILY ON THESE NOMINATIONS AFTER IT RECONVENES NEXT MONTH.

I HAVE FULL CONFIDENCE IN THESE FOUR PUBLIC SERVANTS.

I KNOW THAT THEY WILL DO OUTSTANDING JOBS IN THEIR NEWLY ASSIGNED CAPACITIES AS THEY HAVE IN THE PAST. IN SELECTING SUCH HIGHLY QUALIFIED INDIVIDUALS FOR THESE RESPONSIBILITIES, I WANT THE AMERICAN PEOPLE TO KNOW THAT I HAVE PLACED THE HIGHEST PRIORITY ON MAKING SURE THAT WE WILL HAVE SUFFICIENT ENERGY FOR AMERICA'S FUTURE.

DETAILED BIOGRAPHIES ON THE NOMINEES WILL BE PROVIDED BY THE PRESS OFFICE.

#

PRESS CONFERENCE NO. 4

of the

PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

10:56 A.M. EST
October 29, 1974
Tuesday

In the Briefing Room
At the White House
Washington, D.C.

THE PRESIDENT: This morning, before the press conference, I would like to announce several appointments, and then we will have the press conference subsequently.

At the outset, let me remind you that on October 8 I announced that Rog Morton would be the head of the Energy Council and that subsequently I would make several other appointments predicated on legislation enacted by the Congress and some reorganization in the Energy Administration.

Rog Morton is here. Rog, I think most of you know him. He is pretty hard to miss (Laughter), but the new appointments are as follows:

Dr. Robert Seamans, former Secretary of the Air Force, and formerly a very high-ranking official in NASA, had a great deal to do with the manned space program, will be the new Administrator of the ERDA, the Energy Research and Development Agency.

Bob, we are glad to have you on board.

Then to head the FEA, John Sawhill is resigning, and we will give him a good appointment in the Government, but the new head of the FEA will be Andy Gibson, who was an Assistant Secretary of Commerce and was in charge of the Maritime Administration, will be the new head of the FEA.

Andy, glad to have you on board.

Then, for the new Nuclear Regulatory Agency, I am nominating Bill Anders, who is currently a member of the AEC, but who will be the Chairman, once confirmed, of the new Regulatory Agency.

You are all familiar with Bill Anders' record as an astronaut and his service as a member of the Atomic Energy Commission.

MORE

Page 2

Then, Dixie Lee Ray will be the new Assistant Secretary of State for Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Matters.

Dixie Lee.

This is the new team that will be in charge of the energy program, which we will see moving ahead, I think, under Rog Morton's stewardship with the new faces and the experience of Bob Seamans, Andy Gibson, Bill Anders and Dixie Lee Ray.

I thank all of them for taking on these new responsibilities. I think they are an outstanding group of administrators with experience both outside of Government and within the Government.

MORE

So, Rog, you have got a good group, and I am proud of them, and I think they will do a first class job. Thank you very, very much.

With those preliminary announcements, I will be glad now to respond to any questions.

Mr. Cormier.

QUESTION: Mr. President, the Government's leading economic indicators announced today show that last month they experienced the sharpest drop in 23 years. Might this sort of thing prompt you to amend your economic program to put more emphasis on fighting recession rather than fighting inflation? And if so, what steps might you take?

THE PRESIDENT: The 31-point program that I submitted to the Congress and the American people did take into recognition the problems of some deterioration in some parts of the economy, and at the same time recognized the need to do something about inflation.

It was a finely-tuned, I think, constructive program to meet both of these problems.

Now, the program is before the Congress and Congress must act on certain aspects of it. This, perhaps, will take some time and, in the interim, if there are any economic factors which justify a change, I will be open to suggestions.

But at this point, I still believe the plan or program as I submitted it is sound, both to meet the challenge of inflation and any deterioration in the economy.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in view of the Watergate and inflation and other urgent problems facing the Nation, how do you account for the voter apathy in this country?? And I have a follow-up.

THE PRESIDENT: I wish I knew the answer to that, Mr. Sperling. It would seem to me that with the problems we have, particularly at home--both Watergate and others -- that the voters should be extremely interested in the kind of Members of the House and Senate that are elected or defeated.

One of the reasons that I am campaigning is to try and get the voters off of apathy and on to interest. I happen to believe that a big public showing of voter participation would be very helpful, and I am disturbed that these forecasters say that only 42 percent of the eligible voters are going to vote on November 5.

MORE

So, if I can in any way stimulate voter interest, I intend to do so.

QUESTION: That leads to my second question; that is, do you think you are breaking through this apathy? Are you shaking up this disinterest? What is your finding?

THE PRESIDENT: From my contacts with Members of Congress or candidates who are in the various places where I have stopped, they tell me that voter interest has been stimulated by my appearance. I suspect we will get a few who don't approve of my appearance in a certain community, but I believe overall there has been an increase in voter interest as a result of my visits. And as I said, that is one reason why I intend to continue them.

Miss Thomas?

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you think that Nelson Rockefeller will be confirmed as Vice President, and when?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe that Nelson Rockefeller will be confirmed. I strongly support him today as I did when I nominated him in August. I hope and trust that the Senate and House committees, as well as the two bodies themselves, will act promptly on the nomination. I think he would make a very good Vice President.

QUESTION: Then you don't think the financial problems that have suddenly cropped up will affect the outcome?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not.

QUESTION: Mr. President, the Democratic Study Group, in an analysis they made of your voting record over the last three years you were in the House, showed you voted 86 percent of the time in support of spending proposals beyond the Nixon budget, and it amounted to some \$16.9 billion. How do you square that with your campaign argument that the Democrats are the big spenders?

THE PRESIDENT: I think their own survey, Mr. Lisagor, showed I had a much better record of saving than the Democrats did in the House of Representatives.

In other words, their own document showed that the Democrats were much bigger spenders than I was and that I was a much better saver than they were. So, I will rely on their document to prove that I am a saver and they are spenders.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you know how you came out net?

THE PRESIDENT: It is my recollection that I was about 8 percentage points better than the Democrats as a whole, so even using their figures or their document, I am a saver and the Democrats are spenders.

QUESTION: Mr. President, sir, I want to know if you are going to sign the veterans G.I. education bill that has been left at the Senate so you would not pocket-veto it, but they are ready to send it down if you are ready to say today you will sign it.

THE PRESIDENT: I worked very closely, Sarah, with the Members of that conference committee in trying to find a solution to a bill that I want to sign. The bill has not come down. It has not been staffed out by my staff. Until it arrives at the White House, I am not going to prejudge what I am going to do. I hope that we can find a way for me to sign it because I want to help the Vietnam veterans, particularly, but until it comes down to the White House, I think it is premature for me to make any decision.

MORE

QUESTION: Sir, it calls for an 18 percent cost of living increase, plus up to 23 percent, and that additional would pay for the cost of going to college. Would that be agreeable to you?

THE PRESIDENT: As I recall, that compromise is 20 percent.

Q Twenty-three percent.

THE PRESIDENT: But in addition, they did add a \$600 loan provision to the veteran. They did add nine more months of eligibility beyond what either World War II or Korean veterans got in the way of educational benefits.

So, when they, the Congress, send the conference report down to me, we will staff it out; I will make an honest judgment. I hope it is a piece of legislation that I can sign.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in your speech before Congress on the economy, you said you would do the hard work of making decisions where to cut. Could you give us some specific examples, maybe half a dozen, of the programs you would like to cut?

THE PRESIDENT: I have had one meeting with the OMB and others on that very subject, and later today, before I go to Grand Rapids, I am spending another hour with the same group. We have a long list of items where they give me certain options.

We have not made any final determination. If all of them were put into effect -- and some of them would require legislative action by the Congress -- I think the anticipated saving in fiscal year 1975 would be around \$7.5 billion.

We are going to make a maximum effort to cut at least \$5.4 billion so there is some flexibility between the 5.4 and the 7.5, and I am going to continue to work on it. When Congress comes back, we will have some recommendations.

QUESTION: Mr. President, some specifics now of some of those programs that you would put priorities to cut?

THE PRESIDENT: I would rather not give you any specifics because it is a long shopping list, and I think it is unwise for me to be categorical as long as I try to make an honest judgment on which of maybe a hundred or more proposals they have submitted to me for consideration.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, a two-part question on foreign affairs.

Number one, the emergence of the PLO in the Middle East, how does this affect our position regarding the Middle East?

And the second part, also on foreign affairs, negative reports out of Japan, anti-American feeling and items like that, whether you are reconsidering going to Japan.

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the second question first.

No developments in Japan have changed my attitude. I intend to go to Japan, as has been planned for some time.

The decision by the Arab nations to turn over the negotiating for the West Bank to the PLO may or may not -- at this stage we aren't certain what impact it will have on our role in the Middle East.

We, of course, feel that there must be movement towards settlement of the problems between Israel and Egypt on the one hand, between Israel and Jordan or the PLO on the other, and the problems between Israel and Syria in the other category.

We have not had an opportunity yet to make any firm decision on what impact there will be from this Arab decision. I can only say that we think it is of maximum importance that continued movement toward peace on a justifiable basis in the Middle East is vital to that area of the world, and probably to the world as a whole.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, as one who knows the House better than we do, what is your best estimate now of Republican losses or gains in the House, and what would be the level which would make your efforts seem all worthwhile?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't like to get into a numbers game. I did it on one occasion back in 1966, but I had somewhat different responsibilities then. I can only say that it is important to have a competitive relationship or ratio in the House as well as in the Senate.

It seems to me that if you have a reasonably close ratio of Democrats to Republicans, the public is better off. They get better legislation. They get better handling of appropriations. They get, I think, a better tax bill, whenever the relationship between the two major political parties is reasonably similar.

At the present time, in the House I think it is 243 to 187. I would hope that that ratio would not be seriously changed.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I would like to ask you about your energy program. Why have you dumped John Sawhill? Was his advice too blunt and politically unattractive at this time?

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all. I put a new man in charge -- Secretary Morton. He replaced the Secretary of State (the Treasury), Bill Simon, who went over to the Economic Council.

Rogers Morton and I discussed the kind of a team that he wanted and that I thought would do a good job, and the people that I have nominated fit that pattern.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I wonder if we could return to the Rockefeller affair. If you had known then, before the nomination, all that is public knowledge now about Mr. Rockefeller's financial dealings, would you still have named him to be your Vice President?

THE PRESIDENT: I think I would. Nelson Rockefeller has been a superb Governor of the State of New York. He served both Democratic and Republican Presidents in the past in the Executive Branch of the Government. It is my judgment that he would be a very good Vice President. And therefore these disclosures indicate that he does believe in helping his friends, and a man of that wealth certainly, in my judgment, has that right to give as long as the law is obeyed, and as I understand it, he has.

MORE

It seems to me that his qualifications from previous public service fully qualify him to be Vice President, and therefore I fully support his nomination.

QUESTION: Mr. President, as the only living veteran of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment, how say you as to its continuance?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe the Twenty-Fifth Amendment has served a good purpose, despite my own involvement in it. But leave that aside. It was, of course, if you go back and study the history of it, actually proposed and approved for quite different reasons.

On the other hand, in the last year, certain circumstances have arisen which in my judgment may prompt the need for some changes.

I think, for example, the Congress ought to study the desirability of putting a time limitation on the time that the Congress should have for the consideration, approval or rejection. But these are matters that Congress can, in the remaining days of this session or in the next session, investigate, because of the experiences of the last year or so..

QUESTION: Mr. President, your friend, Paul McCracken, has said that we are entering a V-shaped recession, and we ought to call a spade a spade. Yet Administration officials have been avoiding the word "recession". Would you apply that term to our economic condition now?

THE PRESIDENT: Recession has been defined. I think the National Bureau of Economic Research actually is the authority on this matter. It is my understanding they are going to come up with some answer on this question in the very near future.

But let me make an observation of my own, if I might. We are facing some difficult economic circumstances. We have too many people unemployed, and we want to do something about it. And my economic package that I submitted to the Congress and the American people will do something about it.

The American people are concerned about inflation, and my economic program would do something about inflation. So what we have tried to do, instead of getting into semantics, is to offer constructive proposals to meet the problem. Whether it is a recession or not a recession is immaterial. We have problems. The plan I submitted is aimed at solving those problems and, therefore, I really do not care what the name is. We want solutions, and my proposal, I think, will offer that opportunity.

QUESTION: Mr. President, since Secretary Kissinger has been to Moscow, do you have any optimistic outlook now on the SALT agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: I believe that the Secretary's discussions with the General Secretary, Mr. Brezhnev, were very constructive. Some of the differences, as I understand it, between their view and ours, have been narrowed. As a result of the progress that was made in Moscow, the announcement was made that I would meet with Mr. Brezhnev in Vladivostok the latter part of November. We hope that each step will mean more progress and that we will end up with a SALT II agreement.

QUESTION: Mr. President, your Press Secretary, Mr. Nessen, has hinted or implied that you may be considering limiting oil imports; that is, limiting imports of Arab oil if necessary to make your goal of cutting oil imports by one million a day, perhaps in the form of a dollar figure, a dollar limit on imports. Are you considering it? Is this a live possibility?

THE PRESIDENT: Our first objective is to cut the 6 million barrels per day imports of crude oil by one million barrels. We believe that with the energy conservation recommendations we have made, that objective can be accomplished.

However, if there isn't the saving of one million barrels per day of oil imports by voluntary action, we will, of course, move to any other alternative, including the possibility of mandatory limitations, to achieve that result.

That is essential from the point of view of our economy, our balance of payments, et cetera.

QUESTION: Mr. President, if Mr. Rockefeller is confirmed, would you ask him to refrain from giving gifts as he has given in the past to public officials and other politicians?

THE PRESIDENT: My judgment would be that Mr. Rockefeller would use excellent judgment in the future in however he wishes to dispense the funds that he has available.

I think that his approach in the future would certainly be related to the experiences he has had in the past.

QUESTION: Mr. President, there is a lot of talk on the Hill that Congress might come back after the election and vote themselves a pay increase. There is also talk that if they don't do it this fall, it certainly will be voted early next year. Would you sign a bill that would provide Congress with a pay increase at this time?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: I think it is premature for me to make any judgment. I have not talked to the Democratic or Republican leadership about the matter. I know of no specific proposal by the Congress nor by this Administration, so I don't feel that it is appropriate for me to make any judgment at this point.

QUESTION: Are you planning any other Cabinet changes, particularly in the Agriculture Department?

THE PRESIDENT: I think Secretary Butz, over a period of three or four years, has done a good job. He has been very outspoken. He is a good, hard worker and I have no plans to remove the Secretary of Agriculture or no specific plans to call for the resignation of any other Cabinet officer.

QUESTION: Mr. President, could you tell us the status of negotiations on the Nixon Administration's tapes and documents? Are they still in the White House or --

THE PRESIDENT: They are being held -- I can't give you the precise location -- but they are being held under an agreement with the Special Prosecutor's office and, of course, now there are two other elements that have developed. One, Judge Richey has issued an injunction concerning all or some of the documents. A third involvement is a law suit by former President Nixon against the head of GSA, Mr. Sampson, so we think, under the circumstances, and particularly under our agreement with the Special Prosecutor's office, they should remain intact until legal matters and any other commitments have been handled.

QUESTION: Mr. President, could we pursue the Sawhill matter for a minute, please, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't see who asked that. I can't see with the lights and without my glasses.

QUESTION: What policy differences, sir, did you and Mr. Morton have with Mr. Sawhill which precipitated his resignation?

THE PRESIDENT: As I said a moment ago, I appointed a new man to head up the Energy Council and that requires, I think, when you give a man a new assignment, the opportunity to make recommendations for those that will work with him on the Council. It seems to me that with Rog Morton being given that job, he ought to have the right with my approval, to make changes, and that is why we made the changes. I think they are good people. Mr. Sawhill, whom I admire, will be offered a first-class assignment in this Administration.

MORE

QUESTION: Are you saying, Mr. President, that there were no policy disagreements?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think there were any major policy differences. I think there may have been some differences in approach or technique, but if you give a man a job, you have to give him the people he wants to carry out that responsibility.

QUESTION: Mr. President, in Oklahoma City, you said that overwhelming victories in Congress this fall by the opposition party, being the Democrats, would seriously jeopardize world peace. This is our first chance to question you on that. I was wondering if you would elaborate on that. Did you mean it in the sense that some Democrats accused you of demagoguery or is this consistent with your original announced policy that you were going to try to unify the country after Watergate?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the facts that I referred to involved the conflict we had with a majority of the Members of the House and Senate over the limitations and restrictions they put on the continuing resolution. Those limitations and restrictions on that particular piece of legislation, in my judgment and in the judgment of the Secretary of State, will make it more difficult for the United States to help the Greeks. It will make it more difficult for us to work to bring about a negotiated settlement in the Cyprus matter.

That Congressional limitation will not help our relations with Turkey.

I point out that both the United States and Turkey are members of NATO and if our relationship with Turkey is destroyed or harmed, it will hurt our interest as well as NATO's.

Secondly, we do have an agreement with Turkey as to some military installations and those installations are important for both Turkey and ourselves and if, through Congressional action, we undercut our relationship with Turkey, hurt our relations with NATO, hurt the Greeks-- because it will make it more difficult for a settlement of the Cyprus matter--then I think the Congress has made a mistake and if a Congress that is more prone to do that is elected on November 5, it will make our efforts much harder to execute and implement foreign policy to build for peace and maintain the peace.

MORE

As Mr. Nessen explained in a subsequent press conference, I was referring as much to Republicans as I was to Democrats who don't cooperate in giving a President of the United States an opportunity to meet the day-to-day problems that are involved in foreign policy.

A President has to be able to act. He has to be able to work with allies and with some potential adversaries and if the Congress is going to so limit a President, whether he is a Democrat or Republican, that he has no flexibility, in my opinion, the opportunity for a successful foreign policy is harmed considerably.

MORE

QUESTION: A follow-up question, please, Mr. President.

How would overwhelming Democratic majorities in Congress undermine your policy and Secretary Kissinger's policy of detente and relations with China?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me say at the outset the Democratic leadership -- both Senator Mansfield and the Speaker of the House and other leading Democrats -- was very helpful to me in that struggle that I just described.

If you will carefully read, which I have, reread my statements both in Oklahoma City and Cleveland, I was very careful not to be critical of the Democratic leadership because they did try very hard.

The problem was the troops did not believe either their own leadership or the President of the United States.

If we have a runaway Congress that does not understand the need and necessity for the broadening of detente, that does not understand the need and necessity for a continuation of our policy vis-a-vis the People's Republic of China, then it is going to make it much harder for a President to carry out a policy of peace abroad.

Now, a runaway Congress is one that does not, at least, pay some attention to their own leadership on both sides of the aisle and to the President of the United States.

QUESTION: Mr. President, can I get back to the conversation with General Haig in early August. I know you said there was no deal or no commitment, but sometimes things are done more subtly. When he brought up as a sixth option the possibility of a pardon; did you point out to him that in your testimony on confirmation you had indicated opposition to such a move, or did you in some way indicate to him that you might be inclined -- without exactly saying so -- that you might be inclined to go along with an early pardon?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the testimony I gave before the House Committee on the Judiciary or subcommittee of that committee speaks for itself, and I will stand by that testimony.

I would like to point out, in addition, in the testimony before the Senate Committee on Rules and Administration, I answered it as follows:

MORE

One, I did not think the American people would stand for a pardon, in answer to the hypothetical question that was asked me.

Secondly, because I was not familiar with the precise authority and power of a President to grant a pardon, I did not want to get into any of the technicalities involving that issue, but the testimony I gave before the House committee will speak for itself, and I will let it stand at that.

QUESTION: Mr. President, looking a bit further down the road on your anti-inflation program, sir, do you have any particular figures or program in mind for your 1976 budget, which is now in the process of being prepared?

THE PRESIDENT: That is another matter that I will be working with Roy Ash and his people on after we get through the long shopping list of proposed recissions, deferrals and cutbacks for fiscal year 1975.

I can assure you it will be a tight budget, a very tight budget, because we do have to hold the lid on spending, not only in the remaining months of fiscal year 1975 but we have to reassure the American people that in the next fiscal year we will be just as firm in controlling and holding down expenditures.

QUESTION: Mr. President, when you say a tight budget, do you mean a budget surplus or balanced or possible deficit?

THE PRESIDENT: Our objective will be a balanced budget. We will do the very best we can.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, ladies and gentlemen.

END (AT 11:30 A.M. EDT)

NOVEMBER 14, 1974

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Phoenix, Arizona)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AND QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
AT THE
SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL JOURNALISTS,
SIGMA DELTA CHI

DEL WEBB TOWNE HOUSE

6:04 P.M. MST

THE PRESIDENT: President Otwell, Gene Pulliam, Governor Williams, Senator Fannin, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is a great privilege and pleasure to participate in another meeting of this wonderful organization of professional journalists. I have had several, and I have enjoyed every one, and I am looking forward to this one.

I understand the hour for this occasion was fixed for our meeting not by my Press Secretary, not by the networks, but rather in order to ensure the attendance of all of the late strays from the Lazy R and G Ranch party which Gene Pulliam put on last night. (Laughter) Gene is not only a great host, but a great publisher, and I am sure I will neither be the first nor the last speaker at this convention to salute him as one of the founders of Sigma Delta Chi, the Society of Professional Journalists.

Between Bob Hartmann and Bill Roberts of my own Presidential staff and half of your Washington professional chapter in the White House press room, I am hardly out of sight of one of your members at any time, and I must say I enjoy their company, and I admire their professionalism -- most of the time, anyway. (Laughter)

In doing my homework for this visit, I was browsing through your magazine, the Quill, and I read as follows: "National SPJ-SDX President Ralph Otwell is asking local chapters to contact their Congressmen to urge them to override President Ford's veto of a bill to strengthen the Freedom of Information Act.

MORE

(OVER)

Otwell criticized Ford's actions, saying -- and I quote -- "For a President who is publicly committed to a more open and honest Administration to oppose significant reforms in Freedom of Information legislation is both startling and disappointing. President Ford's veto **suggests** his Administration is pursuing a discredited policy of cover-up as usual."

First, I want to assure your fine President, Ralph Otwell, that I have not come here today or tonight to argue, but to enlighten and, in fact, I may be the first President, probably the first President in history, to come all the way to Phoenix just to hold a press conference. And when I get here, I find out that Dan Rather is going to get the last word anyhow. (Laughter)

Before we go to questions, I would like to make two brief observations, if I might, both of which bear on the business of the Congress, which will be returning to Washington next Monday.

First, about my veto of the Freedom of Information Act amendment. I think, incidentally, that the veto is a constitutional power given to the President in order to require Congress to take a hard, second look at legislation which the President, who is obliged to faithfully execute the law, considers to be unwise or unworkable in whole or in part.

I really don't think my veto suggests a discredited policy of cover-up as usual. Uncovering cover-ups has to be done without the help of any law but by tough reporters and tough editors.

However, before you write all your Congressmen to override my veto, I would like to tell you my side of the story. I do support the Freedom of Information Act, and most of the reforms contained in the current amendments.

There are, however, three amendments that bother me both on principle and practicality, and these were the basis of my veto. I have written the leaders of both the House and Senate to express my hope that when Congress returns, instead of trying to override the veto, they will make three small, but very significant, changes in these three sections and send me another bill which I can and will sign.

MORE

My first objection is to that section that would allow any Federal judge to examine privately or in camera the classified records of any Government agency, including our most sensitive national security and diplomatic secrets, and remove the agency's classification if he found the plaintiff's position to be reasonable.

In other words, no credibility was given to the Government's initial decision. I think that is wrong. As a matter of fact, this change in the proposed law would overturn a 1973 Supreme Court ruling which limited judicial review to the determination of whether or not in the initial classification there was in fact a classification according to law.

With all due respect, I do not believe many Federal judges are experts in the complex weighing of defense and intelligence needs for security or secrecy. I also think that the transfer of this judgment from the Executive to the Judicial Branch of Government may be unconstitutional.

My proposed modification, which I think is reasonable, would accept judicial review, but require judges to uphold the original classification if there is a reasonable basis to support it.

My second objection is far less dramatic. In my view, one section sets unrealistic time limits on the Government's response to a request for a specific document. I have proposed that a 30-day deadline in contested cases be increased to a total of 45 days with extra time for complex cases at the option of the court.

The third reason for the veto was an amendment granting public access to investigatory files such as the so-called raw data reports of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. For example, I am told there was actually pending before the Department of Justice a request for the entire files accumulated by the FBI in their investigation of the Communist Party.

If opening such files had been proposed in the so-called McCarthy era, you would all have denounced it as exposing innocent people to vicious rumor and unproven smears, and you would have been right.

On a practical level, it would have required a brand new bureaucracy and millions and millions of man-hours of the FBI simply to review those files over a period of several decades to determine what now be safely made public without injuring innocent parties or compromising their sources of information.

MORE

I have proposed a more flexible and realistic set of ground rules that would preserve what I consider to be the essential confidentiality of investigatory files of law enforcement agencies. I hope that professional journalists will take another look at this section of the freedom of information bill and see if you don't agree that this Pandora's Box should remain shut.

There is a second matter I will discuss briefly before this distinguished society, whose members I know have a strong sense of history in the making as well as an insatiable interest in good government, both of which I applaud. That is the vacancy in the office of the Vice President.

I supposed I can properly claim to be the world's champion or world's expert on the subject of filling the Vice Presidency under the Twenty-Fifth Amendment. When I suddenly found myself nominated for this position on October 12, 1973, I did some research on the debate in the House and the Senate on this important constitutional amendment which was proposed by the Congress in 1965 and ratified by the legislatures of 47 States in 1967. Frankly, I was curious as to what I might have said on the subject, particularly Section 2, which deals with vacancies in the office of the Vice President.

The fact is, I found I had not said anything in the debate except to vote "aye", and the main subject of the debate was the matter of dealing with Presidential successions in the event of a President's disability or inability to discharge the duties of his office.

The replacement of a Vice President was incidental to this, but it seems fair to infer that the Framers, like the Founding Fathers, considered that office to be essential to the conduct of the Federal Government, and the orderly succession of Executive power in any emergency.

It is implicit in the adoption of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment as part of the Constitution that a prolonged vacancy in the second office of the land is undesirable as public policy, and that such vacancies should be filled as promptly as careful consideration by the President and the Congress will permit.

In my case, despite one of the most exhaustive investigations ever undertaken of anybody not on the FBI's Ten Most Wanted List, the Congress moved expeditiously and confirmed me within eight weeks of my nomination, although I do have to admit it, it seemed a little longer than that eight weeks to me.

MORE

When I suddenly found myself President on August 9, 1974, and the Nation again without a Vice President, I made it my first or highest priority, aside from the Cyprus crisis, which I walked into, to search out and to select the most capable and qualified person I could find for that high office.

I finished the task in 11 days and sent to the Senate and to the House the name of Nelson Rockefeller of New York. That was almost three months ago, and while I recognize the need of the Congress to take the month off for campaigning -- I did it 13 times myself -- I believe that the time has come for them to fish or cut bait in this matter.

I have been assured by Speaker Albert and by Senator Mansfield, the Majority Leader of the Senate, that they will make every effort to bring the nomination to a final floor vote before the 93rd Congress adjourns sine die probably in late December.

I am delighted to have their cooperation because I believe it is what the Constitution mandates and what the American people want from their Representatives. I am as convinced as ever that Governor Rockefeller is the right man for the job, and I am anxious to have him as a working partner in our Federal Government.

For the future, however, I will propose to the next Congress a re-examination of the Twenty-Fifth Amendment which has been tested twice in as many years to see if the provisions of Section 2 cannot be tightened up, either by constitutional amendment, or by public law.

There should be, in my judgment, a specific deadline for the President to nominate and for the Congress to confirm a Vice President. If this reasonable period passes without affirmative action, the Congress would then be required to promptly begin confirmation hearings on another nominee.

It has been suggested to me -- and I underline suggested -- that if, because of a partisan deadlock between the President and the Congress, the Congress fails to act within the deadline, the next constitutional successor, presently the Speaker of the House of Representatives, should be required to actually assume the Office of the [Vice] President. Although I am not prepared to advocate such a step, I must say there is really no way, despite secret briefings and all that, that anyone can even partially be prepared to take over the duties of the Presidency on a moment's notice without all the participation in the Executive process that a President can extend to his Vice President.

In this dangerous age, as the Twenty-Fifth Amendment attests, we need a Vice President at all times, and I speak as one who ought to know.

I will be glad to answer your questions.

MORE

QUESTION: Michael Pakenham of the Philadelphia Enquirer.

Mr. President, on Tuesday the word "recession" made its debut in the official diagnostic language of your Administration. Could you tell us if you are of a mind now to press forward with any significant economic policies that are new, beyond and perhaps including wage and price controls?

THE PRESIDENT: At the time that we put together the 31-point program that I submitted to the Congress on October 8, 1974, which was a finely-tuned program to meet the challenges of a softening economy -- and there were definite signs at that time -- and on the other hand to tamp down inflation. We believed then, and I believe now, that the plan is sound, that it is constructive, that it will meet the two problems that we face.

And may I add most affirmatively, putting wage and price controls on in a period of recession would be just the absolute wrong approach to the solution of a weakening economy. I never heard of the proposal to use wage and price controls to stimulate an economy. The only time I have heard of wage and price controls being advocated was when we had inflation as our major problem.

I happen to think we have got two problems -- a weakening economy and an inflation that is too high. The proposals that I submitted, 31 in number, try to meet both and at the moment, I see no justification for any major revisions.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Gaylord Shaw, with AP.

You said just a few moments ago that in this dangerous age we need a Vice President at all times. My question is this: Would you withdraw Governor Rockefeller's nomination if it is not confirmed before Congress adjourns next month, or to put it another way, are there any conditions under which you would withdraw the nomination and submit another name.

THE PRESIDENT: There are no conditions that I can imagine or know of under which I would withdraw Governor Rockefeller's name. As I said in my prepared remarks, I think he is the most qualified person to be Vice President.

I intend to do all I can to see that he gets confirmed, and I hope that the Congress will respond constructively and act before adjournment sine die in 1974.

MORE

QUESTION: Good evening, Mr. President. I am Bill Close from KOOL Radio and Television in Phoenix.

Congressman John Rhodes is seated over there, and my question concerns him. A move is underway in the House to challenge John Rhodes of Arizona as the Republican Minority Leader. In your opinion, is John Rhodes doing a satisfactory job, or would you rather see someone else in his place?

THE PRESIDENT: John Rhodes, in my judgment, is an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives. He has done a superb job, as the Republican leader in the House, since he took over when I became Vice President.

I see no reason whatsoever for any change in that position in the House of Representatives on the Republican side.

QUESTION: Hampden Smith, Washington and Lee University in Lexington, Virginia.

Another political question, if I may, sir. The Republican Party lost 45 seats in the House of Representatives, five in the Senate and six Governorships in last Tuesday's election, and further public opinion polls seems to indicate that the percentage of Americans who consider themselves Republican has been declining for quite a while, even before the Watergate reaction set in.

My question, sir, is how could you explain this seeming decline in the Republican Party?

THE PRESIDENT: You know, it was bad enough, but it is not quite as bad as the numbers you used. We didn't lose quite as many Republicans in either the House or the Senate. I concede it was not good from our point of view, but I would also like to add this:

As people have indicated, they are leaving the Republican Party, and you are accurate in that the polls show that. They have not gone to the Democrats, they have gone to the Independent category. The Democrats, as a matter of fact, have either lost a little or maintain only their former numerical position. So, the net result is that more and more people are becoming Independents rather than party affiliates.

MORE

I can argue it both ways, but what it really shows, in my judgment, in this last election, is that the Republican Party was in the White House at the time where we had 10 or 11 percent inflation, where we had some softening of the economy, and where we had the heritage of Watergate.

Now, those are pretty tough problems to overcome in the political arena. Those are transitory. We are going to solve the inflation. We are going to strengthen the economy, and Watergate is ended. This Administration had no connection with it, so we are going to be strong come 1976.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Helen Thomas, United Press International.

Mr. President, do you plan to retire General Brown as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, and I have a follow-up.

THE PRESIDENT: I have publicly disavowed the comments made by General Brown. I had General Brown to the Oval Office this morning at 7:15 before I took the plane and I indicated to him very directly my strong feeling concerning the statements that he made, and reaffirmed to him directly my disavowal of those comments that were recorded at Duke University Law School.

I think it ought to be said that General Brown has publicly apologized to those that might have been involved in the comments that he made. I have no intention of asking General Brown to resign. General Brown has been an excellent Air Force officer; he has been an excellent Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He made a mistake; he has recognized it. He is going to continue as the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you think that the Defense Secretary was remiss or some of your White House aides, perhaps, in not informing you earlier of General Brown's remarks so that you could have been apprised?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, the truth is that I had about 12 to 15 hours advance notice. I could not have remedied the situation any better than we have tried if I had known a few hours earlier.

I just want to say very candidly I disapprove and disavow of what he said. I not only said that publicly, but to General Brown directly. It was a mistake, but he is a fine officer and he has done a good job, and I don't think he should be fired for that one mistake.

MORE

QUESTION: Peggy Roberson, the Birmingham News, Birmingham, Alabama.

Mr. President, recently we have seen horrifying pictures of starving people in the world, and we have learned that energy and food are unbreakably linked. Are we prepared to use food as a weapon to force down energy prices so farmers can produce low-cost food to feed these people?

THE PRESIDENT: We are not going to use food as a weapon. We must recognize, however, that food is just as important to the world as oil, and that in order to get a better distribution of oil that is held in vast reserves by other nations and food that is produced by us to a greater extent than any other nation in the world, we must get together and cooperate to make sure that that which is available in both cases is spread throughout the world for the benefit of all people.

Dr. Kissinger, the Secretary of State, has put together the group of oil-consuming nations. We expect to work with the oil-producing nations. I believe that there can be an understanding achieved that will be to the mutual benefit of the producers in food and oil, and the consumers in both.

QUESTION: Jules Witcover of the Washington Post.

Mr. President, Secretary of Interior Morton told reporters yesterday he is still interested in the possibility of a new gasoline tax as a weapon to fight the energy crisis and inflation. Your Press Secretary on your behalf has repeatedly said that you are not considering it.

Can you clear up exactly what the Administration's position is on a new gas tax?

THE PRESIDENT: I certainly will, Julius. I don't know how many times I have to say that we are not considering an additional gasoline tax. I said it the first time, I think out in Sioux Falls, South Dakota, and I have repeated it many times thereafter.

I thought that others in the Executive Branch got the word, and I hope this word is conveyed to my good friend, the Secretary of the Interior. We are not considering an increase in the gasoline tax.

QUESTION: Norman Dohn, Ohio University. That is where Bill Hess is a football coach, not Woody Hays.

My question is in regard to foreign policy. Senator-elect John Glenn of Ohio and others have suggested that despite Dr. Kissinger's very fine track record, that perhaps a foreign policy is such a complex and delicate matter that the machinery of foreign policy ought to be spread out over a broader base. Do you have any plans to do this under your Administration?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: I have no such plans. I can't imagine someone who really is not an expert in the field of foreign policy giving advice to a man who has conducted foreign policy with great skill and great success. If you have got someone who is doing a good job, I don't understand why anyone in seriousness would advocate that he be taken off part of the job and turn it over to someone who might not do as good a job.

I respect the right of the Senator-elect to make the suggestion, but I don't think it makes very much sense.

QUESTION: Tom Jarriel with ABC, Mr. President.

I would like to follow up the answer you gave on the economy a moment ago. You said that wage-price controls would be the wrong approach to combat inflation. Some of your aides are saying inflation is the cause of recession. Should the recession continue and should you see a need to combat inflation in order to halt the recession, would you then reconsider the possibility of wage-price controls, or is this categorically ruled out?

THE PRESIDENT: I have no intention of requesting the Congress to enact mandatory or standby wage and price controls, and I have been told by the Democratic leaders that there is no prospect of the Democratic Congress enacting wage and price controls. There are no circumstances that I foresee today that would justify the heavy hand of wage and price controls in the present economic circumstances.

QUESTION: Have you any tax-raising proposals to replace the 5 percent surtax should that not be acted on by Congress?

Your Press Secretary has said, I believe, you would have an open mind on it. Have you any other proposals in mind?

THE PRESIDENT: No. I would hope that the Congress would take a serious look at this constructive proposal which would affect only 28 percent of the personal income taxpayers, with 72 percent of the income taxpayers not being affected at all. Even a person with a \$20,000 a year taxable income would only have to pay an additional \$42 or 12 cents a day. I think somebody making \$20,000 a year would be willing to make that kind of sacrifice if that would be helpful in whipping inflation and if that would be helpful in helping the people who are less fortunate who need some help during this transition phase from a recession to a healthier economy. It is a good proposal. I hope the Congress does take affirmative action.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, Bernie Wynn of the Arizona Republic.

In light of the GOP disasters at the polls, on Tuesday, would you rather have waited maybe until after November 5 to pardon Mr. Nixon, to have granted amnesty to draft dodgers?

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all. I think the timing in both instances was right. I could see no justification for another two months of delay in the action in pardoning President Nixon. I did it because I think we had very important business to get on with, both domestically and internationally in the United States, and it was obvious to me that with the prospective court action and all the controversy that would be stimulated by it, that it was wise for me to exercise the right of pardon when I did, and waiting two months would have made no difference.

In the case of earned amnesty for draft dodgers and draft evaders, I think the sooner we acted in that case the better, and I am glad to say that from where I had an opportunity to examine it, it has worked well. It has not given a free ride to individuals, and it has given those who wanted to earn their way back a second opportunity, and we have had quite a few who have applied.

I think in both instances I acted right, and in both instances the timing was correct.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Bob Johnson, WHAS, Louisville.

A number of critics say that the people in this country are going to have to adopt a far simpler lifestyle than they have shown their willingness to do voluntarily, something that goes beyond cleaning their plates, eating a great deal less, driving a great deal less.

Do you agree that this will be necessary, and if so, how is it going to be done? What type of leadership are you going to offer?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we may have to tighten our belts a little bit. I think buyers will have to be better Yankee traders, and salesmen will have to be more aggressive salesmen; in other words, we have got to restore some competition on the one hand, and people have to be wiser on the other, saving energy, hopefully, in a voluntary way.

MORE

If not, we may have to impose some limitations or restrictions. But I don't see us having to retrogress. I don't see us having to go backwards, which in my judgment is so contrary to the philosophy of America. We have got a great country; we can make it grow and prosper. We just have to tighten our belts and get rid of the fat, and the excesses, and we will be a lot better off as a country and as individuals.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Norman Kempster of The Washington Star News.

You have spoken of the danger of the Nation being without a Vice President. On Sunday you are planning a trip to Japan where some violence is threatened. What do you expect to achieve on this trip to Japan that could make it worth the risk?

THE PRESIDENT: There are three very important countries that I am visiting, and I should preface that with a comment that a President has two major responsibilities, one in the field of domestic policy and the other in the field of foreign policy.

And where we have three extremely important countries, two where we have good relationships, treaties where we are allies--Japan and South Korea, where we want to strengthen that relationship; and the third, the Soviet Union, where we have been trying to achieve a detente, and broaden it -- where we are going to hopefully lay a broader foundation for SALT II.

When you add up the plusses, I think that there is convincing evidence that I, as President, should go to Japan, to expand our good relations with Japan; go to South Korea, a staunch and strong ally and to work out some differences, if any, and to broaden our relations there, and to go to the Soviet Union to hopefully make some progress in detente in the reduction of arms.

I think it is a very worthwhile trip.

QUESTION: Mr. President, if I may follow up, what is the urgency that would not permit waiting until Governor Rockefeller is confirmed?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, if I knew the Congress was going to act, there might be some justification for it, but I can't sit and twiddle my thumbs and not do something, which I think is important for the benefit of foreign policy of the United States.

We have to do things on an affirmative basis, which I think are necessary, and to sit and wait until Congress acts on this -- and I think they ought to act a lot more quickly than they have -- I think would be wrong.

Some things that we have to achieve here are vitally important, and I think the trip ought to go on, and as far as I am concerned, it is.

QUESTION: Jennifer Schanno, College of Catherine in St. Paul, Minnesota.

Mr. President, there seems to be some argument as to what direction the Republican Party should go to avoid another landslide defeat. Some are saying it should go in a moderate direction; some in a more conservative.

In which direction do you feel it should go?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the Republican Party ought to continue to be a middle-of-the-road party, a party that has a strong, internationally-oriented foreign policy, a party that has a middle-of-the-road to conservative domestic policy, -- certainly conservative in the field of fiscal affairs.

I think that is a good policy and I don't see why we should abandon a good policy just because we took a licking on November 5.

If you go back in the history, in 1946 when Mr. Truman was President, the Democrats took a worse beating, and the 80th Congress came in with more Republicans in the House and Senate by a substantial number. Mr. Truman and the Democrats didn't abandon their policies. They went out and fought for them. They went out and made an effort to sell them. And Mr. Truman and the Democrats were successful in November of 1948.

I think that is what we ought to do as Republicans in 1976.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Lester Coggins of AP.

Why do the Democrats seem to have better luck in electing Democratic Congresses than Republicans do? Why can't the Republicans have won?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I am glad you pointed out that the Democrats have controlled the Congress -- the House and the Senate -- 38 out of the last 42 years. So all of the evils that you have had, you can blame on them, not on us.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Forrest Boyd, Mutual Broadcasting.

I would like to take that just one step further. As Senator Dole suggested that you shed your Boy Scout image and get tough with Congress, and if necessary, go over their heads to the people, what will be your tactics?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me preface the answer to the one part of your question that I was a Boy Scout. I am proud of that experience. I have no apologies for it.

I think they have done a great deal of good for lots of young people and I am not going to back off from the five or six years that I enjoyed being a Boy Scout and doing the things that I think are good for America.

Now, to answer your other question. I wish there would be a lot more Boy Scouts.

Now I am going to try to work with the Congress. It is a Democratic Congress, better than two-to-one in the House, and I think about 62 percent in the Senate. I think we ought to try and work together. They do have some sort of a mandate. They have an obligation, they have a responsibility, but they also have an accountability.

I want to work with them. I hope we can. But if we find that they are going to try and override, dominate with policies that I think are wrong, I will have to disagree with them.

But I am going to start out with the assumption that they are as interested as I am in what is good policy, both at home and abroad, and hopefully that will continue. So let's wait and see.

QUESTION: My name is Tim Rife. I am from the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Mr. President, does your willingness here to show up here to a Sigma Delta Chi convention reflect a new attitude in your Administration towards the press?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think coming here is a reflection of any new attitude toward the press on my part. I think most of the press from Washington would agree that I have always been open and candid with the members of the press. The fact that I became Vice President or President I don't think has changed me. I acted in the past as I am acting now. We don't agree on some things, but I have always felt that I should treat them as I would want to be treated, and vice versa, and I think that is a good relationship.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, I am Russ Ward of NBC News.

There has been some recent talk in the Middle East about a possible reimposition of the Arab oil embargo. Do you have contingency plans for dealing with such a move, and might those plans include a possible change in our relationships over there, either with Israel or the PLO?

THE PRESIDENT: Our plans are aimed at trying to get the Israelis to negotiate a settlement or additional settlements with the Egyptians and the other Arab nations. Those are the plans we have which are affirmative and plans that I think if we continue constructively, can bring about some success.

Until we have failed and, I don't think we will, in trying to get the parties to work together, I don't think it is appropriate to discuss what we will do if we don't achieve success.

QUESTION: Are you suggesting, Mr. President, that Israel should deal directly with the PLO? It has been the Israeli objection all along against recognizing the PLO as a bonafide political organization.

THE PRESIDENT: I didn't say that. I did say that the Israelis should negotiate with the Egyptians and other Arab parties. The Israelis have said they will never negotiate with the PLO. We are not a party to any negotiations. I think we have to let the decision as to who will negotiate to be the responsibility of the parties involved.

QUESTION: Gene McLain, KTAR Television and Radio, Phoenix.

Mr. President, you are approaching your first 100 days in office. How do you size up your plusses and minuses, your major disappointments and successes?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the best things we have done -- number one, nominating Nelson Rockefeller; number two, the conducting of the economic summit meetings, I think 12 all over the country, with two in Washington and the formulation of a good, sound economic plan that meets the problems of a weakening economy and inflation.

I believe that we have laid additional ground-work for success in the Middle East. We have redirected some of our policies in the subcontinent areas. We have, in addition, enhanced the possibility of Strategic Arms Limitation agreement number two, which I think will be enhanced by the meeting I am going to have in Vladivostok in about 12 days, hopefully to be followed by a meeting in Washington some time in the summer of 1975.

MORE

Some of the disappointments -- we had a few bad breaks. I think the Congress was dead wrong when they handicapped myself and Secretary Kissinger in the efforts that we could make in the settlement of the Cyprus question between Greece and Turkey.

I think that was a terrible disappointment, and some of the things we warned about might happen and it won't be helpful to Greece. That was a bad break.

Another was the failure on the part of the Congress to act more affirmatively on behalf of the nomination of Nelson Rockefeller. It should have been done before the campaign recessed. I think the Congress also might have moved ahead more rapidly in some of the economic suggestions.

We have had some plusses and we have had some minuses, but I believe so far we are a little ahead of the game.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, Bob Watkins from the University of Houston.

In response to an earlier question, you said that disenchanted Republicans were becoming Independents and not Democrats. Well, many Democrats are becoming Independents, too. Do you see this desertion as a preface to a large-scale third party movement in 1976?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't see that as a third party movement. I think it does suggest that political parties, the traditional ones, are weakening. I think that is sad, however. I think the two major political parties ought to be strengthened, but nevertheless the trend is just the opposite.

I hope that in the months ahead that we, as Republicans, can regain some of those by the performance both at home and abroad in our policy actions. I don't hope that my Democratic friends improve their situation, but if they do, I still think it would be healthy to have more responsible people in political parties than as Independents.

QUESTION: Good Evening, Mr. President. Walt Rogers of the Associated Press.

I am sure you have read newspaper accounts suggesting that perhaps the United States faces another **Great Depression** similar to 1930. Your Administration has already admitted that we have slipped into a recession and that unemployment will go even higher than the current rate of 6 percent. How much more slippage do you expect in the economy? First, when will the slump bottom out, and specifically, will unemployment go over 7 percent?

THE PRESIDENT: I can't give you categorical answers to those three questions. I think we will have some increase in unemployment, but I do believe that if the Congress cooperates with me, we can reverse that trend in 1975. I believe that we have certain safeguards today that we did not have in the 1930s. I remember the Depression, Wally; you're too young.

In those days, we didn't have any unemployment compensation insurance which is a very helpful protection. We didn't have in the 1930s the kind of additional payments that the auto workers, for example, get from the auto unions to bolster the amounts they get from unemployment compensation.

We have a lot of excellent safeguards that protect our economy today from falling into the depression. I don't think we are going to have one because we have these safeguards.

MORE

What we have to do is to prevent reactions that will really be harmful to the economy, restimulating or reigniting inflation which is actually starting to recede at the present time. We have to follow a very narrow path, and the Congress can help, and if they do, we can avoid the pitfalls of more inflation and economic conditions worse than we have today.

MORE

QUESTION: By way of a follow-up, Mr. President, if I could, I would like to try to pin you down on the unemployment figure. Have any of your economists suggested that unemployment might go to 7 percent or do you entertain that possibility?

THE PRESIDENT: I have not heard any of the economists that advise me saying that unemployment would go to 7 percent or over. They do indicate that it may increase above the 6 percent, which was last reported.

QUESTION: John Kolbe, from the Phoenix Gazette.

Mr. President, early this week you withdrew your nomination of Mr. Gibson as the new energy administrator in the midst of some discussions and some disclosures about his severance agreement from an oil company. The White House reported that apparently you personally knew nothing of that agreement before you made the nomination.

Have you taken or do you intend to institute any new staff-type procedures in the White House that will prevent this kind of embarrassing situation in the future, and if so, what do you intend to do?

THE PRESIDENT: Yes, we have. The procedure we intend to follow in the future is to say that a person is being considered and undertake the FBI or investigation review prior to making any specific announcement that we are sending a name up to the Senate for confirmation, which gives the individual some protection and gives us some protection.

In the case of Andy Gibson, he was an excellent head or director, administrator of the Maritime Administration. He took a Maritime industry and an agency in the Federal Government in 1969 that was dead and really made it into an effective Maritime Administration.

He was a first-class administrator. I regret that the circumstances developed because I asked him to serve in a position which requires a first-class administrator. We have not had that kind of firm direction over in the Federal Energy Administration. Andy Gibson would have been a good one.

I regret very much that he didn't make it, and I regret that our procedure at that time was inadequate. We made a mistake. It won't happen again.

MORE

QUESTION: Do some of the disclosures that have come out about Governor Rockefeller fit in that same category as Mr. Gibson?

THE PRESIDENT: None whatsoever. In the case of Governor Rockefeller, prior to the nomination I submitted three names to the FBI and asked them to give me an updating of their files and to let me know whether there was anything whatsoever in the files of the FBI concerning Mr. Rockefeller and two others. I think that was a sound procedure.

The gifts that Governor Rockefeller has given, in my judgment, are the kinds of gifts that a person, if you have that much money ought to have the right to give, and there is no political chicanery involved at all. He was generous to people that he thought ought to be helped, and there is no connection, no relationship between the Rockefeller situation and the Gibson matter.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. President. Thank you very much.

END (AT 6:55 P.M. MST)

COMMENT

Network News Conference Comment

Ted Koppel (ABC) commented on the President's news conference: "The President made it clear that he wants no post mortem on Vietnam but almost off-handedly he raised a couple of other Asian issues that will provide ample fodder for debate in the weeks ahead. It has been a long time since a President has publicly raised the issue of America's continuing commitment to Taiwan. President Ford did so last night. It has also been a long time since any American President has spoken about America's commitment to South Korea.

Clearly, having lost our foothold in Indochina, the President was signaling a firm intention to keep America involved in Asian affairs. Indeed, there are still some 40,000 troops in South Korea. The great presence of these troops coupled with the danger of a new outbreak of fighting, between North and South Korea, conjures up an alarming picture. And certainly the government in Peking will raise some questions about the state of Sino-American relations when the President of the United States reaffirms this country's commitment to Peking's arch enemy, Taiwan."

"As expected, the questions on Vietnam came first, and Mr. Ford served notice he has no intention of refighting the war to find out what went wrong," Bob Schieffer (CBS) said during a 2:45 minute wrap-up of the conference. -- ABC's AM America, CBS Morning News. (5/7/75)

COMMENT

The CIA Inquiries Need Facts
(Editorial, Excerpted from the L.A. Times)

The success of congressional investigators of the CIA will depend on the thoroughness, skill and dedication of the investigation committees and the extent to which the executive branch will cooperate by supplying necessary information.

There is nothing in the record to show that the Senate committee, would disclose information that would harm legitimate intelligence-gathering. The comparable House committee has yet to be organized.

This lackadaisical attitude, rather than overzealousness, was the flaw in congressional oversight committees charged with supervision of intelligence activities. Their members were only slightly less surprised than the public by revelations of wide domestic CIA surveillance and illegal spying by other government agencies.

In some sensitive areas, congressional investigators must conduct their intelligence inquiries in closed sessions. But in these sessions, they must insist on full disclosure by the White House and heads of agencies under investigation.
(5/7/75)

Advice, Consent and Hazing
(Editorial, Excerpted from the Wall St. Journal)

When the authors of the Constitution gave the Senate the power of advice and consent, we doubt that they intended the kind of hazing Stanley K. Hathaway is getting from the Senate Interior Committee.

Hathaway seeminly has committed all sorts of sins against the environment. The governor, supported some efforts to control livestock predators. And even worse, he tried to create new jobs in the state by encouraging development of mining and manufacturing.

In other words, what the governor did for industry and agriculture was bad and his own idea. What he did for the environment was good, but not his own idea. Ergo, he is unfit to be Interior Secretary.

Unless the Senate can think of better reasons for rejecting Mr. Hathaway than it has so far unearthed, we would suggest that it follow past traditions and consent. (5/7/75)

COMMENT

State and Local Economies Hurting
Bruce Morton -- CBS

The federal government has cut taxes so as to pump money into the economy. It is considering a whole range of spending programs. But while the feds are putting money into the economy, state and local governments are caught in a bind. As a result, they are taking money out of the economy.

State and local government are laying people off, and they have taken about 140,000 jobs out of the economy, too. One of the ironies is that Congress, trying to pump jobs into the economy, has passed a public service employment bill aimed at creating jobs in state and local jobs.

But what has happened in some states and towns is ironic. Local government lays off people who have worked for it for years -- policemen, firemen and so on. At the same time, it gets a limited amount of federal money to fill some new public service jobs on a short-term basis -- aid which comes too little and too late and which does not do much for an out of work policeman.

It reads like a classic case of the government's left hand not knowing what its right hand is doing. CBS Morning News (5/7/75)

COMMENT

Only Ford's Formal Announcement is Lacking
David Brinkley - NBC

In his press conference last night, President Ford wondered why people keep predicting that he will not run for election next time. The answer he said again was yes, he would run and would make a formal announcement later. One reason for not making it now is that all kinds of campaign laws take effect the moment a candidate makes a formal announcement. For one he can no longer get free television time unless every other candidate for the same office gets equal time, and the new complicated rules on campaign financing take effect.

But his formal announcement is about all that's lacking. A group of Republican heavies is now at work here in Washington planning the Ford campaign for '76, talking about finding a chairman, renting offices, raising money, deciding which primaries to enter, and trying to get the telephone 1-9-7-6 -- they all want that. All of this does little to have Ronald Reagan, the only other Republican to make serious noises about running next time if Ford does not, or trying to take the nomination away from him if he does -- an almost impossible task. Unless something regrettable happens in the meantime, it will be the first Presidential election in 16 years when the country was not somehow involved in some kind of war. And while the blame throwing is now and could be an issue, it will also be the first election in 16 years devoted mainly or entirely to local, internal domestic issues and the American people probably are more than ready for it. (5/7/75)

General Comments:

The Chicago Sun-Times said that among the many lessons of Vietnam for the U.S., this one stands out in high relief: American power, no matter how long and fully applied, cannot save a society that does not have the political will to save itself. On the other hand, our assistance can (and has) prove vital to threatened allies when they know what they are fighting for and believe in it. That crucial distinction ought to be kept in mind as we rightfully assess the implications of our failure in Southeast Asia. (4/30/75)

The Miami Herald said that although President Ford has declared the Vietnam chapter closed, the lesson of that chapter cannot be forgotten as we earnestly heed the President's plea to close our ranks, avoid recrimination and look ahead. If we can do that now, working together, we may do final honor to the 56,557 Americans who were taken from our ranks in Vietnam. (5/1/75)

The Atlanta Constitution said the war in Vietnam for the U.S. is now over. Americans are so exhausted emotionally that the ending only dimly tears at the heart. We did not succeed, as we had hoped, in preserving South Vietnam as an independent government. We did not stop the North Vietnamese Communists from overrunning South Vietnam. And yet, there is a nobility and a glory in some sides even of failure. Many young Americans fought and died in Vietnam in the deeply held conviction that the South Vietnamese deserved a chance to live their own way. In retrospect, all Americans can probably regret the mistakes and the suffering of Vietnam. But it is not unimportant, too, to remember why many Americans believed the effort a worthy cause. (4/26/75)

The Minneapolis Tribune said there is no pleasant way to lose a war, no easy explanation, no satisfaction in witnessing an ending that for years seemed inevitable. It will take time for Americans to sort out judgment. The mistake was never too little American involvement in Vietnam, but too much. Its ending could have been better, but it could have been worse and there is limited value in thinking about what might have been. For now, Americans can share a sense of relief that the evacuation was successful and that the Vietnam War is drawing to a close. (4/30/75)

The Grand Rapids Press said that although history may look with some benevolence on America's initial purposes in Vietnam, a less kindly view can be expected of the Cambodian affair. Cambodia has no common border with North Vietnam and its chance to work out an accommodation with the Communists was blown by a U.S.-supported military coup and subsequent invasion. The American obligation in the world, said one observer, is to cooperate, not to dominate. Doing otherwise is lowering ourselves to the enemy's level, an expedient and tempting reaction but one which demonstrates we have no faith in ourselves or our system. (4/24/75)

The St. Louis Post-Dispatch said the United States, at home as well as abroad, has changed drastically since World War II. If it cannot forget whatever honest commitments it has to other nations, certainly it cannot forget its commitments to a decent society for the American people. The reassessment of where the nation stands and how it is to progress must be divorced from the political ideologies of the past. (4/20/75)

The Chicago Daily News said the world is now reassessing our leadership, and there is much pointing with shame and cries of "paper tiger." But this is of far less importance than the outcome of our own self reappraisal. Our system remains by a long shot the world's most productive. We still have much to offer the world by way of leadership, industrial know-how and inventive genius. If we have learned to offer it with a little more civility, with a little more humility, and with a little more respect for the dignity of our fellow men and their right to their own sometimes baffling folkways and beliefs -- then we will have endured Vietnam to some good purpose. (4/30/75)

The Buffalo Evening News said the nation's experience in Vietnam is a bitter pill to swallow, but, as President Ford has said, it is useless to dwell on the mistakes of the past. Rather, it is time to put recriminations behind us -- to bind up the nation's wounds and to accept confidently the challenge of the future. (4/30/75)

The Philadelphia Evening Bulletin said the effects of our experience in Vietnam are deep and will inevitably continue to play a major role in shaping our future course of foreign policy -- the way it is formed, the way it is carried out, and the nature of it. Learning from this is different from keeping open the bitter, divisive quarrels. It is wise and necessary that the President ask, as he did, for all Americans to close ranks, avoid recrimination and to look ahead to the great tasks that remain to be accomplished. The problem for the Executive Branch and Congress will be to not slip back into the language of blame while paying homage to the goal of national reconciliation. We are and will remain an immensely strong nation and we must now get on with our job as a great nation, faithful to the ideal of our founding 200 years ago. (5/1/75)

The Boston Herald American observed that because of our failure to carry through in support of South Vietnam, a new and uncertain chapter in our future remains to be written. The outlook is not encouraging, but the taste of ashes from our Vietnam defeat need not be as important as it may seem. We can recapture lost credibility with our allies by keeping ourselves militarily strong --

and henceforth living up to commitments made with the same kind of selective care taken by pragmatic bosses of the Communist world. (5/1/75)

The Dallas Times Herald said it was a suddenness born of internal conflict and lack of leadership that everything collapsed in South Vietnam. Now, God be with the South Vietnamese who reached so desperately for their freedoms. For the United States, the restoration process ahead must assure others that American commitments to free people will not again crumble. (4/30/75)

The Des Moines Register said the United States, a nation of refugees and migrants, ought to welcome its newest Vietnamese addition, people who have paid us the high compliment of trusting themselves to us in time of disaster, giving up homes and homeland to make our country their country, and our people their people. Let us make them welcome. (5/1/75)

The Dallas Times Herald said that some of the reaction to providing a safe haven for South Vietnamese anti-Communist refugees in the U.S. comes dangerously close to tarnishing this nation's image on the eve of its bicentennial anniversary. It is a tragic mockery of American tradition and principles for many persons, some in elected public office, to stir up animosity toward these unfortunate people. In recent years America has welcomed 50,000 Hungarians and more than 100,000 Cubans. Today, America should welcome the Vietnamese. (4/30/75)

The Boston Globe said the U.S. continues to deal with the people of Vietnam as though some are enemies and some are friends. The President, although a hawk on Vietnam, has had the good sense to say that the war is finished as far as Americans are concerned. Now is the time to stop worrying about saving face and to help all the victims. We must help, but we can no longer discriminate. (4/29/75)

The Atlanta Constitution said the responsibility of the United States is not yet finished in Vietnam. Reconstruction is a dreadfully painful time, as any Southern historian can attest. But the American interest lies in maintaining a working relationship with the new (political) structure in South Vietnam, scornful though it will be toward Americans. The United States should not forget that it has a humanitarian obligation to help those who remain in Vietnam. (4/30/75)

The Miami Herald observed that mutterings of protest and even racial slurs against "Asiatics" have been heard in parts of the United States, including some from Congressmen and others who might have been expected to know better. If this nation now fails to accept its moral responsibility to assist the token number of Vietnamese refugees who managed to escape, America's reputation for honor will be one final casualty of the national mis-adventure in Southeast Asia. (5/3/75)

The Pittsburgh Post-Gazette expressed the belief that, despite the recession in this country and the attendant fear of an influx of immigrants, the American people and the Congress will, generally, welcome to this country South Vietnamese whose association with America made them fearful of remaining in their homeland. (5/3/75)

The Kansas City Star said the flow of refugees can easily be absorbed by this land of 218 million. Those who enjoy the freedom and bounty of the United States today would not be here if the gates had been shut against their ancestors. The end of the evacuation shows the number of Vietnamese brought out not to be particularly large. The newcomers from Southeast Asia deserve the warmest welcome that a decent sense of hospitality can provide.
(4/30/75)

The Yale Speech:

The Dayton (Ohio) Daily News said the violence in American life that President Ford inveighed against won't be ended by the remedy he proposed -- throwing the bums in jail, no matter what. Not that Mr. Ford wasn't right to a degree. Some judges are too casual in their treatment of persons convicted of violent crimes and of crimes in which guns were brandished.

But Mr. Ford's high-horse position showed no awareness that the persons who prey violently on us are themselves often the first victims of society's indulgence of violence-producing conditions. American society not only condones violence but admires it -- as in the popularity of violent TV. It commits violence regularly through racism and the overlapping but by no means exclusively racial economic unfairness.

If ours were a fairer Society, it could more fairly ask its members to behave accordingly. Our half-admiring attitude toward violence, our massive commerce in guns and our refusal to deal seriously with ingrained inequities in income, education and employment would guarantee us a new generation of hoodlums, even if all the present generation were jailed for life. (4/29/75)

The Youngstown (Ohio) Vindicator said the President was on safe ground when he called for mandatory prison sentence for second convictions of violent crime. The speech appeared to be aimed more at the general public than his audience of law students and professors who, for one thing, realize that mandatory imprisonment would require an expansion of the prison system. Judges cannot be expected to give such sentences, or prosecutors to be firm in asking for them, if there is no way to carry them out. If the taxpayers insist on it, they must be prepared to bear the expense.

The public has more to fear from criminals awaiting trial than it does from those who have already been convicted, and more to fear from the Saturday Night Special than it does from the professional criminal's gun.

These are some of the areas the President should consider in his message on crime. Wallace-type slogans are not enough. (4/29/75)

The Providence (Rhode Island) Evening Bulletin said President Ford seemed to be setting Administration policy on crime when he spoke at Yale and his remarks left little doubt where he stands on the issue. Several of his suggestions merit strong support. Plea bargaining has long been due for a change. White House leadership toward limiting the practice is a welcome development.

And the President rightly talks of the need to "foster a law-abiding spirit among ordinary citizens." But a greater respect for the law can neither be achieved by a lock-up philosophy that proscribes judicial flexibility, nor by courts that treat casually the most serious non-violent crimes. Respect for the law can only be won on a basis of general public recognition that justice in this country is evenly dispensed, regardless of the wrong-doer's station in life. (4/30/75)

The Cleveland Plain Dealer said President Ford, in a tough speech on crime, said what most Americans wanted to hear. He left no doubt that the law should punish severely those criminals who cause substantial injury to others or who create substantial danger to the public. Without mentioning Watergate by name, he acknowledged that crime in high places also has made law enforcement more difficult. His critics, while agreeing with that, can point out that Mr. Ford's hasty pardon of former President Nixon unfortunately had the effect of establishing a separate code for the "establishment." In its way, it was illustrative of the very leniency which the President scored in his speech.

But in calling for better guarantees for the safety of citizens, for insuring the domestic tranquility and respect for law, the President was on solid and popular ground. (4/27/75)

The Des Moines Register said mandatory imprisonment policy would prohibit judges from granting probation and would require a huge expenditure for maximum security prisons to house swelling numbers. The existing prison system has failed dismally to prevent recidivism. The President has no basis for believing that his program would accomplish anything except the waste of hundreds of millions of dollars on custodial facilities and guards.

In calling for mandatory imprisonment, President Ford is ignoring the advice of such tough law-and-order types as Chief Justice Warren Burger, who has stated that mandatory sentences for crimes do not best serve the ends of the criminal justice system.

The President said he wants to put gun-users in prison, but nowhere in his address about crime did he suggest the need for government action to curb access to guns. This omission, together with his appeal to the emotions for mandatory imprisonment, suggests that the President may be more interested in playing politics with the crime issue than in dealing realistically with the needs of the criminal justice system. (5/2/75)

Times of Evening Network Newscasts
May 7, 1975

A. <u>ADMINISTRATION NEWS</u>	<u>ABC</u>	<u>NBC</u>	<u>CBS</u>
1. Ford/End of War	2:00 (lead)	:15 (#9)	:20 (#5)
2. Ford/Taiwan	1:25 (#2)	-	:15 (of #11)
3. Ford/'76 Campaign	1:30 (#14)	:15 (#13) plus 1:30 (Brinkley)	1:30 (#12)
4. Ford w/Wilson, Whitlan	-	:15 (#14)	1:25 (#11)
5. Dunlop/Refugees	:25 (#5)	-	-
6. Wilson Confirmed	:10 (#17)	-	-
7. Marine's Bodies	1:30 (#7)	2:30 (#2,3)	1:05 (#4)
8. IRS/Rebates	1:20 (#9)	-	-
9. State/Refugee Sponsor Center	-	1:10 (#5)	-
10. Hathaway's Record as Gov.	-	3:20 (#12)	-
11. HEW/AFDC increases	-	:20 (#16)	-
12. Labor/unemployment benefits	-	:10 (#17)	-
13. Pentagon-Aircraft in Thailand	-	-	:30 (#7)
14. HAK/Disservice to Quit	-	-	:20 (#10)
15. FEA/Utilities Switch to Coal	-	-	:25 (#20)
16. SALT Talks Recess	-	-	:10 (#22)
17. Undiscovered Energy Sources	-	-	:25 (#18)
B. <u>OTHER MAJOR NEWS</u>			
1. Saigon Dispatches/Hanoi film	:55 (#3)	2:30 (lead)	:50 (#6)
2. Aid/Judiciary Subcmte	:20 (#4)	:25 (#4)	1:55 (lead)
3. Refugees/Pendleton	2:10 (#6)	1:50 (#6)	(of #3)
4. Lon Nol/\$1 Million	:20 (#8)	:30 (#8)	1:50 (#3)
5. Stocks Mixed	:15 (#10)	-	:10 (#17)
6. AMC Losses	:10 (#11)	-	:10 (#16)
7. Suez Canal	1:35 (#12)	2:15 (#18)	1:55 (#21)
8. McGovern/Cuba	2:25 (#13)	-	-
9. Political Contributions	:20 (#15)	-	-
10. House/Stripmining	:10 (#16)	:20 (#11)	:20 (#19)
11. Omaha Tornado	2:00 (#18)	2:35 (#10)	1:35 (#14)
12. Malpractice Insurance	1:50 (Smith)	:25 (#15)	-
13. Cambodian convoy	-	:25 (#7)	-
14. Refugees/Philippines	-	-	:15 (#2)
15. Thailand/Overview	-	-	3:40 (#8)
16. Laos Fighting/Agreement	-	-	:20 (#9)
17. Hatcher/Dem. Primary	-	-	:15 (#13)
18. Ford/Plant Shutdowns	-	-	:15 (#15)
19. Refugees in U.S.	-	-	2:35 (Sevareid)