

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT

INTERVIEW WITH HARRY REASONER

CAMP DAVID, MARYLAND

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 26, 1974

MR. REASONER: Mr. President, you are not wearing your WIN button. Is that something you leave in Washington?

THE PRESIDENT: I keep having people take it off of me, Harry. They are a little scarce, and every time I go someplace and somebody does not have one, they grab it. I hope they wear it and use it.

MR. REASONER: I think you have had some problem. A high official in the Chamber of Commerce is boycotting the WIN thing. He says it is not substantive. It is just trying to cure inflation with a gesture. Does he have a point?

THE PRESIDENT: Whenever you get a voluntary group, where you have no control, inevitably you are going to have some differences of opinion, and Arch Booth objected to one aspect of it, but overall Arch and the Chamber of Commerce agreed. But the problem there was in order to get the best results they thought one approach was better than the other, and I think the Chamber and the others in the overall will do a first-class job in getting our people to waste less and to save more.

Now there have been some misinterpretations of what we really meant. I don't want to identify some people, but they thought we were telling people not to spend more. What we were really trying to do with this program was to suggest to people that they buy better, that they shop better, and bargains are available, whether it is in one industry or one marketplace or another. So it is a problem of dealing with voluntary individuals who all have the same objective and are seeking to do the right thing, working together without somebody telling them precisely what to do.

MORE

MR. REASONER: I don't mind identifying people. Mr. Townsend, for instance, and other representatives of the automobile industry are extremely concerned. General Motors' profits for the third quarter was down something like 94 percent from last year and a serious problem with all the auto makers. Are we talking about a semantic difference? If you spend better, and you conserve, and you avoid waste, aren't you also going to unavoidably contribute to a recession?

THE PRESIDENT: If people just stop buying, of course you will have serious repercussions, and I might add parenthetically before answering the rest of your question that in the 31-point program that I recommended to the Congress and to the American people we finely tuned it so that it would not adversely affect purchasing power, and at the same time we would seek to tighten some screws in the area of inflation.

Now in the follow-up speech that I gave at Kansas City we were talking to the American people and urging them to waste less and to buy better, to shop for bargains. Now I think the American society is predicated on people who build automobiles or produce something else to make a product available at a good price, and under our system every product and every piece of equipment that is made by somebody is a little different, and the public ought to shop for what is the best bargain from their point of view.

I want them to spend their money. It is important in our society. But I want them to be sharper bargainers, the old yankee trader trait which I think was good then and is still good today.

MR. REASONER: You outlined this program against inflation, and except for an insufficient number of WIN buttons there is not anything that could be done about it immediately. Congress went away. Do you have any serious expectation that you will get most of what needs Congressional action before the end of the post-election session?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: I certainly hope so, and some elements of it are more important than others. What we try to do is get the Congress to act, to provide more revenue, to put a greater burden on those best able to pay and at the same time relieve some of the problems of inflation off the shoulders and the backs of people who are inequitably affected by the problems of higher cost.

Now if the Congress passes my tax program, which is in my judgment an equitable approach, because it does not affect anybody until after they have an income of \$15,000 or more a year, and even when you go up to \$20,000 a year of taxable income, I think it is only \$42 a year, as I recollect, 12 cents a day. I really don't think that is a terrible burden for people in that income bracket, but the income we get from that extra tax, plus the tax of a five percent on corporate profits, provides the compassion that we can give to people at the lower spectrum of our economic society.

Now if Congress passes that I think we will have done a great service in battling inflation on the one hand and meeting the problems of those who are adversely affected on the other.

Now we have got some other things. I think we ought to tighten up our anti-trust actions, a higher penalty for those that violate the anti-trust laws, people who in the past have been convicted or corporations that have been guilty of violations have not paid a big enough penalty. In this case I think prospective punitive action will help in getting competition in the areas where the anti-trust laws are affected.

I believe that our effort to come up with a program to help temporary unemployment, so that people who have an extension of their unemployment benefits but still are not taken care of would get some benefits. This helps the less fortunate. So in those three or four areas I hope Congress will act. I think it is mandatory that they act, and I am optimistic enough to believe that the Congress will respond.

MORE

MR. REASONER: But you also, sir, had twenty-five years in Congress, and on a realistic basis, reaction to the five percent surcharge was somewhat underwhelming. Even many men of your own party are carefully not endorsing it.

THE PRESIDENT: Well I think you have to understand, Harry, that I offered this or proposed it at a most inauspicious time completely. It was within a month of the campaign or the election, and I understand Democrats as well as Republicans backing away from a tax increase, but once the election is over I think a good many members of both political parties will realize that something has to be done to dampen the inflationary pressures on the one hand and help the people less fortunate on the other.

It was interesting to me as I read what various Members of Congress said, of both political parties, that they differed with where I had the cutoff. They did not necessarily differ with the approach. And I understand Congress well enough. They always have to be a little different from a President, whether it is me or anybody else -- and I will in the long run rely on the Congress doing what is right.

MR. REASONER: Would you accept a modification or a change in the five percent?

THE PRESIDENT: I would as long as they do not abandon the concept.

MR. REASONER: The concept is the revenue.

THE PRESIDENT: The revenue -- where they put the cutoff is a matter of judgment. I thought one figure was right. If the Congress decides differently I certainly will accept it, but the concept of putting a burden on those better able to pay is important in order to relieve the inequities for those less able to pay.

MR. REASONER: Sir, every statement you make and every poll indicates that inflation, the economy, is the major issue in politics right now. One study which was based on the traditional comparison between what has happened to people's spendable income and the popularity of the President, one study indicates the Republicans might lose 70 seats in this election, which is more I think,

a higher figure than anyone has guessed. Can you live with that if it happens?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me say at the outset, I can live with anything, but what I have to look at is what is best for the country, and I have learned over a period of time in the Congress that the closer the balance is between Democrats and Republicans the better the legislation is. If one party totally controls the Congress with overwhelming majorities, you get a lack of competition, and the net result is the legislation does not reflect the broad basis of American thoughts or the consensus of America.

So a loss of 70, a net loss of 70 in the House for example, I think would disturb that balance, destroy the competition, and the net result would be bad legislation. Now I can live with that, but I would just like something a little better balanced.

MR. REASONER: You made some fairly strong statements. You said it might disturb the question of world peace. Have you backed off a little on that, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Not really, Harry, and I don't like the idea of correcting what maybe the press or what some of the Democrats have said, but I would like to put it in perspective if I might.

I honestly believe -- because I came to the Congress at a time there was maximum bipartisanship, Democrats, Republicans, a Democratic President, Harry Truman, Republican Congress, the 80th Congress -- that two-year span did more in my judgment to make America strong in leadership in achieving peace, building for peace, than any period that I know of, and I praise President Truman, and I think the 80th Congress was great.

Now we sailed along on a relative level with Republican and Democratic Presidents, Republican and Democratic Congresses where this has continued, this bipartisanship, in the area of foreign policy. The last several weeks before the recess I found that

MORE

despite Senator Mansfield, despite the good efforts of the Speaker of the House, a Democrat, both of whom agreed with me, that the Congress was moving in a different direction seeking to limit, to hamstring a President's capability to make decisions and to seek solutions in complicated foreign policy areas.

This is what really worries me. And in the speeches that I made that were criticized by some, I think the speeches were good. I think the interpretations unfortunately were inaccurate.

I want to work with a Democratic Congress, Democratic leaders, but I need the help of Democrats as well as Republicans in the House and Senate if we are going to make peace a reality in the months ahead.

MR. REASONER: Suppose, sir, you have to live with a House of Representatives with 350 Democrats, and they all remember that you were out making strong speeches, are you maybe throwing away your, or eroding your relationship with the Congress by being so partisan in the campaign?

THE PRESIDENT: The truth is, as I see it, I am not as partisan as some have interpreted it, but assume that what I have said is interpreted to be partisan. As long as I, as President, present programs, whether domestic or whether they are involving international matters, can be honestly justified on the basis of what is good for America, I would hope that even an overwhelming Democratic Congress would be responsive.

I think it would be more difficult, and I don't mean difficult in a mean, vicious sense, but more difficult because I would have more connection with or relationship with Republicans. But most Members of Congress, regardless of political label, in my 25 years I have found if you talk with them, you lay out what you want, or what is told to you by a Democratic or Republican President, most Members of Congress at least will give you a fair shake.

MORE

MR. REASONER: Mr. President, what about Nelson Rockefeller? I suppose you and I should both establish we have received no gifts from him.

THE PRESIDENT: Not to my knowledge. Nelson never contributed to my political campaign.

MR. REASONER: Do you still anticipate his confirmation?

THE PRESIDENT: I am glad you asked that because I want it clearly understood I am firmly for Nelson Rockefeller. I think I made the right decision. I did it very consciously. I thought he was the best man. I still do, and I am for him. I believe he will be confirmed.

MR. REASONER: From very early on, I think in your first news conference, you said the ethical standards of this Administration would be your ethical standards. You don't see any problem in what has come out about Mr. Rockefeller? You don't see anything unethical in what he has done?

THE PRESIDENT: I do not, from what I know, and I think I know all of it, because Nelson has told me all of this information has come out subsequent to his first hearing. He made available to the committee and the Senate -- and on the basis of what I know I am completely convinced what he did was totally ethical.

MR. REASONER: Is it possible there is something wrong with the 25th Amendment that maybe you cannot confirm anyone if you go deeply enough into his history?

THE PRESIDENT: Certainly the experience I had, and obviously the one Nelson is having, shows that anybody who is going to get confirmed by the process of the 25th Amendment has to lay his or her life out from birth to the present. I don't object to that. I think it is all right, but I do think that people who are asking questions in some of these areas ought to expect that their own life would be equally exposed.

MORE

You know, I think we ought to have a single standard, and how you achieve it I have not thought that out, but certainly people who are questioning Nelson Rockefeller, who questioned me, ought to in their own conscience -- and maybe publicly -- have their own lives laid out in the same way. What is wrong with that? We ought to have a single standard.

MR. REASONER: You were twenty-five years in Congress. If you can face up to seeing how you look I can, I guess, sir.

You spoke outside about possibly minor revisions to the 25th Amendment. Do you have anything specific in mind?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Harry, I am sort of predating a speech I am thinking about. I will just give you one thought. The 25th Amendment I do not believe in its inception contemplated what has happened in the last year, but it happened and we have to learn from experience. We hope the circumstances of the last year are not repeated, but we cannot be sure in this country.

It seems to me there is one area where there should be a revision. There is nothing in the 25th Amendment that says once a President submits the name of a Vice-President that the Congress has any date certain that they must act.

Now in my case they acted within about two months. In the case of Nelson Rockefeller it looks like it will be a longer delay. How long it is hard to tell. But I think that delay, without any pressure by the Constitution or law is a handicap to the proper functioning of our Government.

I am President. My good friend the Speaker of the House is in effect Vice-President by the Constitution. We have a hiatus. We have no Vice-President. It seems to me that there ought to be a time limitation that Congress has to act within a reasonable period of time instead of letting a delay like we are having at the present time.

MR. REASONER: A deadline.

THE PRESIDENT: A deadline.

MR. REASONER: Which might take the heat off the Congress too.

THE PRESIDENT: Right. In other words, they would have to act more expeditiously and then they would not be accused of being partisan by the delay. They were acting on the basis of what the Constitution required them to do. Sixty days, 90 days, some reasonable limitation that the Congress should act in order to prevent this sort of limbo situation.

MR. REASONER: There is a deadline in the other part of the amendment, in acting on Presidential disability.

THE PRESIDENT: That is correct.

MR. REASONER: Sir, I was interested in what happened to a man who does not plan all his life to be President, and something you said, you questioned the interpretation of some speeches you have made. Is that part of it? Is it hard to suddenly have people read your speeches a lot more carefully? Do you wish you were back when nobody listened?

THE PRESIDENT: I have said several times, Harry, that I am not saying things too much differently today than I said before, but people appear to be listening more or reporting it more.

I cannot change fundamentally, although I do look at the problems of the country a bit broader, I cannot change my views of being open and frank, and very forthright in what I say. I suspect I probably have to describe a thought a little more restrained than I did in the past, but you cannot change a person's personality. At least I find it very difficult to do, and I don't think I ever will.

MORE

MR. REASONER: You were quoted as having said to a friend who criticized your voting record in the House, "Don't worry, that is Grand Rapids". Were you, are you conscious without basic change of a different attitude for issues now that you represent the Nation instead of Grand Rapids?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me first say in defense of Grand Rapids, it is a very cosmopolitan Middle West community. It is a far more sophisticated community than some news media have indicated. I just do not want to be in the position of criticising the people that helped bring me out and mold me, et cetera.

On the other hand, the problems, whether they are economic, whether they are cultural, whether they are in any other way, they are quite the same as in New York or San Francisco, or in Miami.

I had an obligation for twenty-five years to represent fundamentally that community, or that area of Michigan. But now that I am President I think I have to have a bit broader viewpoint. I have the same basic philosophy, but it can be interpreted, I think, a little differently as you meet the problems of New York and Chicago, and Kansas City, and perhaps Los Angeles.

MR. REASONER: I would like to, unless we are just about running out, I would like to just kick off some of the chief criticisms of you, President Ford, including some from people who respond to you.

I suppose the basic one is that your Administration so far seems rudderless, without direction, a response to the problems of inflation, as an appeal to elect Republican candidates, but the feeling that you do not have the grip on it. Is there something in that?

THE PRESIDENT: Harry, I of course disagree with that.

MORE

I do not know of a President in recent times who was faced with high inflation on the one hand and so many adverse economic conditions developing on the other, who went to the people, as we did, with our economic summit programs that include twelve mini-summits around the country, who came up with a comprehensive economic plan to meet the problems of inflation on the one hand, and economic disturbances or adversity on the other hand.

I think that was a major accomplishment in a very significant area affecting all of our people. So when individuals say that we were rudderless, I think this was an indication of grabbing the wheel and moving the ship of state right down the middle, aimed at meeting the challenges on one side or another.

Now there have been some criticisms by fine people that we did not do this, or we did not do that. But fundamentally they recognize that we came up with a comprehensive plan, and I think it is a good one. We will pass judgment when the Congress responds.

You know some people have said, Harry, that our plan was a marshmallow. Others said it was too tough. I don't know who it was who said that the Democratic proposal was far less comprehensive, far less broad in its understanding of these problems. I think we incorporated Democratic as well as Republican ideas, we brought in labor and management, consumers, housewives, I think we did a good job in probably the most pressing problem we have. And to say we are rudderless, I think, is an unfair criticism.

MORE

MR. REASONER: The second major criticism is somewhat allied to that which is that you are a nice guy from Michigan, that people respond to your warmth and your friendliness, but that you have not got the magnitude of the grasp on the Presidency. -- I am talking about going from rudders to magnitude -- but that you would have a narrow view formed by twenty-five years representing a homogeneous district. Can you grow into this job, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: I honestly believe, Harry, that I grew into it in the twenty-five years I served in the Congress. When I came from Michigan in 1949 I concede I was provincial, except I had probably more educational breadth having gone to the University of Michigan and Yale Law School, which was a great experience for me.

But when I came to Congress, after serving four years in the Navy where I traveled pretty extensively, I did have the focus on the problems of Western Michigan and the State of Michigan. But the Committee assignments that I had during that quarter of a century were the most broadening ones that any member of the Congress ever had.

I served on the Committee on Appropriations. In the first place that Committee handled all of the problems of the government, domestic as well as foreign, and then I had the blessing of an experience of serving on the Foreign Aid Subcommittee, the CIA Subcommittee and the Department of Defense Subcommittee. We dealt with problems involving the globe, the poor people in other countries, the enemy in other countries; we had the problems of dealing with every aspect of foreign as well as domestic problems.

So in that twenty-five year span I was blessed by circumstances with a great opportunity, and I think I grew with it. So when I came to the Vice-Presidency, here I was with twenty-five years of the best experience in Congress, placed in a position where I might have some opportunity to make decisions, so I think education in the Congress was a blessing, and I think it has been very very helpful.

MORE

MR. REASONER: That would lead to the other question. A Harris poll indicated something like sixty-two percent of the people are concerned about your competence in foreign affairs as opposed to domestic. But you are aware there is a world out there?

THE PRESIDENT: I sure am. And let me say, this country is very very fortunate to have Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State and as director of the National Security Council. I meet with Henry Kissinger at least an hour every day where we discuss current problems and those that are prospective or down the road. I call on this experience that I indicated a few minutes ago after being in the Congress where I dealt with Secretaries of Defense, Secretaries of State, plus I knew Jack Kennedy, I worked with Lyndon Johnson, I worked with Dick Nixon as President; those experiences as leader in the Republican Party in the House exposed me to many many problems that a president has, whether it is a Democratic or Republican president.

MR. REASONER: Mr. President, you said, I think about fifteen hours before you were sworn in, that you would keep Henry Kissinger. Are there any other members of the cabinet who you would absolutely guarantee their jobs are safe?

THE PRESIDENT: I have no present plans to make any changes, but I thought it was extremely important, Harry, at that time, to reassure the American people, as well as our friends and adversaries abroad, that Henry Kissinger would be our Secretary of State. I did this for the reasons I just said. But also I had, over a period of time, developed a very good relationship with Henry. I strongly supported his policies. I knew they were the best for the country and I just did not want any rupturing in that relationship.

But as far as the rest of the cabinet is concerned, I think they have done a good job. Circumstances may change, but at the moment I see no immediate change in the cabinet situation.

MR. REASONER: Do you see your administration as restoring the authority and prestige to the cabinet as

MORE

opposed to the White House?

THE PRESIDENT: We hope to. I firmly believe that cabinet members and departments ought to have more of the authority, more direction and that the White House should not control everything. That takes a little time to change the direction of a huge bureaucracy, but we are issuing directives and we are encouraging cabinet members to assume more responsibility. We are going to turn back some of the questions at press conferences and say, Ask the cabinet officer, don't ask the White House, because that is a cabinet decision or a cabinet responsibility."

I think that is the way to run an organization. Pick good people, give them a responsibility, hold them accountable, and if they do not perform then you make a change. If you do it all from the White House, Harry, you do not have that combination of responsibility and accountability. So we hope to make that change which is quite important, but you cannot do it overnight.

MR. REASONER: Might that mean over a period of time, sir, not a declining, but a reduction in the White House staff in what has become a very large department of government?

THE PRESIDENT: I hope so. I think the White House staff has tended to get too big. It was predicated on a different philosophy; that the White House was the sole dispenser of power and decision. If my thought about greater responsibility at the cabinet level is carried out, I think we can, and I think we should, reduce the White House bureaucracy. Don Rumsfeld has some good ideas in that area. We intend to carry them out.

MR. REASONER: Do you feel you, at this point, have succeeded in making it the Ford White House instead of the Nixon White House, even if you have some holdover staff members?

THE PRESIDENT: We have not done as well as we intended to. But I think the American people have to understand that I, almost literally, became President

MORE

over night and the move from the Executive Office Building as Vice President into the White House, under those circumstances, was unique, and I am not the kind of person who likes to cut somebody off, cut their throat so to speak, over night. I think you have got to give some reasonable period of transition. We have just about achieved that in the White House staff and from now on I think you and the news media can hold me and my people accountable, because we are primarily today a Ford administration with no mixture between the previous and the present.

MR. REASONER: If you had to characterize the difference between the Ford administration and the Nixon administration, how would you put it, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: I would say the openness, not only of myself, but I believe the people that are working for me. You take Ron Nessen. I think there is a difference. You take Don Rumsfeld. I think there is a difference. And I am not being critical of the other people. There is just a difference in style. Or you take the others who are in our top staff organizational setup. They are more open. I think they are more candid. That is, I think, the hallmark of my administration.

I addition I think it is going to be more evident, as I said a moment ago, that we are going to move from total control and domination in the White House to responsibility and accountability in the various departments.

MR. REASONER: Openness inevitably means people are going to blow it from to time. Will you forgive that?

THE PRESIDENT: Including me.

MR. REASONER: Will you forgive it in yourself and others?

THE PRESIDENT: Nobody that I have ever known in public office is one hundred percent what they say, or even decisions, and I am the first to concede that even in this important office I have said some things that I had to modify or qualify and I will probably do it in the future, but isn't it better to be open and to make a mistake

MORE

in a word or a phrase or something than to be so restrictive that you don't say anything? So I would rather do it the way I am doing it and I hope that my people or the people working with me would emphasize openness and if we make mistakes, there is no harm in admitting them.

MR. REASONER: How close is your communication now with Mr. Nixon, sir?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, for a period of time, from August 9th until just recently, we had a regular courier setup giving the former president, almost exclusively, foreign policy classified information. During that period of time I talked to him by phone, I think, four times. I have not talked to him for three or four weeks. I cannot recall exactly.

But we have decided that it is not necessary to communicate that foreign policy information, classified as it is, by courier. We have communications equipment that makes it possible for me to give to Mr. Nixon the important information that relates to the decisions he made and the information he had, and he, despite the criticism, in many areas I thought did a superb job in foreign policy, and I want him kept up to date. His judgment on this issue or that, if he is kept up to date, can be an important input into decisions that I might make, not that it will be controlling, but he has to be kept up to date if he is going to have an impact. So we are doing it, I think, differently; instead of by courier, by our classified communications system.

MR. REASONER: There is no litigation and possible legislation about the tapes and other records on which you made an agreement. Have you changed your mind any on the wisdom of that agreement?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we have recognized that it probably had to be modified and on the objection of Mr. Jaworski and his staff, and now Mr. Ruth, we have agreed that we won't implement it until there is a reasonable satisfaction from the Special Prosecutor's point of view.

MORE

In the meantime, of course, former President Nixon has instituted a law suit which of course will make some fundamental determinations as to the control of the tapes and other documents. In the meantime it is getting even more complicated by the action of the United States Senate in passing a bill which I presume in one form or another may pass the House of Representatives. So you have the basic agreement, the modifications that we are willing to make to cooperate with Mr. Jaworski's staff, and Mr. Ruth's staff now, the law suit of Mr. Nixon, and the prospective acts in the Congress.

What I am fundamentally interested in is that that material be made available for any criminal prosecutions, for any legitimate utilization, historically. On the other hand a lot of people -- and this is I think quite important -- were taped without their knowledge, including myself. I have no objection to whatever I said in the Oval Office or elsewhere, but there are some people, including high ranking government officials from other governments, who were in the Oval Office whose conversations were taped, which is vitally important in their own home or own country or in world diplomacy. I am not sure that all of that material ought to be made public. It could be very harmful.

There is a degree of privacy that is involved and personal privacy as well as diplomatic privacy has to be taken into consideration. I am concerned about that aspect..

MR. REASONER: It has been suggested that one of the reasons you made the agreement was to keep your conversations with the President from being known.

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all, Harry.

MR. REASONER: There is nothing in there you were worried about?

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all. As a matter of fact, if my memory is accurate, any conversation I had that was taped, a conversation with Mr. Nixon, would be beneficial to me and would not be harmful to the President. So I have

MORE

no objection whatsoever to any of those tapes, if they exist, being made public.

MR. REASONER: You made no pejorative remarks about the Prime Minister of Canada?

THE PRESIDENT: No. If my memory was correct I never was hyper critical or partisan in any comments I made about any others. I have thought about it, because you can say something in a private conversation, but as I reflect on it nothing I said would I have any objection whatsoever to being made public.

MR. REASONER: Sir, in a final personal area, have you or Mrs. Ford regretted your instinctive decision to be completely open about her health and her surgery?

THE PRESIDENT: None whatsoever, Harry. It was a big shock first to know of the problem. The first twelve hours we did not tell the American people because we thought that that was better for her and for our schedule and over all, but once the operation was done, and what has happened since, we think was good for America, good in that I am told that literally thousands and thousands of women have now gone and had the same examination. I know it gives Betty the feeling that she may have saved some lives and we think it is good and I think we would do it precisely the way we did in the past.

MR. REASONER: Assuming her excellent apparent recovery continues, how does she feel about 1976? We know how you feel.

THE PRESIDENT: She has not told me anything different following the operation. I think she relies on whatever decision I make which I hope in my case will be predicated on what I think is good for the country, so the net result is certainly there is no change in what I said shortly after I was sworn in.

MR. REASONER: Almost immediately, as I remember.

THE PRESIDENT: That I would probably be a candidate in 1976, and I have not changed one bit.

MORE

MR. REASONER: Can you win?

THE PRESIDENT: I always enter a contest -- whether it is in athletics or politics -- on the assumption that I am probably not going to win, because I work a little harder and try a little better. So I think it is a horse race. Democrats will undoubtedly have a good candidate. I don't know who it will be, and I am not sure they do. But I always assume I am going to lose and then I am happier -- there is an old saying, Harry, "Prepare for the worst and the best will take care of itself," and that is the way I feel about day to day as well as '76.

MR. REASONER: You need a name for your administration. It is not the New Deal; it is not the New Frontier; it is not the Great Society. What else is there? It is not the New Majority? Have you got an idea?

THE PRESIDENT: I wish you would have given me a little advance notice on that. Maybe we ought to think about it. I think there is something unique about this administration. I think, as the American people see it, they will find that it is a new approach, a down to earth pragmatic practical answer to the problems we face, both at home and abroad. I think our problem is we have not thought about a title. But maybe the results will give us the title. I hope the results are good.

MR. REASONER: Thank you very much, Mr. President.

END