## The original documents are located in Box 134, folder "June 25, 1974 - Speech, American Medical Association, Chicago, IL" of the Gerald R. Ford Vice Presidential Papers 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Digitized from Box 134 of the Gerald R. Ford Vice Presidential Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

## PRESS CONFERENCE MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA JUNE 26, 1974

The Vice President --- I'm glad to hear the press so enthusiastic. Well, it's nice to be in Minneapolis, see some new friends and a few old ones. Why don't we just go ahead.

Q --- Mr. Vice President, the State Republican Committee apparently has passed or adopted a platform including one plank to the effect of opposing the equal rights amendment. What is your position on that?

A --- I think my position is quite clear. I voted for it the year that it was finally passed by a two-thirds majority in the House and eventually passed by a two-thirds majority in the Senate. It is my recollection that a year or two before that it had passed the House, and I had supported it, but unfortunately, at that time, it didn't pass the Senate. It's my judgment that this is a matter that the Congress has spoken on. It's now up to the respective state legislatures to act and my record is clear. I supported it not once but twice in the House of Representatives.

Q --- Mr. Vice President, from your viewpoint, could you tell us \_\_\_\_\_ what you feel President Nixon's major accomplishments have been first of all on the domestic scene and then on the foreign \_\_\_\_\_ as you see it.

A --- Let me take the domestic first. When President Nixon came in in January of 1969, he was faced with a good many commitments, financially and fiscally, that would have overburdened the taxpayer and the federal treasury, and he tried to get a handle and tried to hold down and limit federal expenditures so that we would be able to at least lay the groundwork for a successful battle against inflation. In addition, he inherited a good many of the programs that had been initiated in 1965 and 1966 that I think in retrospect were overfinanced and undercontrolled and the net result was that we had to do some cutting back and trimming in those areas. Probably the most significant domestic achievement is the President's promotion of what we call New Federalism where \$5,200,000,000 a year goes from the federal treasury back to state and local units in the government so that locally elected officials can make decisions for the expenditure of this vast amount of money for local projects and programs on a priority list determined by local officials. This has gotten away from the over-regulation by the Federal government, and it's gotten the money and the programs back in the hands of the locally elected officials. And I think it's working well, and I hope and trust the Congress continues after the initial five-year legislation.

Vice President - I'm glad to hear the press so enthusiastic. Well, it's nice to be in Minneapolis, see some new friends and a few old ones. Where Why don't we just go ahead.

Q - Mr. Vice President, the state Republican Committee apparently has passed or adopted a platform including one plank to the effect of opposing the equal rights amendment. What is your position on that?

A - I think my position is quite clear. I voted for it the year that it was finally passed by a two-thirds majority in the House and eventually passed by a two-thirds majority in the Senate. It is my recollection that a year or two before that it had passed, the House and I had supported it but unfortunately at that time it didn't pass the Senate. It's my judgment that this is a matter that the Congress has spoken on. It's now up to the respective state legislatures to act and my record is clear. I supported it not once but twice in the House of Representatives.

Q - Mr. Vice President, from your viewpoint could you tell us \_\_\_\_\_\_ what you feel President Nixon's major accomplishments have been first of all on the domestic scene and then on the foreign \_\_\_\_\_\_ as you see it.

A - Let me take the domestic first. When President Nixon came in in January of 1969, he was faced with a good many commitments financially and fiscally, that would have overburdened the taxpayer and the federal treasury and he tried to get a handle and tried to hold down and limit federal expenditures so that we would be able to at least lay the ground work for a successful battle against inflation. In addition, he inherited a good many of the programs that had been initiated in 1965 and 1966 that I think in retrospect were overfinanced and undercontroled and the net result was that we had to do some cutting back and trimming in those areas. Probably the most significant domestic achievement is the President's promotion of what we call New Federalism where \$5,200,000,000 a year goes from the federal treasury back to state and local units in the government so that locally elected officials can make decision for the expenditure of this vast amount of money for local projects and programs on a priority list determined by local officials. This has gotten away from the over-regulation by the Federal government and it's gotten the money and the programs back in the hands of the locally elected officials. And I think it's working and well, and I hope and trust the Congress continues after the initial five year legislation.

**EXAMPLEMENT ACTION** In the field of foreign policy, it's my judgment that the Nixon Administration has done more to achieve peace, to continue peace and to lay the groundwork for continued peace in the world than any other administration certainly in my life time and probably **im** not only in this century but in the history of the United States. The record is very, very complete in that the war was ended in Vietnam, we made more progress and had more success in the Middle East than any other Amministration in the last 25 years since the establishment of the nation of Israel. We have better prospects for a permanent peace in that area of the world than any time actually in the history of mankind. The recent declaration signed by the various foreign ministers and our Secretary of State in Ottawa, Canada which will be confirmed when the President goes to Brissels in a day or two strengthens, revitalizes NATO. In the field of foreign policy, no administration had the vision or the courage to open up a new relationship with 800 p million people on the mainland of China. A step that will pay big dividends in the future. It's already had some significant benefits. The detente with the Soviet Union formations is certainly a major success. It has 1.1., I think, to the easing of tensions between the two major powers. And I think this will in addition be highly beneficial in the months ahead. Yes, Mr. Jones-

## QxxxRhiixXXanesxx&exxesaeee

Q -

A -

It is my feeling that a person in my position ought to respect the decisions whether they're right or wrong of another branch of the federal government, and I'm not going to condemn or criticize or praise what the federal courts have done. They have the to account to the American people and their record work will stand on what the American people believe. Yes, Mr. Nessen-

Q - The other day you proposed a third or unbiased objective person listen to the tapes and make up a transcript identical to them. Have you had any more thoughts on how that would work, who that person would be and has the White House indicated to you their feeling towards your idea?

A -I frankly had not pursued it any further than I think last Saturday morning. I still think that it's a suggestion that has merits. I've had not a communication from the White House pro or con on the suggesstion that I made. Yes--

Q -

A - Speaking only for myself, I don't think that I ought to be critical of someone who has left us so to speak. J. Edgar Hoover had a tremendous record of achievement and accomplishment over a long period of time from the 1920's to the early 1970's. **Examplify period** Final American are people and he was appointed or reappointed not by one but by many presidents. So I think at least for a person in my position I shouldn't be critical of a dead man under these circumstances. Yes--

Q - Mr. Vice President, what kind of message are you giving \_\_\_\_\_\_ republicans you are talking to around the country/\_\_\_\_\_\_

A - I think you have to be realistic. They do have some pessimism but that pessimism is waning and there is a growing, I think, realization that pessimism isn't going to preserve our two party system. Pessimism isn't going to save some basic principles which are so important **reactions** if we're going to keep a well balanced **reaction** society. So as I travel around and listen to a good many Republicans and I might add a good many independents, there's a feeling that despite some of the loses in some of the elections. Congressional races, that they ought to redouble their efforts working with the party leaders, contributing perhaps more than they had anticipated a few months ago. I think we're on the upswing. We've got a long way to go but we've got a few months to change the political environment. Therefore this pessimism for the last several months, I think, is changing to one of working a little harder and making a little bigger effort so I sense de as we see the President's achievements in foreign policy, as we are getting over some of the economic hurdles that looked pretty serious a few months ago, that the political environment come October will be a lot more encouraging to Republicans than it has been over the last six months.

Q -

A - Im not familiar with this particular effort, but I can tell you that George Bush has said to me and I think its a matter of official record that the small donors to the Republican National Committee in the last year have increased in numbers and contributions by about 20%. The area where there's been some reluctance has been among the large donors. Goerge Bush's records would seem to not coincide with just what you have told me because the National Committee is getting more small donations from more people and I think this is encouraging and I hope that some of our more affluent friends will follow suit and I think they're beginning to realize that the chips are really down and their doing to help us in the future as they have in the past. Yes--

Q -

A - Well I suspect that those comments or the analysis made by the Committee don't come from the members themselves. It came from a staff that was picked primarily by the Domocratic members. So I think to some extent there's a built-in bias. And I think you would agree that those democratically steected people who made that analysis den't qualify as a totally objective group in checking words in those tapes. So, as long as there is that, I think, public apprenhension about the objectivity of the staff of that Committee and I think there's plenty of evidence for it, that if we're going to have a conflict between the White House version onone hand and a prejudiced version from the staff of a committee picked exclusively by the Democrats, perhaps it makes good sense to have another group make a totally objective analysis of the two versions.

Q - Would you rule out the fact that perhaps the White House version could be prejudices well?

A - I think what I said is that there are people who are suspicious of the White House version. How many I don't know, but there are poeple who. I think, would probably have reservations of the White House version. The But the fact that is there's some reservation about that doesn't make the **Come**crat staff analysis any more credable. There version could also be subject to some honest challenge by people who say they are prejudice. So under these circumstances, I think perhaps an unbiased group the political philosophy or whose objectivity would not be challenged might be the best answer. A - Well, I've looked at both versions and there are some descripencies. I don't think they're particularly major byt there are some descrepencies. I don't think they really get to the gut issue whether the President's guilty of an impeachable offense or not. But there wre some descrepencies and differences and if we are going to seek purity then I would hope that we might be an unbiased group, a group that would certainly be more objective than the democratic-appointed staff of the House Committee on the Judiciary and perhaps the version of the White House.

Q - Who would that be?

A - Well I frankly haven't gone that far but I am sure there are some qualified people who might undertake the job.

Q - Mr. Vice President, when you talk about the prejudice staff members appointed by the pemocrati and I think last week you talked about people who had leaked material on Kissinger trying to sabatoge American foreign policy, and you also talk about the strident voices on the Potomac and how you're trying to get away from that and trying to be a moderator. Are you sometime one of the silving for yourself when

A - I think I am speaking factually, Mr. Dixon who is an appointee on the Democratic side of the House Committee on the Judiciary, I am sure we all understand, was an ardent McGovern campaign manager, I've forgotten in what state, but whatever state it was they were Sited by the GSA for violations of the election, the federal election code, Gertainly his memorandums are less than credable on an objective basis and those of course are well-leaked him by him or by others, I can't recall it hand then Mr. Kak Eillberg as as I'm sure you well remember leaked these charged against Secretary of State Kissinger at a very, very critical period when the President was traveling in the Middle East. This I happen to think was a deliberate effort to undersut the success of that mission. I think those are farly accurate accusation. I don't use them in a strident way, I try to present them in a factual account. And I think that can't be challenged as factual illustrations. If I am strident, I apologize. I have tried to be factual and I'll continue to be factual but very firm. I don't hesitate to say that. Yes

Q -

A - Well I think the proposal that's been made in the United States Senate is promoted by the most liberal element in the United States Senate. What they are trying to do is to actually prevent an expansion of America's industrial capability, With They want to take away the same kind of incentives that are given to business in everyone of the major industrial countries of the world. And if we don't have an incentive to produce more at a cheaper price, we are never going to lick the problem of inflation and I think the Administration is opposed to these extreme liberal views and the tax policy because the Administration wants to win the battle against inflation and you don't do it by hamstringing American industry. And for very good and solid reasons the Administration with the help of a number of very solid Remocrats and a number of very solid Republicans are going to lick this political demogogry  $(5\rho)$ 

Q -

Q -

A - Well you're taking the other side of the coin and if **iteration treaty** there is a bonafide treaty proved by the United States Congress, I think the United States has an obligation to carry out its responsibility.

Q -

A - If it has been so delcared by the highest court of the land, I would assume so, yes.

Q -

A - Well the latter question, the interpretation of the Constitution in 1974, that's in the hands **and** or in the **responsibility** of the United States Supreme Court and I have enough problems without trying to make judicial decisions. In this area we have nine good members of the Supreme COurt and whether I agree with it or not, I certainly would abide by whatever they decide. What was the first question again?

Q -

A - Well I thin k in the field of foreign policy, **inditat** the major problem is for the Congress is to support the President's forward looking peace achieving spece, peace-securing policies whether its in the Middle East, Western Europe or Southeast Asis.

Domestically, it's my judgment that a our major issues right now are one: to lick inflation. And we're trying to make some headway in that regard and number two: to provide more energy so we can continue to have a productive society. And hopefully the Congress will respond to some of the recommendations of the President in this area.

Q -

A - I have not talked to him, I intend to call him and apologize for the shot shot off a tree as I understand it and indirectly hitting him. I hope and trust that his injury is not serious and I am told by authorities that it is not. It's very regrettable and I am deeply sorty that such an unfortunate incident took place.

Q -

A - Well, I can only speak for myself.