

**The original documents are located in Box 44, folder “9/30/75 - Nebraska” of the Ron Nessen 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. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT'S BRIEFING BOOK

(Key Questions)

For: September 29, 1975

TAB A	SPECIALS FOR OMAHA
TAB B	GENERAL DOMESTIC
TAB C	ENERGY
TAB D	INTERNATIONAL



## OMAHA WATERFRONT REDEVELOPMENT

- Q. As you may know, Omaha has for some time been planning a waterfront redevelopment (Omaha Waterfront Redevelopment Project). Part of this project calls for railroad bed relocation. Is the Federal government prepared to give the financial assistance necessary to complete this project?
- A. I'm aware of this project and understand that you are making progress toward its completion. I also understand that you have been in contact with the Federal departments of HEW, HUD, and DOT in an effort to secure financial assistance. This type of project is one in which the major responsibility for planning and execution does in my judgment lie at the local level. However, steps should be taken to utilize existing Federal programs to assist you in this effort. Given the need for financial restraint on the part of the Federal government, we do not have the luxury of initiating special programs to assist in such projects at this time.

SMc/9-29-75

## CHILD CARE

- Q. Why does HEW in its regulations require such a large number of adults for supervision of child care programs when many states have highly acceptable programs which do not mandate the presence of so many supervisors?
- A. The HEW regulations were developed after careful consultation and review. I know, however, that Secretary Mathews is concerned about this matter and has directed his staff to reappraise the regulations and to consider the possibility of revisions.

### Background

HEW Title XX regulations call for certain numbers of adult supervisors to be present at child care programs. The number of adults required decreases as the age of the children increases. The standards were developed after extensive consultation and are in accord with much expert opinion. The ratios required are, however, more severe than those found in many programs and have been subject to much criticism. The House Ways and Means Committee is presently considering a proposal to suspend the HEW day care standards for six months and during that period to have state law or the current practice prevail.

## RAILROAD ASSISTANCE

- Q. There appears to be considerable activity underway in Washington to assist the railroads in the Northeast quarter of the country. What are you doing to help out the railroad problem in the Midwest?
- A. With regard to passenger service, I have continually supported the AMTRAK operation. In May of this year, I signed the AMTRAK Improvement Act of 1975 increasing Federal assistance for and improving the management of vital rail passenger service throughout the country. With regard to freight service, I have submitted to the Congress the Railroad Revitalization Act which, if passed, would provide approximately two billion dollars of loan guarantees for improving railroad equipment and facilities. Midwestern railroads would be eligible to participate in this program.

SMC/9-29-75

## RURAL TRANSPORTATION

- Q. As you may know, Nebraska has within it substantial rural areas with dispersed population where the need for improved transportation is very real. What is your Administration doing to respond to this need?
- A. To begin with, I have submitted to the Congress legislation that would streamline Federal funding for highway projects that would return part of the Federal gasoline tax to the States for their use, and that would provide States with greater flexibility in selecting transportation projects for Federal funding. Secondly, the current Federal highway program and the national mass transportation assistance program (which I signed last November) provide financial assistance for demonstration projects aimed at improving rural transportation. In fact, Secretary of Transportation Coleman recently announced the award of such assistance grants to thirty-one States -- included was a grant to the City of Neligh, Nebraska.

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON LIBRARIES  
AND INFORMATION SERVICES

Q. On December 31, 1974 you signed into law S.J. Resolution 40 (P.L. 93-568) which authorizes the President to hold a White House Conference on Library and Information Services not later than 1978 with up to \$3.5 million funding. Why have you not called this conference since you introduced the House version of the White House Conference while a member of Congress?

A. The request for a White House Conference on Library and Information Services was carefully reviewed in light of the need for fiscal demands for Federal dollars. I decided that in line with my stated policy of requesting no new spending initiatives, that I would not request an appropriation for the White House Conference at this time. A review of the proposed White House Conference will, however, be made as a part of developing the 1977 budget proposals.

The National Commission on Library and Information Science , created in 1970, provides a good mechanism to identify and resolve library and information service problems. The NCLIS works closely with state and local agencies in this endeavor. Also, this fall there was held a Tuesday at the White House on the Federal Role in Libraries.



TITLE XX - NEBRASKA

- Q. People from Nebraska are concerned about the new Federal Title XX social services program which goes into effect this week (Oct. 1). Won't this mean a loss of funds and subsequent cutback in services?
- A. This new program does not require that Nebraska cut back its services to any particular group of beneficiaries. As you know, because funds for social services under Title XX are not open-ended, the State must decide where its allocation of money will be spent, for example, on day care or on programs for the aged.

Background

Title XX, the new Federal social services program, was added to the Social Security Act by a bill signed by you on January 4, 1975. The regulations go into effect on Wednesday, October 1. Under the regulations, the State must publicly publish its proposed program so that all the citizens and various groups can have "input" on what the social services program will cover. However, funds for these programs no longer are open-ended, so that the State now knows it has only a certain number of Federal dollars each year for this purpose. Nebraska has complied with all of the HEW regulations prior to making the difficult decisions on its social services program.

SCM/9-26-75

TITLE XX - MEANS TEST FOR THE ELDERLY

- Q. Under Title XX a means test for the elderly has been instituted. Is HEW going to revoke this?
- A. It is my understanding that HEW is temporarily suspending the means test for the elderly, that is, the status quo will not be changed for six months.

Background

When Title XX was adopted, it was agreed that the concept of automatic group eligibility would be eliminated and that a specific means test would be applied to each individual.

The elderly, in particular, have not liked this procedure, arguing that they are a unique class for which group eligibility would be appropriate. This would mean that if a group of the elderly could qualify for Title XX programs no individual in that group would have to demonstrate his particular eligibility. Many elderly consider the means testing to be degrading.

HEW is somewhat sympathetic to these concerns, but is worried that if group eligibility is reinstated for the elderly, other groups will seek similar treatment. This would return us to the pre-Title XX situation where aid can go to those not most in need.

## HEALTH PLANNING - NEBRASKA

- Q. The State of Nebraska had a problem with the Federal Department of Health, Education and Welfare over designation of a health service area. Isn't it a form of government interference when the Federal agency tells the State that it cannot set its own health service area boundaries?
- A. The Department of Health, Education and Welfare is charged with the responsibility, under the National Health Planning and Resources Development Act of 1974, to establish such health service boundaries. It is my understanding that these boundaries are negotiated extensively between the Governors of the states and HEW.

### Background

HEW is charged with responsibility of establishing boundaries for health service areas, in which all health resources and planning will be carried out. The law requires that attempts be made to make these boundaries conform to reasonable geographic lines and to incorporate certain sized populations. In the case of Nebraska, the Governor submitted a proposed area that was too small, in that it failed to cover the Federally-required 500,000 population minimum. After the Governor resubmitted the rejected plan, HEW imposed a four area network. The area designations were published in the Federal Register on September 2 and are final. People in Nebraska are now making a great effort to implement the plan.

## HOME MORTGAGE ASSISTANCE

### QUESTION

Increased interest rates and rising land values have contributed to the decline in new housing starts which have dropped approximately 50% in Omaha since 1973. What is the Government doing to assist in the housing recovery?

### ANSWER

The Administration sought and achieved passage of the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 (PL 94-50) which among other things authorizes an additional \$10 billion for the purchase of mortgages at below market interest rates. Currently the Congress has a \$5 billion appropriation under consideration for this section of the Act. To date over \$15.5 billion have been pumped into the economy to enable would be homeowners to purchase homes at below market interest rates.

### BACKGROUND

Under the Emergency Home Purchase Assistance Act of 1974, the State of Nebraska received an allocation of \$45,730,000. Of this, they have used \$42,005,700. This Act was the forerunner to the Emergency Housing Act of 1975 for authorization of the purchase of mortgages at below-market interest rates, and contained an authorization of \$7.75 billion.

Iowa was given commitments of \$55,710,000 and has used \$53,900,125.

## REVITALIZATION OF THE CENTRAL CITY

### QUESTION

Since 1970, over 60% of all new construction in the Omaha area has taken place on the City's western fringe while the central city area has shown a population decline of 20%. Is the government doing anything to assist in the rejuvenation of our central cities?

### ANSWER

This pattern exists in many of our nation's cities and under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, we are seeing a healthy interest shown by the Mayors and citizens to reverse this trend. In fact, the cities are demonstrating this by allocating significant percentages of their block grant funds to rehabilitation programs to bring the city housing up to code. Over 60 cities have shown an active interest in the Urban Homesteading Demonstration program provided for under this Act. Open space and improved streets are other concerns being addressed under this Act.

### BACKGROUND

The Community Development Block Grant for Omaha in FY 75 was \$1,390,000.

TRH  
9/29/75

B

## BREAKING UP MAJOR OIL COMPANIES

- Q. Recently Senators Abourezk, Hart, and Nelson introduced a bill that would break up the big oil companies, because they felt their monopoly power had contributed to the current energy crisis and high cost of petroleum. Do you support that bill? And if not, why not?
- A. I must admit the public reputation of the oil companies is poor. We live in a period of skepticism and it is understandable why many people should demand that all of our institutions justify their existence.

But we should not let our skepticism lead us into the trap of blaming all our troubles on the oil companies, or into believing that some simple and quick solution will solve all our problems.

We ought to look at the major reasons for our problems:

1. OPEC is setting the price for oil, and they are continually raising it.
2. We continue to import too much oil.
3. Until Congress acts on an energy program, there is nothing we can do about these increases, and about our continued dependence on foreign suppliers. That is why I hope that Congress will face up to the hard, tough decision needed to restore America's energy independence, reinvigorate America's economy and save American jobs before it is too late.

Then, if Congress should find that the oil companies are contributing to our problems, we should take whatever action is appropriate.

## REGULATORY REFORM

- Q. You have frequently stated your desire to reform the numerous governmental regulations affecting business and industry. What specifically do you have in mind?
- A. First, let me make it clear that I am not proposing that we eliminate all government regulation. Much of what the government does in this area is essential and beneficial.

What I am proposing is to scrape off the costly barnacles which are dragging down the operation of our economy. However well intentioned it is, much of the regulation now in effect is contradictory and expensive.

Let me give you just one example. In St. Louis recently, the owner of a retail shopping center was told by the Federal Drug Administration that he had to install smooth floors that could be easily cleaned. Then the Occupational Safety and Health Administration told him he had to install rough floors so that his employees would not slip. He made his decision not on the basis of what was right but on which agency did not impose criminal penalties. That type of contradictory regulation helps no one.

Regulation also raises prices by removing the incentives for competition and by adding to paperwork, and it unnecessarily influences business decisions that ought to be made on the basis of sound economics, not on the basis of what a government regulator in Washington says.

I have, therefore, submitted legislation to Congress to restructure regulations affecting the pricing, routing and operation of railroads. I'm currently considering similar legislation for the airline and motor carrier industries. This type of legislation would eliminate unnecessary barriers to route and pricing competition and would result in a more efficient, equitable priced and hopefully more financially sound transportation system.

And I am looking at other regulatory areas to see where they can be improved.



C

LOCATION OF THE PROPOSED SOLAR ENERGY RESEARCH  
INSTITUTE (SERI)

Question

On August 15th, in Vail, Colorado, you indicated that there was competition between Arizona, New Mexico and Florida for the location of a new Solar Energy Research Institute(SERI). Have you decided to locate the new Institute in one of those three states.

Answer

No decision has been made on either the specific nature or the location of the proposed Solar Energy Research Institute (SERI).

I understand from the Energy Research and Development Administration(ERDA) that groups in more than 20 states have indicated that they wish to compete for the proposed Institute.

ERDA, the agency with responsibility for the Institute and for our major solar energy R&D programs, is developing criteria that can be used in making decisions about the Institute. ERDA will be asking for proposals from various interested groups in the next month or two.

I'm confident that ERDA will give all proposals full and fair consideration.

PRICE-ANDERSON LEGISLATION

- Q. Why, if the Federal Government considers nuclear power a safe energy alternative, does it feel it necessary to have insurance on nuclear plants in the amount of \$560 million? And, if they are not that safe, should a liability limit of \$560 million be set--is it enough?
- A. In answer to the first question,--even though nuclear energy is a safe, economical form of power, estimates of probability of a nuclear accident will be the subject of much study for as long as we have nuclear reactors. Due to technological changes, scientific advances and a broad spectrum of other factors, the estimates of probabilities will inevitably change. They may go up; they may go down--but there will always be a finite possibility of an accident. Thus, the fact that reactors are judged to be safer now than was previously believed should not be confused with the issue of whether or not to provide financial protection to the public.

Secondly, the argument that the liability limitation of \$560 million should be increased seems based on a false assumption. The limit of liability value was never intended to be the maximum amount of money which might be paid out for damages resulting from a nuclear accident. It was a dollar value which would provide prompt compensation beyond which amount the Congress would become further involved, if necessary, in order to indemnify the public. Whether this is \$500 thousand, \$500 million or more, it is a Congressional prerogative which is not directly related to reactor safety studies, now or in the future.

Further resolution of the issues of reactor safety, including accident probability and damage estimates, while they are very important factors to the nuclear power program as a whole, should not be considered prerequisite to extension of the Price-Anderson concept; further studies of reactor safety will be on-going for many more years.

## SLOW DOWN ON NUCLEAR POWER

- Q. In view of the continuing problems of safety and reliability of nuclear power plants -- and the lack of answers on nuclear power plants -- and the lack of answers on nuclear waste management -- why does your Administration keep pushing the expansion of nuclear power?
- A. We must continue to expand commercial nuclear power because:
- . There is no way we can provide the electricity needed by our Nation in the years ahead without the responsible expansion of nuclear power.
  - . Electricity from nuclear power is a bargain compared to other sources--now costing between 25 and 50 percent less than electricity produced from fossil fuels.

Commercial nuclear power plants have an excellent safety record. We now have about 60 plants in operation, representing years of operating experience, without a single fatality due to a nuclear accident.

All applications for permits and licenses for constructing and operating nuclear power plants are evaluated carefully by the recently established, independent Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) -- which has as one of its primary responsibilities assuring safety and environmental protection.

We are spending about \$80 million this year on R&D to provide even greater assurances of nuclear plant safety and about \$40 million on the development of improved, environmentally sound waste management systems.

### Background

- . It's possible that nuclear power could be an issue in Omaha because of problems being experienced at the Cooper Nuclear Plant, operated by the Nebraska Public Power District near Omaha. The NRC has required reduction of power levels to 50% of operating capacity due to vibrations in the reactor core. Omaha papers last week carried stories that NPPD was suing GE, the reactor supplier, for \$150 million on grounds of faulty design. By contrast, the Fort Calhoun Plant near Omaha has been operating very successfully and planning has started for another plant at Fort Calhoun in the early 1980's.

Source: George Dworak  
Neb. State Energy Ofc.  
402-471-2971

NEBRASKA  
ENERGY BACKGROUND

Primary Issue: Natural Gas

- Nebraska confused by and opposed to the Administration's proposed emergency natural gas act. Anxious that their barely adequate supplies may be diverted to other states as a result of the legislation.
- The irrigation industry is the biggest consumer of natural gas during the summer (although the industry itself depends more on propane and diesel fuel). It is speculated that natural gas supplies to the irrigation industry might be curtailed by 1977, a situation which would affect 6 million acres of farmland. The State expects the FPC to change the industry's priority rank from #2 to #3.
- Food processing industry is the heaviest user of natural gas during the winter. It does not anticipate shortages unless an allocation system diverts their supplies.
- Neb. has two major pipelines and neither expects a severe winter in terms of natural gas supplies.
- Area utilities consider themselves forewarned and have been making coal contracts with companies in the Wyoming/Montana region.

Conservation

- Lighting & Thermal Operations Program--Nebraska state piloted its own mini-audit program this summer. Three college engineering students conducted the mini-audits, surveying commercial buildings and industrial establishments, making suggestions and preliminary reports. Anticipate resultant energy savings of 20-40 percent.
- State sponsoring an infrared scanning project where a low-flying plane scans residential and commercial areas to detect heat loss. 100 major towns have been involved in the project. People have been coming in to discover whether their own residences were included and the results.
- Nebraska and Kansas have devised a joint project in agricultural conservation. The 10-point proposal is in transit to FEA for approval. Cost estimated about \$250,000.
- Lighting & Thermal program for homeowners has been successful and will be continued if funds are provided.

## NEBRASKA (cont.)

### Utilities

- As mentioned before, utilities are making coal contracts on their own in anticipation of natural gas cutbacks.
- Utilities in Nebraska are publicly owned and operated. There is no state commission--a factor which the state thinks contributes to the system's efficient operation.
- No Nebraska utilities have been ordered to convert to coal.
- Nebraska ranks No.1 in its per capita usage of nuclear power.

### Research & Development

- University programs have concentrated on solar research and its potential agricultural uses.

### Energy Production

- |   | <u>Production 1973</u>   |
|---|--------------------------|
| - Natural gas (marketed)                            | 4,595 million cubic feet |
| - Petroleum (crude)                                 | 7,338 thousand barrels   |
| - Coal supplies are minimal                         |                          |
| - One small refinery, approx. 5,000 barrels per day |                          |

### Energy Consumption

- No figures available, but the following is the descending order of consumption of primary fuels (Btu equivalent)

Natural gas  
Motor gasoline  
Fuel oil  
Diesel fuel  
Coal-LPG  
Nuclear

- Sector distribution of consumption:

<u>Transp.</u>	<u>Residential</u>	<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>Commerc.</u>	<u>Industrial</u>
30%	20%	11%	15%	24%

D

BILATERAL UNDERSTANDINGS WITH ISRAEL --  
What Kinds of Agreements are These?

- Q: Do our private memos of understanding with Israel constitute a formal treaty requiring Congressional approval? Why has the US refused to formally sign the memo of understanding with Israel until Congress acts on the proposal for technicians?
- A: The various understandings related to the Middle East agreement have been provided to the pertinent committees and members of the Congress; there are no treaty relationships involved. We have requested Congressional approval of the proposal for the Early Warning System in view of the importance of any proposal involving commitment of US personnel.



## US ARMS FOR ISRAEL

Q: What are the facts on US arms for Israel? It is true that the US will try to give positive consideration to the sale of such sophisticated equipment as the F-16 and the PERSHING missile? How could you sell the PERSHING knowing that it is outfitted for a nuclear-warhead? Would you do so on the basis of Israeli assurances no nuclear warheads would be used?

A: We have committed to nothing more than to study Israel's requests for military equipment. Our policy is to help Israel meet its legitimate security needs, to develop our relations with the moderate Arab states and generally to promote peace in the Middle East. Any arms decisions will be made with these objectives in mind. While I am not going to get into a detailed discussion of our on-going military supply relationship with Israel or with any country, I would add that my views on the proliferation of nuclear weapons are clearly on record.

September 26, 1975

MIDDLE EAST-SOVIET ROLE

Q: If your policy is to help ease tensions between the US and USSR in areas of potential conflict and in areas where both the US and USSR have interests, don't you regard leaving the Soviets out of the negotiations for any interim Sinai agreement and also injecting US technicians -- excluding the Soviets -- as provocative to the Soviets?

A: We believe that any developments which reduce the prospects of war-- and therefore the prospects for superpower confrontation--in the Middle East are in the mutual interests of the United States and the Soviet Union.

The role we have played was requested by the two parties. We do not regard the most recent agreement between Egypt and Israel as either detrimental to Soviet interests or giving unilateral advantage to the US. We have always recognized that a Soviet role is important to a final settlement in the area. Both the Secretary and I have had full discussions on the Middle East with Soviet Foreign Minister Gromyko.

September 26, 1975

SITUATION IN LEBANON

Q: What is our policy toward the situation in Lebanon and has or will the US offer assistance to the Lebanese Government? Will Americans be evacuated? Do you fear possible Syrian military intervention and the risk of counter-involvement by the Israelis?

A: Our strong friendship with the people of Lebanon and our policy of support for Lebanon's territorial integrity and independence are well known. The tragic events now occurring in Lebanon elicit our deepest sympathy for the people and the Government of Lebanon. We are naturally following events there closely with respect to the safety of American citizens. Any judgment on evacuation would depend on the prevailing situation.

As far as military involvement by other states, we don't see this prospect now and I do not think it is fruitful to speculate on a hypothetical situation.

September 26, 1975

MIDDLE EAST -- WHO WILL THE TECHNICIANS BE?

- Q: What kind of people will be recruited as the US technicians? Are intelligence or military personnel likely to be selected? Will these Americans be sponsored privately or by the government and to whom will they report?
- A: We are presently studying all of these questions on an urgent basis. Naturally people will have to be found who meet the technical requirements for the job but I would expect they would be recruited from civilian life. The personnel will not be under the Defense Department, because they have no military function to perform. The personnel will report to both sides and to the UN as well as the United States Government.
- When the study now underway is completed we will have a clearer idea of how to proceed on these detailed aspects.

September 26, 1975

SADAT, RABIN VISITS

Q: When is President Sadat due in Washington? The Egyptians have talked about October 28. Can you confirm Sadat is definitely coming or will he cancel if the Congress does not act on the proposal for technicians and puts the whole Agreement in jeopardy? What about a Rabin visit?

A: I invited both President Sadat and Prime Minister Rabin to visit Washington when I talked to them by phone on September 1, following the initialling of the Sinai accord. When specific arrangements have been made we will announce them.

[FYI: As soon as all of the final details related to the Sadat visit beginning in Washington October 27 are firmed up, we will be making a formal White House announcement.]

September 26, 1975

HAWK MISSILES FOR JORDAN

Q: What is the status of the HAWK missile package for Jordan?  
Were you upset with the Jordanian outburst over the conditions attached to the sale and the attacks on your letter to the Congress?

A: The status is that the sale has been approved and will go forward as agreed. I am grateful that the issue is now resolved and that we may now proceed with the sale.

September 26, 1975

MIDDLE EAST AID REQUESTS

Q: What will this agreement cost the US in economic and military assistance? Reports are that it will run well over \$3 billion, including over \$2 billion of this for Israel? How can you expect the American taxpayer to want to finance this when the economic situation in the US is bad?

A: I will soon be submitting aid requests for Israel and some Arab states to Congress. Until I do it would be premature to discuss precise amounts.

Let me point out, however, that our aid for Israel will reflect our long-standing commitment to its security and survival. Our aid requests for certain Arab states will reflect our interest in their plans to concentrate on improving their economic situation and their efforts to promote peace and stability in the area. Thus, our Middle East aid package will reflect our interests in peace and moderation in the Middle East. I think most Americans will agree that the price is not too great to pay for tranquility in that troubled region, where the outbreak of war could have grave political and economic consequences for all of us.

September 26, 1975

CONGRESSIONAL NON-ACTION ON MIDDLE EAST  
ACCORD OVER DECLASSIFICATION

Q: What is your position on the total declassification of everything related to the Sinai accord? To break the logjam, will you agree to the total declassification of every document (including Presidential letters) related to the agreement? Are you concerned about Congressional delay in acting on approving the proposal for the technicians, thus holding up the Agreement?

A: I am seriously concerned about any further delay in approving the proposal for US technicians because this could jeopardize the already-concluded Egypt-Israel agreement. If we seek peace in the Middle East, I cannot see how delaying this accord is in our interest. Moreover, it raises questions as to the good faith and credibility of the United States in its efforts to help the parties make progress toward peace.

The Administration has made an unprecedented effort to inform the Congress of all aspects of the agreement and the appropriate Committees have all the relevant documents. We are working with the Committees to make as much as possible public within the requirements of confidentiality in dealing with other governments.



September 26, 1975

"MULTILATERAL MEETING" TO SOLVE MIDDLE EAST PROBLEM

Q: Since the Geneva Conference exists as the framework for an overall settlement in the Middle East, what is the significance of the Secretary's statement at the UN that the US would also look favorably on another approach--an "informal multilateral meeting" to assess prospects for peace? Who would attend such a meeting--the Soviets, other powers outside the Middle East, all of the Arabs, the Palestinian PLO?

A: The point the Secretary was making and that I have emphasized throughout is that the US remains open-minded toward any approach that might hold the promise of progress toward peace. The suggestion of such an informal meeting is only one of several options mentioned. The parties would have to be consulted and I therefore would not pre-judge the outcome of those discussions with regard to who might attend such an informal session.

Q: Could the PLO attend?

A: It is difficult to envisage a PLO role under the current circumstances in which the PLO refuses to accept the existence of Israel.

## SALT

Q: Can you describe the status of the SALT negotiations?  
Will there be a new SALT agreement by the end of this year?

A: As you know, General Secretary Brezhnev and I did spend some time discussing SALT at the CSCE summit in Helsinki. Foreign Minister Gromyko and I also discussed SALT during the Foreign Minister's recent visit to Washington. During those meetings we made some progress on several outstanding issues. I don't want to commit to a precise timetable for concluding negotiations on a new SALT agreement but progress toward an agreement is continuing to be made.

September 26, 1975

ISRAEL-SOVIET RELATIONS

Q: What is your view of the increasing evolution of USSR-Israeli ties, do you envisage early resumption of relations and what impact does improved ties between Moscow and Tel Aviv have on the Middle East negotiating situation?

A: This is a matter solely between the two countries involved.  
  
In general terms, however, any discussions which enhances prospects of progress toward peace in the Middle East are welcome.

Q: Have the Israelis kept the USG informed of their contacts with the Soviets or were you surprised by this development?

A: We were not surprised by the meeting and indeed we encourage any moves which might contribute to the prospects of peace in the Middle East.

September 26, 1975

PORTUGAL/ANGOLA

Q: There have been recent newspaper reports that CIA is involved in assistance to Portugal and certain liberation movements in Angola. Can you confirm these reports?

A: We have had a long standing practice neither to acknowledge nor to deny allegations about possible on-going CIA activities. I think that is a good practice. It is wholly without prejudice to the situation in any particular case and I see no reason to alter the practice in this case.

VIETNAM - SOUTH KOREAN U.N. MEMBERSHIP

- Q: Can you comment on the U.S. veto of the U.N. membership applications of the two Vietnams?
- A: We believe in the principle of universality in the United Nations, but not its selective application. When South Korea's application for membership was refused consideration, we responded by vetoing the applications of the two Vietnamese states. We would vote affirmatively on an application for membership that included South Korea as well as the two Vietnamese states.

## SEATO

Q: The recent SEATO Council of Ministers agreed to phase out the SEATO organization. What effect does this phase-out have on the security of Southeast Asia?

A: As the situation in Southeast Asia has been changing over the years, SEATO has also evolved. We understood and supported the desire of the Asian members to phase out the SEATO organization. This step does not alter our security commitments in the area.

Q: Is the Manila Pact still valid?

A: The Council of Ministers did not rule on the Manila Pact. The Pact therefore remains in force.

OK

SECRETARY KISSINGER'S UN SPEECH

Q: What has been the reaction of other nations to Secretary Kissinger's speech to the Seventh Special Session of the United Nations?

A: Secretary Kissinger's speech represents a major reformulation of US policy toward the developing world. It proposes practical steps for addressing many of the problems identified by developing nations and for ensuring a sharing of responsibility for maintaining a prosperous international economic order. It has been very favorably received both by the industrialized and by the developing nations. Many nations share our view that realistic discussions of pragmatic proposals such as the U.S. has made are needed far more than ideology and confrontation.

We are dedicated to the cooperation and prepared for the hard work which will be needed to implement our proposals. And we are, of course, prepared to examine constructive proposals from other countries.

U.K.  
September 10, 1975

ISRAEL AND THE UN

Q: What are your views on the question of any attempt to expel Israel from the UN? Will the US leave the UN if Israel should be suspended or expelled? Will we take any actions against those who try to suspend or expel Israel?

A: The United States Government has been very clear on this issue: We strongly object to exclusion of any member from the General Assembly or other UN bodies as a method of conducting diplomacy. Exclusion from the UN or any of its organs is, under the UN Charter, a decision to be made by the Security Council. The United States will resist any such effort at exclusion, but I will not speculate on what actions the US might take in any hypothetical situation where Israel or another UN member were excluded. Our main interest, hopefully shared by many other nations, is to prevent such a situation from arising.



## CHINA TRIP

Q: When do you expect to visit Peking?

A: No date has been set as yet; but there has been no change in my plans to visit the People's Republic of China this year.

Q: Do you plan to send Secretary Kissinger on an advance trip to China in the near future?

A: I expect the Secretary will be travelling to China but we're not in a position to announce details at this time.

OK

CHINA

Q: Doesn't Peking want you to break relations with Taiwan as a price for normalization?

A: I see no useful purpose served by speculation now about this and other questions that may come up in the future

I look forward to holding wide-ranging discussions with senior leaders in Peking later this year on a broad range of issues, but there are no preconditions for my trip to the PRC and no prior commitments about the outcome of my visit.

## U.S. PROPOSAL ON CONFERENCE ON KOREA

Q: Secretary Kissinger in his September 22 UNGA address proposed a meeting to discuss the easing of tensions on the Korean Peninsula. What do you have in mind?

A: We believe the parties directly concerned should first discuss measures to continue the Armistice Agreement and to reduce tensions. We are also willing to consider a broader international conference. Each side would be free to raise any issue it wishes.

Q: Are we prepared to meet with the North Koreans alone, as they proposed?

A: No. We will not accept the exclusion of the Republic of Korea in dealing with this problem.

## THE MAYAGUEZ

Q: Ieng Sary, the Cambodian representative at the UN, recently stated that the Cambodian Government did not order the capture of the Mayaguez. Further, Cambodian authorities ordered the release of the ship and crew, as soon as they learned the details of the incident. Your decision to use force to liberate the Mayaguez thus seems a hasty one. Perhaps we also could have avoided the deaths of our servicemen. Would you comment?

A: From the beginning of the Mayaguez crisis, we made every effort to communicate with the authorities in Phnom Penh -- through direct diplomatic correspondence, through third parties, and through the UN. By the afternoon of May 14, when our efforts failed to produce any response, I decided the safety of the crew required that we take definite steps to affect their release.

We carefully considered our actions throughout this crisis. We did not commit American troops until we tried all other avenues.

Several  
okay

MBFR PROGRESS

Q: In recent statements both you and Brezhnev have referred several times to the need for progress in the European force reduction negotiations in Vienna. Does the US intend to offer some of its tactical nuclear forces in Europe in an effort to break the stalemate as has been reported? Is there any reason to think this would move the talks forward? Could some reductions be made while the talks continue?

A: The issues being addressed in the MBFR talks go to the very heart of the structure of European security and affect the vital interests of some 19 participating countries. The negotiations are extremely complex and difficult, and we should not expect quick results.

However, we continually assess the state of play in the negotiations and we are prepared to take appropriate initiatives when that will help us to meet our objectives. In view of their expressed interest in MBFR progress we presume that the Soviet Union and its allies are also prepared to make progress on the common objective both sides should be working toward -- undiminished security for all but at a lower level of forces.

We remain optimistic that the talks will ultimately achieve a successful result. Until that time there will be no US troop withdrawals from Europe. US forces are in Europe for very good reasons and the level of those forces should be no lower given the levels of forces on the other side.

OK.

## US POLICY CONCERNING NUCLEAR FIRST-STRIKE

Q: Would you clarify US policy concerning nuclear weapons "first-strike" and "first-use" plans?

A: As I have indicated before, the policy of the Administration continues to be that the US will not develop a strategic capability or doctrine designed to deprive the Soviet Union of its basic retaliatory capability.

Recent strategic force improvements are intended to increase the flexibility of our forces to meet all possible contingencies. Because flexible options will increase the credibility of our deterrent, they will help to decrease the chance of conflict starting in the first place.

With regard to "first use," the US has never ruled out and cannot now preclude the use of nuclear weapons in certain circumstances, such as response to major non-nuclear aggression which could not be contained by conventional forces. However, US policy continues to be that the primary defense against conventional attack is the conventional capability of the United States and its allies.

PANAMA

Q: Secretary Kissinger recently said that the United States must maintain the right, unilaterally, to defend the Panama Canal for an indefinite period. Given the Panamanian reaction to this statement and the action of the House in insisting on its Amendment to deny funds to continue the negotiations, do you plan to continue the negotiations? What are the prospects of concluding a treaty this year for submission to the Congress?

A: Discussions with Panama relating to the Canal have been conducted during the last three Administrations. The goal of these negotiations is to reach an agreement which would accommodate the interests of both nations while protecting our basic interests in defense and operation of the Canal. We believe this should be possible, and we are now in the process of discussing with Panama the possibility of arriving at such an agreement. There are a number of difficult questions remaining to be resolved and the negotiations are continuing. At this stage it simply would not be useful or possible to predict when agreement on a treaty might be reached.

It is my hope that in considering any amendment to the State, Justice and Commerce appropriations bill the Congress will be mindful of the importance of maintaining our commitment to complete these negotiations so that any agreement can be considered on its merits. I have no intention of proposing to the Congress any agreement with Panama, or with anyone else, that would not protect our vital interests. Naturally, any treaty we reach will be submitted to the full constitutional process, including Senate approval, and we will be consulting closely with Congress as the discussions continue.

(If asked)

Q: But are we seeking agreement to enable the U.S. to defend the Canal for an indefinite period?

A: We are talking about an arrangement which would protect U.S. defense interests in the Canal for many decades and maintain our operating interest as well for several decades, but this subject is still under discussion with the Panamanians.



CUBA

Q: The U.S. has announced that it would lift the restrictions it placed against nations which trade with Cuba. Do you now expect to move toward normalization of relations with Cuba, or will the Cuban-hosted conference on Puerto-Rican independence affect this process?

A: Last July the OAS, by a two-thirds majority, passed a resolution freeing each government to determine in accordance with its own particular policies whether to maintain relations with Cuba. In order to be consistent with this, we decided to begin modifying those aspects of our Cuban denial policy which penalize other countries that trade with Cuba. The lifting of those restrictions, however, does not affect our bilateral policy and prohibition against bilateral trade with Cuba, which continues in force.

It has already been said on a number of occasions that we see no advantage in permanent antagonism between ourselves and Cuba but that change in our bilateral policies toward Cuba will depend on Cuban attitudes and policies towards us. There are a number of outstanding and complex issues between us, and I wouldn't want to speculate on when or whether it might prove possible to begin to work out these issues.

As to the meeting in Havana, I can only say that Americans in this country and in Puerto Rico feel just as strongly as others about interference in their internal affairs. The Puerto Ricans have expressed themselves strongly on their relationship with the United States in free elections. We consider the Cuban action an unfriendly act and an unwarranted interference in our domestic affairs.

September 26, 1975

TURKISH MILITARY ASSISTANCE

Q: Mr. President, on July 25, in retaliation for the continued cut-off of military assistance, the Turkish government significantly curtailed U.S. activities at joint bases in Turkey. What impact has this had on the security of the Eastern Mediterranean? Can this situation be reversed?

A: The Turkish government's actions altering the status of the joint defense installations has had a harmful effect on the security interests of both countries, as well as on NATO. The continuation of the ban on arms assistance is a serious impediment to our relations with Turkey, an old and faithful ally. There is no question that the continued embargo hinders progress on the fundamental questions in a Cyprus settlement. I am hopeful that the arms embargo can be lifted, so that our two nations can pursue once again our mutually beneficial relations and fundamental security interests. This in turn would increase our ability to work effectively with all the parties involved in achieving a just and equitable settlement of the Cyprus problem. It is in this context that I asked the House to reconsider its earlier decision on resumption of assistance to Turkey and I attach very great importance to a favorable vote by the House.

(FYI: Vote expected on October 1)

September 26, 1975

US-SPANISH BASES NEGOTIATIONS

Q: Mr. President, the 1970 US-Spanish Agreement of Friendship and Cooperation expired on September 26 without the parties reaching agreement on renewal. What are the prospects for a new agreement and must we now begin withdrawal of our forces based in Spain?

A: As you know, the United States has been holding consultations with Spain on this issue on a regular basis since the summer of 1974. The tenth round in the negotiations concluded on September 18. On September 22, Secretary of State Kissinger met with Spanish Foreign Minister Cortina in New York to discuss this matter further. They met again in Washington on September 26. I am hopeful that these discussions will lead to a successful conclusion. In the interim, while talks with the Spanish continue, I wouldn't wish to comment in any greater detail.

015

## DETENTE

Q: Mr. President, taking into account developments in Portugal, the Middle East and our sale of grain to the USSR, how do you see our relations with the Soviet Union developing? Are the Soviets getting more out of detente than we and does this foreshadow a cooling off period in our relations?

A: From the outset of my Administration, I have stressed my commitment to working for improved relations with the Soviet Union in the interests of world peace. The effort to achieve a more constructive relationship with the USSR expresses the continuing desire of the vast majority of the American people for easing international tensions and reducing the chances for war while at the same time safeguarding our vital interests and our security. Such an improved relationship is in our real national interest.

I have previously observed that during this process, we have had no illusions. We know that we are dealing with a nation that reflects different principles and is our competitor in many parts of the globe. In Helsinki, I cautioned that detente must be a two-way street.

The policy of relaxation of tensions is essential but it can be done only on the basis of reciprocity. Together our two countries must solve the problems of the nuclear arms race; together we must attempt to bring about restraint in areas of direct confrontation between our governments, such as in central Europe. And together we must defuse tensions in areas where we could become reluctant participants to a major conflict, as in the Middle East.

Through a combination of firmness and flexibility, the United States has in recent years laid the basis of a more reliable relationship based on mutual interest and mutual restraint.

Without giving up vital American interests, we will continue to pursue the policy of relaxation of tensions.

O.K

GRAIN SALES

Q: When will grain sales to the Soviets be resumed? Is the United States trying to work out a barter deal with the Soviet Union involving grain and oil?

A: At this moment, as you know, we are not undertaking any new contracts for the sale of grain to the Soviet Union. We will reassess this position again in October when additional information on world supplies and demand is available.

We are now in the process of exploring the possibility for a long-term grain purchase agreement with the Soviets, which would avoid the sudden fluctuations in Soviet demand for American grain exports. This would enable our farmers to plan with greater certainty. It would minimize shocks to our market and therefore minimize the impact of future Soviet purchases on our prices. We are also exploring in a very general fashion the prospects for purchases of Soviet oil.

## PORTUGAL

Q: Mr. President, what is your assessment of the situation in Portugal now that the Goncalves regime has been replaced by more moderate elements?

A: As you know, I have been following this matter very closely. I believe that recent events have been encouraging. The United States supports the emergence of a democratic, pluralistic government reflecting the will of the Portuguese people as expressed in the elections of last April. Together with the Western allies, we will continue to watch carefully the situation in Portugal in the context of our longstanding friendship and alliance with that country. However, we will continue to speak out -- as we have in the past -- against any attempts by an anti-democratic minority to subvert the efforts of the moderate majority to rebuild Portugal by democratic means.

September 10, 1975

PROTECTION OF COASTAL FISHERIES

Q: Mr. President, many foreign countries, including the Soviet Union, are overfishing in the waters off our coasts. This has depleted our valuable fish resources and caused economic damage to our coastal fishing industry. What action is the Administration taking to protect the livelihood of U.S. fishermen?

A: I appreciate your concern over foreign fishing off our coasts. Many in this country are urging us to act on this issue unilaterally. However, I continue to believe that a comprehensive law of the sea treaty offers the best hope for protecting our valuable marine resources, including fisheries. Work is going ahead in the U.N. negotiations -- work aimed at a treaty text in the interests of our coastal fishermen. To protect our coastal fishing industry while the treaty is being negotiated, the United States will continue to take initiatives to negotiate interim arrangements with other nations to conserve and protect our coastal fish stocks in appropriate fashion to ensure effective enforcement, and to safeguard the livelihood of our coastal fishermen. Unilateral legislation would be a last resort only in the event that our multilateral and bilateral efforts fail. I assure you that this question will continue to receive my very careful attention.

Recognizing the seriousness of this problem and the importance of our coastal fishing industry, we have concluded bilateral agreements with a number of fishing nations, including the Soviet Union, Japan and Poland and other countries, which deal with their catches off our coasts. We are also continuing our efforts in regional fisheries organizations to implement conservation and protection measures.



## US ARMS TO EGYPT

Q: What kind of secret understanding has been reached with respect to military assistance for Egypt that led you to say we have an "implied commitment" to help Egypt in this field? What is the nature of the commitment and will Congress be informed and asked to approve or disapprove it? What kind of arms do we plan to sell and won't Israel be upset?

A: First, all US understandings with respect to the recent negotiations have been put before Congress. Those undertakings do not include any specific commitment on an arms request for Egypt and no decisions have been taken. As I have previously indicated, any such request would have to be discussed and Congress would be involved before any arms were sold.

On the other hand, President Sadat has said publicly and has told members of Congress visiting in Egypt of his interest in diversifying his sources of arms supply to include the West and the US. In keeping with our commitment to continue the momentum for overall settlement in the Middle East, we will try to be as responsive as possible to legitimate requests from all the countries involved.

MIDDLE EAST--THE PALESTINIANS

Q: How does the US expect further progress towards an overall settlement when no attention is being given to the Palestinian problem? When are they going to be brought into the process? Aren't you afraid of Arab radical reaction, possible aided by the Soviets to jeopardize the peace process as long as the US continues to ignore the Palestinians?

A: Our policy remains that any final settlement must take into account the legitimate interests of the Palestinians. The issue of the Palestinian Liberation Organization role in the negotiations would seem academic as long as the PLO does not recognize Israel's right to exist.

## US TECHNICIANS -- ANOTHER VIETNAM?

Q: In a post-Vietnam period how can the Administration expect the American public and Congress to welcome a US presence in the volatile Middle East?

A: There are several very important factors to be kept in mind:

-- First, the US role would be a civilian one -- very limited numbers of technicians to help with the warning systems and only few in number -- no more than 200. They have no military role whatever. We are simply offering our technological expertise at the request of the parties.

-- Second, Congress is being asked to approve the provision of US technicians as requested by the two Parties.

-- Third, we have been invited by both Parties to provide these technicians. This is not a case of military advisors assisting one side against the other side.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

DOMESTIC - GENERAL

Supplies Book for  
Quaranta  
Oct 1, 1975

## FARM PRODUCTION

- Q. How can you expect farmers to produce record harvests, as your administration has urged, when you yielded to political and diplomatic pressures to restrict the export of such commodities as grain?

(This is a subject of interest to the Nebraska Farm Bureau Federation.)

- A. I will not accept the premise that we "Yielded to political and diplomatic pressure." I haven't forgotten my promise to the American farmer to help you sell your produce all over the world.

We have delayed grain sales to the Soviets temporarily in order to determine the size of our harvest and to try to work out a long-term agreement with the Soviets. That way we can work out a program that will be in the best interests of both the farmer and the consumer.

Let's look at the facts of where we are.

1. This year we will have the biggest grain crop in American history. Even after foreign sales we will have enough left over to meet all our present needs and to modestly add to our reserve.
2. This great production - a miracle of modern agriculture - is a result of this administration's policy of full production, which benefits both farmers and consumers. (The average American today spends a lower percentage of his income on food than he did in 1950. Moreover, he is not paying the hidden cost in higher taxes to support New Deal-type programs which encourage scarcity.)
3. Part of our program is also to encourage export sales. Sales abroad earn money for American farmers and for the country, strengthening the dollar and giving us the foreign exchange needed to buy raw materials and other necessities. This benefits all Americans.
4. The situation this year, however, has been unusual.

The Soviets came into the grain market with unexpectedly large orders. In order to reduce the destabilizing impact of wide fluctuations in Soviet import demands in recent years we are currently negotiating a long-term agreement which will provide our farmers with an assured Soviet export market.

5. Our overall goal is assured markets for all our products - farm and industrial. If we reach it, we will be a long way on the road to the prosperity we all desire.

## REVENUE SHARING

- Q. Although the concept that revenue sharing allows local citizens more control over how federally collected money is spent seems sound, in practice it seems to mean that minority and disadvantaged groups, which need help the most, are slighted. Do you see any way the concept of revenue sharing can be preserved, while at the same time helping the poor and disadvantaged?

(This is a matter of concern to the Urban League of Nebraska.)

- A. I am deeply concerned about the plight of minority and disadvantaged groups. And I believe the non-discrimination provisions of revenue sharing insure that no one will be kept out of programs because of race, sex, religion, or age.

Let me explain why I believe revenue sharing is the best way to solve many national problems. The United States is a large country. It is made up of greatly varying regions. No two areas are exactly alike.

I do not believe that any one solution is right for all those regions. But if every community, benefitting from the availability of additional money, is able to tackle its problems in its own way, creating and adjusting programs to meet its own specific local problems, we may begin to eliminate some of the ills that now plague us.

There are other benefits. If local communities take on this responsibility, we will begin to restore that sense of local initiative and self-confidence that helped build the United States. And as people realize that the solution to their problems lies not in Washington but right in their own city halls or state legislatures, we will begin to strengthen the two-party system at the grass roots. If a program isn't working, people don't need to go all the way to Washington to correct it.

I am confident that within a few years, we all will recognize that many exciting and innovative solutions have emerged from communities all over the United States because of revenue sharing.

## EXPLAINING AMERICAN ECONOMIC SYSTEM

- Q. The Iowa Manufactures' Association is concerned that many people do not understand how the American Economic System operates. Do you have any suggestions as to how this ignorance can be overcome?

(This question is a concern, also of the Nebraska Association of Commerce and Industry.)

- A. There is no reason why a system which benefits so many people, and has produced both the highest standard of living in the world and the greatest sense of personal freedom should be so misunderstood. The system's occasional excesses and defects are far outweighed by its good points.

But I agree that more people should be aware of how the American economic system operates.

The best place to start is in the schools, and there are several groups which are working with great success to teach this practical form of economics.

One is the Junior Achievement Program, under which students set up small businesses and learn how a business operates, creates jobs, markets its products and succeeds or fails.

Another is the Joint Council on Economic Education, which helps schools to set up courses in which economics is taught from kindergarten to college.

There are others, too.

Business can play an important role in bringing these programs to their own communities and also to explain better how business operates. And every citizen should take it upon himself to learn all he can, for the American economic system, like democracy, requires us all to participate intelligently if it is to work.



## CAPITAL PUNISHMENT

Q. The recent execution of Basque terrorists by the Spanish Government has raised the issue of whether you support capital punishment. Do you?

Background: At the daily press briefing 9/29/75, Ron Nessen said he would not comment on your position because the issue was before the Supreme Court. He said he would have to check to determine your position before you became President.

A. As you may know, the Supreme Court in 1972 struck down a series of capital punishment sentencing provisions which were imposed by judges or juries without adequate standards for imposition (Furman v. Georgia). However, the Court did not rule that the death penalty is per se unconstitutional. The Department of Justice has since proposed legislation to provide objective standards for capital punishment, imposable only upon conviction of treason, espionage, sabotage and murder, in instances where there are no mitigating circumstances (e.g. immaturity, duress, etc.) found to be present. Subject to further review of the issue by the Supreme Court, I support this limited approach.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

SPECIAL FOR OMAHA

GRAIN FUTURES DESTINATION POINT

- Q. Do you support the bid of the Council Bluffs Chamber of Commerce to be designated, by the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, as a grain futures destination point? (A subject of interest to the Chamber of Commerce.)
- A. I'm afraid I can't get into that, as this is an independent commission.

PL/9-30-75

## VOCATIONAL EDUCATION - AGRICULTURE

Q. Future Farmers of America are concerned over the seeming lack of interest in identifying agriculture in vocational education programs. Can you tell us why the U.S. Office of Education is trying to disclaim the Vocational Youth Organization Policy Memo issued in September 1974? And also whether you support inclusion of vocational education programs in agriculture in pending Congressional legislation?

A. The Office of Education strongly supports the Policy Memo which states it is Office of Education policy to see support provided at the state and local level not only to the Future Farmers of America but to five other major youth organizations concerned with aspects of vocational education.

The Administration supports vocational education in agriculture. More agriculture education is taking place today than ever before and there is greater enrollment in agriculture education and youth organizations than ever before.

### Background

The Policy Memo issued a year ago marked a change in the traditional Office of Education position, a change welcomed by the youth organizations. The policy says the six identified youth organizations shall be supported with federal funds routed through state and local organizations. The organizations are: Future Farmers of America; Future Homemakers of America; Office Education Association; Future Business Leaders of America; Distributive Education Clubs of America; and Vocational Industrial Clubs of America.

The question may relate to the views of some members of the National Advisory Council for Vocational Education who would like to place even greater emphasis on agriculture education.

## PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION

Q. What are you doing to encourage the development of increased and improved public transportation?

A. To begin with, I have stated several times my dedication to the revival of efficient public transportation in this country, and my belief that there is a legitimate and major role to be played by the Federal government to achieve this goal. More specifically, last November I signed into law the National Mass Transportation Assistance Act of 1974. This legislation, which I personally worked hard to develop, will provide 11.8 billion dollars in assistance to public transportation over a six-year period. Financial assistance will be available for the planning, acquisition, development and operation of transit systems, and for the development and testing of new concepts in public transportation.

In addition, I have submitted to the Congress legislation that would permit greater flexibility in the use of Federal highway assistance including the transfer of funds to mass transportation projects.

While these programs provide a Federal source of assistance, it is clear from experience to-date, that local financial and political support is essential if public transportation is to become a viable alternative to the automobile in urban and non-urban areas.

### DAIRY PRICES

- A. Dairy farmers are very upset about the dairy support price not being higher. Some groups are saying that the nation will run short of milk unless the government increases price supports. What's your position?
- A. A few months ago, when the price supports were set, the Agriculture Department felt then that the supports were generally adequate. At the present time the Department is making an extra review --- a mid-year review --- to see if supports should be raised at this time.

PCL/9-29-75

- Q. Did the Committee reject the compromise offer you made concerning the delivery of classified documents? Don't they have a right to see anything they want?
- A. I had a very constructive meeting last Friday with Speaker Albert, Minority Leader Rhodes, and also the Chairman of the Select Committee, Representative Pike, and the ranking Minority member, Representative McClory.

At that meeting, I proposed an arrangement designed to make available to the Committee information relevant to its work while guarding against the improper disclosure of sensitive intelligence.

It is my understanding that the Committee has not specifically voted on the compromise. Their recent action involved other issues -- not just the question of access to classified documents.

I believe that when the Committee fully considers the procedure I suggested at that meeting, they will agree that this will enable them to receive all the information they need for their inquiry and, at the same time, safeguard national security and diplomatic secrets.

Under that procedure, nearly all the information that the House Select Committee desires will be provided, subject only to the condition that if there is a disagreement between the Committee and the Executive agency concerned about whether certain materials should be published, the matter will be referred to the President.

Q. Why have you refused to turn over classified information to the House Committee that's investigating the CIA? Isn't this, in essence, another cover-up?

A. No. The Administration has gone out of its way to assure that no material is withheld to mask failure of intelligence or possible wrongdoing. Indeed, the CIA has provided post-mortems which make clear the failure of the intelligence community concerning the Mideast war as well as other shortcomings in other crises.

There has been only one difference between the House Select Committee and the Executive branch. This concerned the publication of highly classified and sensitive national security materials and diplomatic communications. I have made it clear that so long as the House Committee follows procedures which will safeguard from public disclosure material which, if disclosed, would prejudice our national security, the Committee should be able to see these documents.

I have a Constitutional obligation to protect the national security of the country but, at the same time, I want to fully cooperate with legitimate activities of the Congressional Committees. I have no problem making this information available to Congress, and, as a matter of fact, if there were some way of putting a wall around the 214 million Americans, I would be delighted to make it available to them. The problem, of course, is that once this information is made public, it can be of enormous importance to actual and potential enemies of the United States.

I have instructed all Executive department agencies not to use national security classification to cover up mistakes or wrongdoing. We have already delivered a massive amount of material to both the Church and Pike Committees and are delivering additional classified materials subject to this compromise condition concerning publication.

9/30/75  
(M.D.)



Q. There have been some obvious abuses by the intelligence community. What do you plan to do to correct these?

A. I now have under consideration the recommendations of the so-called Rockefeller and Murphy Commissions, which have looked into the activities of the intelligence community.

I will soon be making final decisions concerning their recommendations, which will be designed to make our intelligence agencies more responsive to the defense and foreign policy needs of government and, at the same time, fully protect the Constitutional rights of all American citizens .

In addition, I will take such other Executive action and recommend additional legislation, as necessary, to ensure that there is a proper balance between national security and individual interests.

9/30/75  
(M. D.)

Q. Why won't Secretary Kissinger let State Department employees testify in response to the intelligence investigation by Congress?

A. Secretary Kissinger and all agency and departmental heads within the Executive branch have been instructed by me to cooperate fully with the Church and Pike Committees.

The State Department and all other Executive agencies already have provided a great deal of classified information and other information to the Committees. At issue is how best to make available the necessary information from those most competent to supply it.

I am certain that accommodations between the State Department and the Committee can be worked out so that they will have access to all the witnesses they need and yet, at the same time, protect the integrity of the decision-making process of the State Department.

9/30/75  
(M.D.)