

[Reprinted From Yesterday's Late Edition]

Transcript of the President's News

Following is a transcript of President Nixon's news conference in Los Angeles last night, as recorded by The New York Times:

OPENING STATEMENT

Ladies and gentlemen, we've had a slight delay because the audio in the room—I hope that all of you will ask your questions quite loudly.

I understand, however, that our television audience has no problem because a shotgun mike will pick them up. For the benefit of your colleagues, ask your questions a little more loudly.

This press conference is one that is being held for the first time, while I have been the President, outside of Washington. And we want to welcome all the members of the California press who are here. We'll follow the usual format of the White House press conference with the first two questions going to the wire services. Then we'll try to cover as many others as we can.

QUESTIONS

1. Response by Israel

Q. Mr. President, could you give us an update on the very fast-moving developments in the Middle East—particularly, have we heard from Israel in response to your peace initiatives?

A. We have not yet heard from Israel on our peace initiative. As you know, we have heard from the Jordanians and the U.A.R., and the Israelis have been considering the matter in cabinet sessions. We are hopeful that Israel will join the U.A.R. and Jordan on the peace initiative.

Some concern has been expressed by Israeli government officials that if they agree to a cease-fire that they run the risk of having a military build-up occur during the cease-fire. We, and others, have attempted to assure them that that would not be the case.

If there's a ceasefire, a natural proposition connected with that—and condition with that—is that there will be a military stand-still during that period. As far as Israel's position is concerned, I indicated on July 1 in a television broadcast with network commentators from Los Angeles the position of this Government insofar as Israel's security is concerned and our commitment to maintaining the balance of power in the Mideast.

Seventy-one Senators have endorsed that proposition in a letter to me, which I received today. In view of that position, which was stated then, and which I will not go into now, I believe that Israel can agree to the cease-fire and can agree to negotiations without fear that by entering negotiations her position may be compromised or jeopardized in that period.

YORK TIMES, SATURDAY, AUGUST 1, 1970

[Reprinted From Yesterday's Late Edition]

Conference on Foreign

[Reprinted From Yesterday's Late Edition]

and Domestic Matters

2. Wholesale Price Index

Q. Mr. President, the Wholesale Price Index registered in July its greatest gain in six months. Can you tell us when you expect prices to go down?

A. What I am more interested in is, of course, not just what happens in one month but what happens over the six-month period. And what we are encouraged by is the fact that the trend in the six-month period for wholesale prices was downward: the rise of the rate of increase is downward rather than up upward.

This three-tenth of a percent increase to which you refer has to be balanced against a zero increase in the month of May. The zero increase in the month of May does not mean the rise in wholesale prices could stop, just as this does not mean that a rise in wholesale prices will escalate.

We believe, based on not only wholesale prices but other economic indicators, that the inflation is being cooled, that it will continue to be cooled if we can continue to have responsibility in the conduct of our budget problems in Washington, D. C., and that we are on the way, so far as the other side of the coin is concerned, with an economy moving upward in the last-half of 1970.

3. Paris Negotiations

Q. Mr. President, when Mr. —Ambassador Bruce takes over on Saturday in Paris, do you feel that conditions

for a negotiated peace have improved or worsened since the invasion of Cambodia?

A. I believe that the prospects for a negotiated peace should be better now than they were before the Cambodian operation. I do not say this because of any intelligence with regard to enemy attitudes, but I say it because, as a result of our Cambodian operation, the enemy position is weaker than it was before we went into Cambodia.

Their timetable has been set back. Time is no longer on their side.

Now, whether they will be convinced by this that their best interests would be served by negotiations rather than by attempting to win a military victory on the battlefield remains to be seen.

But we have sent a senior negotiator, Mr. Bruce, to Paris with wide latitude in negotiation, and we hope that they will reciprocate by negotiating in good faith and try to bring the war to an early conclusion, as it could be by negotiation, rather than letting it be drawn to a conclusion through the longer path of Vietnamization, which we're prepared to do also.

4. Thieu's Positions

Q. Does President Thieu of South Vietnam hold any positions that would take away some of Ambassador Bruce's flexibility? A. No, he does not. President Thieu's position with regard to negotiation is on all fours with ours. We have consulted with him and he with us before any negotiating positions have been presented, and also you will note that Ambassador Bruce went to South Vietnam and met with President Thieu and with Ambassador Bunker to be sure that there was no disagreement on our negotiating position.

5. Mitchell on Integration

Q. Mr. President, do you concur with Attorney General Mitchell's recent prediction that by the fall school term most of the schools in the South will be desegregated, and also do you have an approximation of how many Federal representatives would have to be sent to achieve such a goal?

A. Well the Attorney General has primary responsibility in this field. And I think a prediction made by him must be given great weight. Whether that prediction turns out, of course, depends in great part on whether there is cooperation in the key Southern districts where the desegregation program is still behind schedule.

Now as far as the number of Federal officials that should be sent to the South, let me emphasize that that will be based on whether those Southern districts or states that have this problem of desegregation ask for help, either Justice Department or H.E.W. experts.

We are not going to have force—a force policy in this area. We're going—our policy is one of cooperation, rather than coercion. And we believe that is the best way to handle this very difficult problem in the Southern states.

6. The Arms Race

Q. Mr. President, last Sunday the Russian naval commander engaged in a bit of saber rattling directed at us, and I recall that Adm. Hyman Rickover and Gen. Thomas Power of S.A.C. in the last year have warned that we're falling behind in the armaments race, and they warned of nuclear blackmail if the Russians get ahead. Now, with that in mind, do you think we can afford to disarm at this point? Or what is your feeling in that regard?

A. We have certainly no intention of disarming. What we are talking about in the SALT negotiations is not disarmament but a limitation of arms—where we limit what we do and they limit what they do.

And the very thing that you refer to makes it very important for us to pursue in those negotiations, because the Soviet Union since 1967 for example, when we stopped any deployment of land-based missiles, since that time has deployed 724 I.C.B.M.'s—either SS-9's or SS-13's.

Also, since that time, when



Mr. Nixon during news conference Thursday at the Century Plaza Hotel in Los Angeles

Associated Press

we launched our last nuclear submarine with missile-carrying capabilities, the Soviet Union has deployed 13 more. And by 1975 they will—assuming they continue their present building pace—they will catch up with us in nuclear submarines.

Now we can either continue this race in which they continue their offensive missiles and we go forward with our defensive missiles, or we can reach an agreement. That is why, at this point, we have hopes of attempting to find, either on a comprehensive basis and, lacking a comprehensive basis, a selective basis, the first steps toward which the superpowers will limit the development of and particularly the deployment of more instruments of destruction when both have enough to destroy each other many times over.

7. Coalition Government

Q. Mr. President, you said that we're in accord with President Thieu on peace initiatives. Does that mean that we agree with him that no candidate who would support a coalition government and no Communist would run in elections that would try to settle the war?

A. Miss Thomas, the position of President Thieu there with regard to a Communist not being on the ballot is purely a matter of semantics. Under the South Vietnamese Constitution, a Communist cannot run for office. On the other hand, President Thieu has specifically agreed that those who are members of the N. L. F., who of course represent the Communists in South Vietnam, could run as members of the N. L. F. on the ballot.

Now as far as President Thieu's attitude on coalition government is concerned, it is the same as ours. A coalition government should not be imposed upon the people of South Vietnam without their consent. If the people of South Vietnam by election elect people who then choose to form a coalition government, that is a matter of course that we will accept.

8. Military Preparedness

Q. To pursue the question of our military preparedness a bit further, twice within the past week statements have been made by high-ranking naval officers—Admiral Rickover and Admiral U. S. Grant Sharp—to the effect that our military preparedness is suspect. And they went further. Each gentleman said that in his opinion it is doubtful we could win a war with the Soviet Union. Given the eminence of these gentlemen, as Commander-in-Chief, how do you regard the validity of those statements?

A. I would first react by saying that if there is a war between the Soviet Union and the United States, there will be no winners. There will be only losers. The Soviet Union knows this, and we know that.

That is the reason why it is vitally important that in areas like the Mideast that we attempt to avoid to the greatest extent possible being dragged into a confrontation by smaller powers, even though our interests in the area are very, very great.

And that is why it is very

much in our interest in the SALT talks to work out an arrangement, if we can, one which will provide for the interests of both and yet not be in derogation of the necessity of our having sufficiency, and their having sufficiency.

One other point I would make briefly is this: what the Soviet Union needs in terms of military preparedness is different from what we need. They're a land power, primarily, with a great potential enemy on the east. We're primarily, of course, a sea power and our needs, therefore, are different.

But what is important now is to find a way to stop this escalation of arms on both sides. That is why we have hopes in the SALT talks, which, I emphasize again, do not involve disarmament for the United States or the Soviet Union, but do involve a limitation, and then, eventually, a mutual reduction.

9. Smog in New York

Q. Mr. President, do you have any magical powers that you may invoke to help the people on the East Coast breathe a little easier, or do you consider that Mayor Lindsay's problem?

A. I think Mayor Lindsay has enough problems without wishing that one on him. The problem on the East Coast, of course, reminds all of us who are Southern Californians that with all the kidding we've been taking about our smog, that it isn't limited to us.

And I also would remind the people on the East Coast and in California that it isn't limited to the United States.

It's a problem in Tokyo, it's a problem in Rome, it's a problem in all of the great industrial areas of the world now.

There isn't any short-range answer. We can't get the kind of automobile engine which will be pollution-free in a year, or two years, or three years.

But there are certain things that can be done now.

The Congress can pass the legislation which I submitted six months ago in the environmental message, which will provide for some action in this area.

And, second, that we are going to pursue the problem of seeing that the automobile industries follow very strict standards that we've laid down with regard to automobile emissions.

Third, of course, we're going to do everything we can with regard to Federal facilities to see that they adopt pollution-free policies, and we, of course, are urging all kinds of industrial activities to use the kind of fuels that would reduce the problem.

I would only say this, that it was perhaps fortunate, in a way, that the East Coast saw this problem in such a massive manner. Now we realize that we don't have much time left and it's time for the Congress to get the environmental message and all of the recommendations that I had made in February—a very strong message and very strong measures—to get them on the front burner and act on them now, because this is an area where we cannot wait.

10. Anti-Inflation Policy

Q. Mr. President, in regard to your anti-inflation policy

and unemployment, especially among blacks, some statistics last June: The unemployment rate was 4.7 and among blacks it was 8.7. Locally here in the Los Angeles area there are no specifics since no agency will speak out, but the limited concentrated survey by the Federal Bureau of Labor Statistics last year in South-Central and East Los Angeles brought it at 16.2 for blacks. Representative Augustus Hawkins has viewed the area and said that conditions there are worse than in 1965 prior to the Watts riots and that a rebellion was possible but it would be economic and not racial. My question now: Paul McCracken, chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers, about two weeks ago said the economy was bottoming out and there was an upturn coming but that unemployment will continue due to anti-inflationary policy. The question is will you continue your present anti-inflationary policy despite such warnings of rising employment rebellion?

A. Our present anti-inflationary policies, of course, have resulted in some cooling of the inflationary forces and, of course, one of the costs is that the economy slows down.

There is another reason, however, for the slowdown in the economy which particularly affects this area, and that is the transition from a wartime to a peacetime economy. As a result of our bringing down the war in Vietnam, the activities there, and also of our change of priorities, where for the first time in 20 years that we are spending more for domestic purposes—41 per cent of our national budget—than for military purposes, which are now 37 per cent of our budget. As a result of that, 800,000 people over the past year have left either defense plants or the armed services and, of course, have added to the unemployment problem.

That, however, we believe is a price worth paying because we believe that we should work toward prosperity without war, and we believe that we can have it. Now there is a difficult transition. The problem that you mention of blacks; the problem of all unemployed does concern us. That's one of the reasons why we've urged the Congress to act more swiftly on our extension of unemployment insurance and the other measures which will cushion this transition period.

Long-term, however, this economy is going to move up and the unemployment slack will be taken up.

11. Unrest on Campus

Q. Mr. President, what is your reaction to the Heard report's contention that you have not been paying enough attention to the problems of minority students?

A. Dr. Heard made a number of recommendations, of course, and also gave some conclusions in his report, and I have read them and of course will consider them. The problem of communicating with students and other groups is a perennial one. It existed in previous Administrations; it exists in this one.

However, I would say that in order to maintain balance, we have to recognize that for university presidents and

professors and other leaders to put the blame for the problems of the universities on the Government primarily I think is very short-sighted.

We are ending the war. We will bring it to an end.

We will bring the draft to an end and have a volunteer armed service.

We're going to deal with the problems of the environment. We're going to clean up the air and the water. All of these things can be done and will be done by Government.

Mr. Douglas Halleck, who is the editorial chairman of The Yale Daily News, had a piece in one of the papers yesterday in which he said that the problem of conduct on the campus could not be brushed aside and simply blamed on what the Government was or was not doing; that faculty administrators and faculty presidents, and faculty members; had also to assume some responsibility.

We're reforming Government to make it more responsive to the people, more power to the people rather than more power in Washington, D. C.

But once all those things are done, still the emptiness and the shallowness, the superficiality that many college students find in college curricula will still be there.

But still when that is done, the problem that we have of dissent on campus not remaining a peaceful challenge which is perfectly appropriate and defensible but dissent becoming sometimes violent, sometimes illegal, sometimes shouting obscenities when visiting speakers come to campus—this is a problem that is not a problem for Government. We cannot solve it.

It is a problem which college administrators and college faculties must face up to. We share our part of the blame. I assume that responsibility. We'll try to do better.

But they have to do better also. I would urge in that respect, incidentally, that a very interesting commentary on this was by a young man who will probably be sitting in one of your chairs in a few years ahead.

I think it's necessary to keep balance. Yes, sir.

12. Prisoners in Vietnam

Q. Mr. President, the hostilities, open hostilities, in Korea ended 17 years ago this week and a week ago Senator George Murphy said that he believed there are still American prisoners of war held from that conflict. Lt. Everet Alvarez will have been a prisoner six years next Wednesday. Did Ambassador Bruce get any special briefing about the hundreds of men held in North Vietnam?

A. The problem of those who are held prisoner in North Vietnam is one of enormous concern to us. It was discussed, not only when Ambassador Bruce was in Vietnam, but, also, when he met with us in Washington; with Secretary Rogers and Dr. Kissinger and others, and got his new instructions.

I can assure you that it will be very high on his agenda when he goes to Paris. I cannot promise, and I would not want to hold out any false hope to those who are the dependents and those who are the wives and children of those who are prisoners. But we are going, we certainly are going to keep this very much high on the agenda and work toward a solution of it at any peace settlement if we can get one.

13. Fears of Repression

Q. Mr. President, your special commission on campus unrest that Mr. Kaplow referred to earlier also spoke about the reality of fears of repression among students, but especially among minority groups. Now taking into consideration your signing into law this week a new law which allows under some circumstances entrance into homes without knocking and so-called preventive detention, considering some of the things your Vice President has said and considering some of the things that allegedly happened to Black Panthers, what argument can you give to those specifically nonminority groups that they shouldn't fear Government repression?

A. Well, they shouldn't fear Government repression because we intend no repression, we do not believe in repression. It is not a Government policy.

You mentioned for example the D.C. crime bill. The people that are really repressed in Washington are the black citizens of Washington, D.C., who suffer from the highest crime rate year after year, usually of any city in America or in the world. And those citizens need some protection, and the provisions of that crime bill it's true were unprecedented, but we were dealing with an unprecedented matter.

And I want to take the necessary strong methods — and I agree that they are strong — to deal with those who are the criminal elements so that the hundreds of thousands of people who are not violating the law can have freedom from fear.

As far as repression generally is concerned, I, of course, do not accept the proposition that the Vice President represses people. It seems to me that people are very free in speaking up about the Vice President. Many of them do to me.

14. The Press

Q. Mr. President, do you see any improvement in the objectivity and fairness of the nation's press in light of the statements by the Vice President about the press?

A. Well, my reaction is that I recall once having comments about the press in California when I was here, and that didn't seem to get me very far. All I can say now is: I just wish I had as good a press as my wife has, and I'd be satisfied.

15. Mexican-Americans

Q. Mr. President, a few days ago some organization—Mexican-American organizations—called on you for 55,000 jobs in the Federal Government. Have you anything to comment on that?

A. Yes. We have provided more opportunities for Mexican-Americans than any Administration in history. It is of high priority for this Administration. As you know, Mr. Castigal from Los Angeles, is working with us in the White House on this proposition.

And, second, we would welcome Mexican-Americans who are qualified, who are interested in Government positions—we could welcome them in Government positions. We're looking for them, we're just trying to see that they are qualified and we hope they will have the qualifications.

16. Bills and Veto

Q. Mr. President, in your efforts to get Congress to hold down on spending, will you veto the education appropriation bill?

A. Well I will be faced next week, I understand, with perhaps two or three hard decisions—the education bill and the H.U.D. bill, which was \$600-million over my recommendation. The two total a billion dollars over the recommendations that I have made.

I'm not going to announce now the decision that I will make, because I want to consult with the Congressional leaders once again before making the decision and announcing it. But I will say this: that it is necessary for the President to represent all the people and to stand up against those very well intentioned Congressmen and Senators who vote for this appropriation or that one—appropriations and spending that would benefit some of the people, but that would cost all the people in higher taxes and higher prices.

I have to represent all of the people; and that is why I'm going to make some hard decisions vetoing some popular measures—if I believe that those measures would result in increasing prices or require an increase in taxes.

And on that last point: we can avoid an increase in taxes. And we can avoid a noninflationary budget in 1972. But only if we get the cooperation of the Congress in these next two to three months. This is the critical time.

If the Congress does not cooperate in holding down

spending, it will be necessary, then, to look hard about where we're going to find the money, and that means more taxes. But if the Congress cooperates, we can avoid it.

17. Indochina Policy

Q. Mr. President, how do you reconcile the position of the United States that we're not bent on a military victory in Indochina? Would the statement that was made yesterday by President Nguyen Van Thieu that he is looking for a military victory within the next three years, and also, he says that he is against a coalition government in Vietnam, whether that is imposed or negotiated. In other words, to what extent are we the independent authors of American foreign policy and to what extent are we subservient to President Thieu?

A. We are opposed to a coalition government, negotiated or imposed. We are for a government which is consented to by the people of South Vietnam, and if that government happens to be one that has Communists in it, and it is their choice, we do not have an objection, and neither does President Thieu, as I understand it.

Now as far as President Thieu is concerned, when he speaks of victory for the Government of South—for his Government and the people of South Vietnam—he is referring of course to what will happen in Vietnam over the long haul, assuming there is not a negotiated settlement.

As far as we are concerned, we have a program of Vietnamization. We are withdrawing our forces just as soon as the South Vietnamese are able to defend the country without our assistance, we will be gone.

But then, if at that time, the South Vietnamese still have not worked out a negotiated settlement with their enemy, then it is certainly up to the South Vietnamese to determine whether they are going to negotiate with the enemy or seek a victory. That would be President Thieu's decision.

18. Government and People

Q. Mr. President, this press conference in Los Angeles is sort of a climax to the series of activities that you have described as bringing the Government to the people — such as your recent meetings in Louisville, Fargo, Salt Lake City, and your work at the Western White House in San Clemente. What benefits do you see to you and to the country from such activity?

A. Well I hope there is benefit to the country, I believe there is benefit in bringing the White House to San Clemente, or Fargo, or to Louisville. I note, for example, some comments to the effect that I leave the White House too often.

I think that all of my predecessors would agree with this statement — a President never leaves the White House. The White House always goes with him wherever he is. It must go with him; and it is with him wherever he is. And I think it's very important for the people of California, for example, to know the White House, to participate, for example, like this in a Presidential press conference.

I think it also—the other side of the coin—is vitally important to those of us in Government. Everyone of the members of the Cabinet who have participated in one of these regional meetings come away making this very significant statement. And it is that when they meet with people in the country, those individuals—whether they're governors or mayors or representatives of citizens groups—talk much more freely than they do when they're in the Cabinet Room or in the President's office in Washington, D.C. Or even in their offices in the various departments.

I think this whole program of bringing Government to the people can be served by having the White House ~~go~~ to the country from time to time and of course we can handle Federal business from here with rapid communications just as effectively as we do in Washington.

Q. Thank you, Mr. President.

A. Is that all?
