

The original documents are located in Box 7, folder “Busing - Presidential Statements (1)” of the James M. Cannon Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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

Page 5

QUESTION: Mr. President, some members of Congress are talking like an extension of the tax cut is already an accomplished fact next year. In fact, they are saying that an even larger cut needs to come. What is your thinking right now on the tax cut next year?

THE PRESIDENT: We have made no firm decision on that. We will, in a reasonably short period of time, make a recommendation. If the economy needs any additional stimulant, we will, of course, recommend a continuation of the present tax cut.

If we find that the economy is continuing to come out of the recession, as it is, and there is no danger of added inflationary problems, we would probably not recommend a continuation of the tax cut.

But, we do feel that we have some additional time before making a specific request of the Congress for action in this area.

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have been saying that there is a better way than busing to achieve quality education and suggested some better ways, such as improving facilities and the teacher-pupil ratio. Are you prepared to approve of more money to do things like that?

THE PRESIDENT: We, of course, do have in the emergency school aid legislation and appropriations a substantial amount of money that is available, and we have made money available to Boston and we have -- if my memory is correct -- done the same in Louisville, although I will have to check that.

The thing that bothers me about actions of some of the courts, where they are involved in the school busing controversy, is that they apparently have not taken into consideration the law that was passed and signed by me on August 12 of 1974, three days after I was sworn in.

That law included what was known then, and still is, as the Esch amendment. I just happen to have a copy of the Esch amendment here (Laughter) that sets forth seven specific proposals that the court should follow before they actually use the busing remedy.

It is in Title 2 of the Education Amendments of 1974, Section 214. This section establishes a priority of remedies and it says, in effect, that the courts and other Government agencies shall require the first of the following remedies, or the first combination of the remedies, which would correct a denial of rights.

MORE

It says, for example, assigning students to schools closest to their homes, taking into account both school capacities and natural physical barriers; two, assigning students to the closest school, taking into account only school capacities; three, permitting students to transfer from a school in which a majority of the students are of their race to one in which a minority are of their race; four creating or revising attendant zones or grade structures without requiring transportation, construction of new schools or closing of inferior schools, establishment of magna schools.

Then it goes on to say that students should not be transferred to a school other than the school closest or the next closest to his place of residence.

Now, those recommendations included in law in many instances apparently have not been followed by the courts. I think the court ought to take into cognizance the legislative recommendations that are as a matter of law, at the present.

Now, in addition, there are other things that I have mentioned before -- improved facilities, upgrading the teachers, if necessary, including the better pupil-teacher ratios.

QUESTION: Mr. President, that requires a lot more money than just the emergency funds you talked about. Are you going to propose increases?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think it is going to require a great deal more money, Bonnie. Really, that is a very substantial sum, and it has been used up in Boston, and I believe it is being used in Louisville.

It is not nearly as much money if you focus it in on the places where the tension is the highest, and the problem is the greatest, particularly if the courts follow the law, as was enacted by the Congress in 1974.

MORE



QUESTION: Mr. President, do you have thoughts of inviting Senator Percy into your Administration, and if so, in what capacity?

THE PRESIDENT: Senator Percy has been a long-time friend of mine. In fact, in 1949 or 1950, we were jointly honored with eight other people down in Joliet as ten of the young outstanding men by the judges, so I have known him from 1949 or 1950.

I think he does an excellent job as United States Senator. He has been very helpful to me in this campaign. I think very highly of him personally and professionally, and his political life. He has been helpful on many occasions representing the great State of Illinois, and I have mentioned him as one of a number of potential Vice Presidential candidates, not above or below any of the others, but as one of a number, but other than that, I have no specific plans for having him as an active part of the Administration.

QUESTION: Thank you, Mr. President.

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have mentioned your opposition to forced busing previously, as have several of your predecessors, yet forced busing continues to be a major political issue.

I am wondering if you foresee any changes in the next four years that will change the stance of HEW or the courts on this issue?

THE PRESIDENT: Of course, the problem is forced on the country under a judgment or a decision of the United States Supreme Court that came about the mid-1950s on the basis that it was a Constitutional violation of the rights of individuals to perpetuate segregation in public school systems.

Now, the courts make that judgment. Nobody in the Executive Branch can change that judgment. The problem is that when Congress has tried to change the laws to meet the problem, there is always the Constitutional question involved whether the law violates the Constitution just as the practices did for a good many years. I do think, however, that the courts, in applying the Constitutional principle, have begun to use more reasonable and rational remedies. That is the real problem.

So the courts, when they have used radical remedies, have torn the local communities' society asunder, but when the courts use a rational remedy for the solution of the Constitutional issue, there is a great deal more acceptance by the community.

Now, I have asked the Attorney General and the Secretary of HEW to submit to me any thoughts that they might have or recommendations they might have for what I or we in the Executive Branch might do. They submitted this a week or so ago. I asked them to take two or three of the suggestions and to refine them more precisely.

MORE



I have not gotten their final recommendations back, but I think the final answer really comes in how the Federal courts interpret the Brown decision and utilize it in individual cases at the local level, and I have found some of the more recent decisions more moderate.

I strongly disagree with the radical remedies of forced busing to achieve racial balance. I don't think that accomplishes what we all want, which is quality education.

I think it is harmful to quality education, and I think there are some recent studies that prove that.

So if the courts will be more moderate, and we can help in any other way, I think that is the real answer.

MORE



QUESTION: A very quick follow-up. Do you believe any of the candidates that are now running for President of the United States, if elected, could change the busing situation in this country in the next four years?

THE PRESIDENT: No, because it is primarily within the jurisdiction and responsibility of how the Federal court system interprets the constitutional issue and what remedies they utilize, so there is no law that can underline a constitutional issue, it is a matter of the Judicial interpretation of the factual situation, the constitutional problem and the remedy that is used.

I don't see how any Presidential candidate, other than to have an impact or an influence indirectly on the Judicial system, would have any capability of changing it dramatically.

QUESTION: Thank you.

QUESTION: Mr. President, during the 1974 Health Planning and Resources Development Act in the designation of Health Systems Agencies nationwide, will your program of block grants through HEW force a scrapping of HSA's and, if so, what will replace the planning structure?

THE PRESIDENT: No, my health block grant program seeks to consolidate -- I think it is 15 or 16 -- various federally financed health programs into one block grant to the State and to the local units of Government. What that would do is to give no less money than they have this year, in fact we promised them about a half billion dollars more each year for the next several years.

It is now \$10 billion and it goes up to \$10.5 billion, \$11 billion under our proposal. What it does is to give the same amount of money or more to the States and to the local units of Government for all of these programs and then it depends on how the local or State officials want to utilize that money.

In some States they might want to put more money in Program A and less in Program B. It is a matter of local determination at that point so there is no denial of the amount of money, it simply transfers the decision-making process to the local unit of Government and it does away with an immense amount of red tape because if you have 15 or 16 categorical grant programs, the red tape is unbelievable. If you have one block grant program, you save an awful lot of man hours in the applications and you can reduce correspondingly, I think, a number of Federal employees.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, we have talked about educational issues and specifically some of NEA's concerns about the future of education in the United States. I would like for just a couple of minutes, if you would respond to our concerns about some of your other major aims and objectives as the President of the United States?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I look for the next four years and the next century, John, that this country ought to have an objective, and the objective that I believe in very deeply is that in our third century as a Nation we have to put a greater emphasis on the right of the individual. You can look at it from this point of view--the right of the individual to express himself, to participate, to be a leader in our economy and all of the ramifications that that includes.--the right of the individual to express himself, participate more in education in a professional way, in whatever his profession might be, in our society as a whole.

As I look back over the first two centuries of our country, the first century was dedicated to the foundation of a political system that had stability, and that is now secure. The second century involved the development of the United States as a country that had the greatest industrial capacity of any nation in the history of mankind, but our third century -- and this, I think, is very appropriate as far as teachers are concerned -- we want in the next 100 years to put the emphasis on the rights of the individual. That, of course, cuts across almost every program that the Federal Government participates in.

QUESTION: Thank you very much.

On behalf of the National Education Association Board of Directors and our membership at large, we are honored that you took this time out of a very busy schedule.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much, John, and thank all of the others. It has been a pleasure to be on your program.

END (AT 11:40 A.M. EDT)



QUESTION: Mr. President, on two occasions over the weekend in discussing busing you mentioned a 1954 Supreme Court decision as the basis for busing. It is my recollection that that Supreme Court decision in Brown versus the Board of Education related to striking separate but equal. Could you elaborate a little bit on that?

THE PRESIDENT: You are correct but I don't think I said that decision in any way ordered court busing. It was the decision in 1954 that declared unconstitutional the long accepted practice in many States of having separate but equal schools. But as an outgrowth of that court decision there have been the subsequent decisions that have involved busing.

QUESTION: Mr. President, as you know, a good many Congressional offices are receiving mail which runs contrary to your proposal for the Middle East settlement, particularly objecting to the use of American technicians in the Sinai.

I was wondering, sir, if as you say that is worth the risk? How long are those Americans going to be there, and is that not an open-ended commitment?

THE PRESIDENT: They will be there during the term of the agreement unless I, or another President, withdraw them because of any danger to their lives. It is a case of not more than 200 Americans performing a highly technical warning station responsibility in a UN buffer zone. I think it is a good contribution by the United States to the establishment and permanency of peace in the Middle East.

QUESTION: May I follow up, please? I would like to ask what you would do if in the course of their term in the Sinai, the PLO moves in and kidnapped some of them, captured them, or if perhaps they were killed? Would you then use American intervention; the question being then, would you flatly rule out there would be no American intervention to protect those people?

THE PRESIDENT: You are speculating on something I do not anticipate would happen. I think I or any other President would use utmost caution in the protection of the lives of any Americans.

Yes?

QUESTION: Mr. President, to follow that up, if you are committed to the use of Americans on the Egyptian front, would you also, later perhaps, be committed to the principle of using Americans on the Jordanian or the Syrian front?

MORE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON
SIGNING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 69,
THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT

August 21,
1974

I think it is fair to say that this legislation places reasonable and equitable restrictions upon the problem of busing, and in conjunction with the Supreme Court decision will hopefully relieve that problem and make the solution far more equitable and just.



(On signing HR 69,
an omnibus education bill)

Much of the controversy over H. R. 69 has centered on its busing provisions. In general, I am opposed to the forced busing of school children because it does not lead to better education and it infringes upon traditional freedoms in America.

As enacted, H. R. 69 contains an ordered and reasoned approach to dealing with the remaining problems of segregation in our schools, but I regret that it lacks an effective provision for automatically re-evaluating existing court orders. This omission means that a different standard will be applied to those districts which are already being compelled to carry out extensive busing plans and those districts which will now work out desegregation plans under the more rational standards set forth in this bill. Double standards are unfair, and this one is no exception. I believe that all school districts, North and South, East and West, should be able to adopt reasonable and just plans for desegregation which will not result in children being bused from their neighborhoods.



(On signing HR 69,
an omnibus education bill)

Much of the controversy over H. R. 69 has centered on its busing provisions. In general, I am opposed to the forced busing of school children because it does not lead to better education and it infringes upon traditional freedoms in America.

As enacted, H. R. 69 contains an ordered and reasoned approach to dealing with the remaining problems of segregation in our schools, but I regret that it lacks an effective provision for automatically re-evaluating existing court orders. This omission means that a different standard will be applied to those districts which are already being compelled to carry out extensive busing plans and those districts which will now work out desegregation plans under the more rational standards set forth in this bill. Double standards are unfair, and this one is no exception. I believe that all school districts, North and South, East and West, should be able to adopt reasonable and just plans for desegregation which will not result in children being bused from their neighborhoods.



REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT UPON
SIGNING AMENDMENTS TO H.R. 69,
THE ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATION
ACT

August 21,
1974

I think it is fair to say that this legislation places reasonable and equitable restrictions upon the problem of busing, and in conjunction with the Supreme Court decision will hopefully relieve that problem and make the solution far more equitable and just.



STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT REQUESTED
BY BOSTON MEDIA REPRESENTATIVES

October 12, 1974

Boston is a fine, proud City. The cradle of liberty. Where many of the freedoms that we all so cherish today in this Country, were born, 200 years ago. The people of Boston share a tradition for reason, fairness and respect for the rights of others. Now, in a difficult period for all of you, it is a time to reflect on all that your City means to you. To react in the finest tradition of your City's people. It is up to you, every one of you, every parent, child, to reject violence of any kind in your City. To reject hatred and the shrill voices of the violent few.

I know that nothing is more important to you than the safety of the children in Boston. And only your calm and thoughtful action now can guarantee that safety. I know that you will all work together for that goal. And have one more thing to be proud of in the cradle of liberty.

JULY 4, 1975

Busing

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Baltimore, Maryland)

THE WHITE HOUSE
REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
FIFTH ANNUAL OUR COUNTRY CELEBRATION

FORT McHENRY
9:05 P.M. EDT

Governor Mandel and Mrs. Mandel, Senator Beall and Mrs. Beall, distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, Congressman Long, Congressman Gude, Congresswoman Holt, Congressman Bauman, Congresswoman Spellman, Congressman Sarbanes, Mayor Schaefer, our country's newest citizens, and all of you wonderful people from Baltimore and the great State of Maryland:

We meet here tonight at the twilight's last gleaming. The casement walls and the silent cannons of the Fort McHenry bear a very quiet testimony to the Nation's travail on another night in another age.

We all know that Francis Scott Key enshrined forever those events in 1814 -- the patriotism and the national pride surrounding our flag, our country, and their defense that night, our heritage -- in a song and a verse.

The Star Spangled Banner is an expression of our love of country. We must not be so sophisticated, so blase that we ignore those simple but eloquent moments of our history.

We need to remind ourselves that America is really the land of the free and the home of the brave, and we should be proud of it.

We are honored, every one of us, by those who earlier this evening became our newest United States citizens, and we should give them a special round of applause right now.

They have chosen what often is taken for granted among many of us. The hallmark of our first century was the establishment of a free Government. In the face of the greatest odds, 13 poor struggling colonies became a fledgling Nation.

MORE

(OVER)



Its future, in those dark days and weeks and months, was insecure. In the first 100 years the Western movement accelerated, vast territories were acquired, States joined the Union, Constitutional issues were raised and wars were fought, none more devastating than the one that turned American against American.

Yet, through that horrible ordeal, it was resolved that this Nation would not endure half slave and half free. The Union was preserved.

By our Centennial in 1876, the American Republic had been securely established. Of this, there was no doubt, either at home or abroad.

Our second century has been marked by the growth of the great American free enterprise system. The pioneer spirit which carried us West turned us to new frontiers. Railroads spanned the Continent and became a web of steel linking city to city, region to region, town to town.

The automobile and its assembly line changed forever transportation and our manufacturing process in America. The Wright brothers mastered powered flight at Kitty Hawk. The age of flight was born.

From the first Atlantic crossing by the lone eagle, Charles Lindbergh, to the American astronauts who announced that the Eagle had landed, when touchdown on the moon, America's latest ship was again established.

The telegram. The telephone. The television. All are a great part of the communications revolution of our second century. Science, medicine, agriculture, production, marketing -- these have been just a few of the modern frontiers since 1876.

But now our third century, I believe, should be an era of individual freedom. The mass approach of the modern world places a premium on creativity and individuality.

We see mass production, mass education, mass population. They must not smother individual expression or limit individual opportunity. Individualism is a safeguard against the sameness of society. A Government too large and bureaucratic can stifle individual initiative by a frustrating statism.

In America, and never forget it, our sovereign is a citizen. Our sovereign is the citizen, and we must never forget it.

(OVER)

MORE

Governments exist to serve people. The State is the creature of the populus. These propositions are the foundation stones of our Bicentennial. Today, in the 199 years of our independence, we stand on the threshold of a new American experience.

Let us make the coming year a great year on America's agenda of achievement. As we move to the Bicentennial of American independence, let us think where we will be and what we can achieve by next July 4, by the next decade, by the 200th anniversary of our Constitution and by the year 2000.

Let us resolve that this shall be an era of hope rather than despair. Let us resolve that it shall be an era of achievement rather than apathy. Let us resolve that it shall be a time of promises rather than regret.

The Bicentennial should be a time for each of us for self-examination and individual accomplishment. Quality and permanence should be the measurement of your life and my life and the life of 214 other million Americans in 50 States and our territories.

Let us pursue truths and values that will enhance the quality of life, of you and your fellow Americans. To form a more perfect Union -- and that is what we want -- we need to learn more of our country and more of our good people.

Americans must appreciate the diversity of our lands and the diversity of our citizens. There is a quotation that I learned in my early days in Sunday school, that the beauty of Joseph's coat is its many colors, and that is the strength of America.

Boundaries of regionalism and urbanization must dissolve before our will to be one Nation and one people. In the coming year, the Bicentennial must become a true national experience. The American Revolution and its legacy belong to each of the States and our far-flung territories. It belongs to every county, to every city, to every church, to every club and to each and every American citizen.

At every school where the American flag flies, it is my hope that there will be, in the coming year, a concentrated effort in the classroom to study, discuss and portray these past 200 years of our history.

I would urge that every community seek to make its program as meaningful as possible to as many as possible -- old, young, in every walk of life.

MORE



MORE

This should stress the history, culture and the achievements and the basic values that are so important that we associate with our way of life.

Yes, the ideas that were forged and fought for in the 13 colonies crossed the Appalachians. They followed the wagons and rode with the Pony Express. They crossed the Mississippi and the Missouri, spanned the plains and the American desert.

They belong as much to the West as they belonged to the East.

Wherever the American flag has gone, so went the concepts of this great Republic. American clipper ships that probably sailed in part from this great Baltimore harbor took the story of America to the far corners of the earth with pride and with success. American jet liners carry it every day across the skies to distant lands.

Indeed, this event does not belong just to Americans. This is a celebration of liberty, freedom, democracy, wherever they exist, and we want them to exist on a global basis at some time in the world's history.

While we cherish the many heritages that enrich our land, we of all people have no history except what we have written for ourselves. We are not Americans alone, by birth or blood, by oath or creed or compact among princes. We are Americans because we deliberately chose to be one Nation, indivisible. For 199 years, with God's help, we have gone forward together, and we will in the future.

Two centuries of sacrifice and struggle, of conflict and compromise, have gained for us an unprecedented measure of political and economic independence.

We have, on this Independence Day of 1975, a free Government that checks and balances its own excesses, and a free economic system that corrects its own errors, given the courage and the constructive cooperation of a free and enlightened citizenry.

This is the amazing history Americans have written for themselves, you and your forefathers, as we begin our Bicentennial celebration.

The young Republic of yesteryear is today a strong and a very great Nation. It still lives by the values of the Declaration, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It influences the destiny of millions beyond our shores. It still remains, in Lincoln's words, "The last, best hope of earth."

MORE

Let us, this Fourth of July, continue to be a Nation of hope. The American people believe in tomorrow, that by dawn's early light our flag will still be there. Let us be one Nation and one people indivisible, for our flag is one and our destiny is one.

Let us be people of value, of liberty, equality and justice, no matter what the cost. That has been our history, and we are proud of it. We have never counted the cost of freedom, and I don't think America every will.

Let us in the final analysis be true to ourselves for then we can be false to no nation or to no people. Let us live, not only for our own progress, but also in harmony and hope for all other men, women and children everywhere in this great globe.

In so doing, the United States and its people serve and honor the promise of Francis Scott Key's words: "Land of the free, and home of the brave."

Thank you and good night.

END (AT 9:20 P.M. EDT)

JULY 4, 1975

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Baltimore, Maryland)

THE WHITE HOUSE
REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
FIFTH ANNUAL OUR COUNTRY CELEBRATION

FORT McHENRY
9:05 P.M. EDT

Governor Mandel and Mrs. Mandel, Senator Beall and Mrs. Beall, distinguished Members of the House of Representatives, Congressman Long, Congressman Gude, Congresswoman Holt, Congressman Bauman, Congresswoman Spellman, Congressman Sarbanes, Mayor Schaefer, our country's newest citizens, and all of you wonderful people from Baltimore and the great State of Maryland:

We meet here tonight at the twilight's last gleaming. The casement walls and the silent cannons of the Fort McHenry bear a very quiet testimony to the Nation's travail on another night in another age.

We all know that Francis Scott Key enshrined forever those events in 1814 -- the patriotism and the national pride surrounding our flag, our country, and their defense that night, our heritage -- in a song and a verse.

The Star Spangled Banner is an expression of our love of country. We must not be so sophisticated, so blase that we ignore those simple but eloquent moments of our history.

We need to remind ourselves that America is really the land of the free and the home of the brave, and we should be proud of it.

We are honored, every one of us, by those who earlier this evening became our newest United States citizens, and we should give them a special round of applause right now.

They have chosen what often is taken for granted among many of us. The hallmark of our first century was the establishment of a free Government. In the face of the greatest odds, 13 poor struggling colonies became a fledgling Nation.

MORE

MORE

(OVER)



Its future, in those dark days and weeks and months, was insecure. In the first 100 years the Western movement accelerated, vast territories were acquired, States joined the Union, Constitutional issues were raised and wars were fought, none more devastating than the one that turned American against American.

Yet, through that horrible ordeal, it was resolved that this Nation would not endure half slave and half free. The Union was preserved.

By our Centennial in 1876, the American Republic had been securely established. Of this, there was no doubt, either at home or abroad.

Our second century has been marked by the growth of the great American free enterprise system. The pioneer spirit which carried us West turned us to new frontiers. Railroads spanned the Continent and became a web of steel linking city to city, region to region, town to town.

The automobile and its assembly line changed forever transportation and our manufacturing process in America. The Wright brothers mastered powered flight at Kitty Hawk. The age of flight was born.

From the first Atlantic crossing by the lone eagle, Charles Lindbergh, to the American astronauts who announced that the Eagle had landed, when touchdown on the moon, America's latest ship was again established.

The telegram. The telephone. The television. All are a great part of the communications revolution of our second Century. Science, medicine, agriculture, production, marketing -- these have been just a few of the modern frontiers since 1876.

But now our third century, I believe, should be an era of individual freedom. The mass approach of the modern world places a premium on creativity and individuality.

We see mass production, mass education, mass population. They must not smother individual expression or limit individual opportunity. Individualism is a safeguard against the sameness of society. A Government too large and bureaucratic can stifle individual initiative by a frustrating statism.

In America, and never forget it, our sovereign is a citizen. Our sovereign is the citizen, and we must never forget it.

MORE

(1875)



Governments exist to serve people. The State is the creature of the populus. These propositions are the foundation stones of our Bicentennial. Today, in the 199 years of our independence, we stand on the threshold of a new American experience.

Let us make the coming year a great year on America's agenda of achievement. As we move to the Bicentennial of American independence, let us think where we will be and what we can achieve by next July 4, by the next decade, by the 200th anniversary of our Constitution and by the year 2000.

Let us resolve that this shall be an era of hope rather than despair. Let us resolve that it shall be an era of achievement rather than apathy. Let us resolve that it shall be a time of promises rather than regret.

The Bicentennial should be a time for each of us for self-examination and individual accomplishment. Quality and permanence should be the measurement of your life and my life and the life of 214 other million Americans in 50 States and our territories.

Let us pursue truths and values that will enhance the quality of life, of you and your fellow Americans. To form a more perfect Union -- and that is what we want -- we need to learn more of our country and more of our good people.

Americans must appreciate the diversity of our lands and the diversity of our citizens. There is a quotation that I learned in my early days in Sunday school, that the beauty of Joseph's coat is its many colors, and that is the strength of America.

Boundaries of regionalism and urbanization must dissolve before our will to be one Nation and one people. In the coming year, the Bicentennial must become a true national experience. The American Revolution and its legacy belong to each of the States and our far-flung territories. It belongs to every county, to every city, to every church, to every club and to each and every American citizen.

At every school where the American flag flies, it is my hope that there will be, in the coming year, a concentrated effort in the classroom to study, discuss and portray these past 200 years of our history.

I would urge that every community seek to make its program as meaningful as possible to as many as possible -- old, young, in every walk of life.

MORE

MORE



This should stress the history, culture and the achievements and the basic values that are so important that we associate with our way of life.

Yes, the ideas that were forged and fought for in the 13 colonies crossed the Appalachians. They followed the wagons and rode with the Pony Express. They crossed the Mississippi and the Missouri, spanned the plains and the American desert.

They belong as much to the West as they belonged to the East.

Wherever the American flag has gone, so went the concepts of this great Republic. American clipper ships that probably sailed in part from this great Baltimore harbor took the story of America to the far corners of the earth with pride and with success. American jet liners carry it every day across the skies to distant lands.

Indeed, this event does not belong just to Americans. This is a celebration of liberty, freedom, democracy, wherever they exist, and we want them to exist on a global basis at some time in the world's history.

While we cherish the many heritages that enrich our land, we of all people have no history except what we have written for ourselves. We are not Americans alone, by birth or blood, by oath or creed or compact among princes. We are Americans because we deliberately chose to be one Nation, indivisible. For 199 years, with God's help, we have gone forward together, and we will in the future.

Two centuries of sacrifice and struggle, of conflict and compromise, have gained for us an unprecedented measure of political and economic independence.

We have, on this Independence Day of 1975, a free Government that checks and balances its own excesses, and a free economic system that corrects its own errors, given the courage and the constructive cooperation of a free and enlightened citizenry.

This is the amazing history Americans have written for themselves, you and your forefathers, as we begin our Bicentennial celebration.

The young Republic of yesteryear is today a strong and a very great Nation. It still lives by the values of the Declaration, the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It influences the destiny of millions beyond our shores. It still remains, in Lincoln's words, "The last, best hope of earth."

Let us, this Fourth of July, continue to be a Nation of hope. The American people believe in tomorrow, that by dawn's early light our flag will still be there. Let us be one Nation and one people indivisible, for our flag is one and our destiny is one.

Let us be people of value, of liberty, equality and justice, no matter what the cost. That has been our history, and we are proud of it. We have never counted the cost of freedom, and I don't think America every will.

Let us in the final analysis be true to ourselves for then we can be false to no nation or to no people. Let us live, not only for our own progress, but also in harmony and hope for all other men, women and children everywhere in this great globe.

In so doing, the United States and its people serve and honor the promise of Francis Scott Key's words: "Land of the free, and home of the brave."

Thank you and good night.

END (AT 9:20 P.M. EDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

AUGUST 30, 1975

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Newport, Rhode Island)

THE WHITE HOUSE

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT

BY

ARTHUR ALBERT

EXECUTIVE NEWS DIRECTOR, WJAR-TV

SARAH WYE

CORRESPONDENT, WJAR-TV

AND

JACK CAVENAUGH

CORRESPONDENT, WJAR-TV

SHERATON-ISLANDER INN

6:00 P.M. EDT

QUESTION: We have a weekly public affairs program we at WJAR normally call a news conference.

Because of the stature of our guest, we have expanded the format and produced this special edition, which is being shared with 12 television stations throughout New England. All of you are most welcome.

Our guest is President Gerald Ford, who promised when he came into office a year ago to bring new openness and accessibility to the White House. His participation in this unusual sort of regional format indicates he is making that effort.

Mr. President, welcome.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you. It is a pleasure to be on the program, Sarah.

QUESTION: Asking questions along with me tonight will be Jack Cavanaugh, on the WJAR-TV staff and Arthur Albert, News Director of WJAR radio and TV.

I think one of the subjects you will be hearing a lot about in this discussion in the next half hour is energy. Obviously, it is very heavy on the minds of the people throughout the country. Until Friday, we were braced for a massive increase in domestic crude oil because of your decision to veto the Congressional extension of price controls.

You have since changed your mind about decontrol, and you are suggesting perhaps a 60-day extension and gradual decontrol. What went into the decision to change your mind?

MORE



THE PRESIDENT: I think first, Sarah, you have to understand that the United States, our country, has a serious energy crisis. Actually, the energy crisis in New England is more serious than it is in any other part of the country, primarily because New England is more dependent on foreign oil than any other part of the United States.

So, unless we solve the energy problem for the United States, and unless we make ourselves more free of foreign oil imports, New England is going to be in more and more trouble.

In January, I submitted to the Congress a comprehensive energy program for a ten-year period, and we made some exceptions as far as New England was concerned, recognizing the vulnerability of New England.

I had hoped that the Congress would act on a comprehensive plan, either the one I submitted or one they might put together.

Unfortunately, Congress has not acted, so after attempting to decontrol on a phased basis on two occasions--one over a 30-month period with an increase in old oil, so to speak, at a rate of about 3 percent per month--the Congress turned that down.

I made another effort of compromise and conciliation, making it a 39-month phased decontrol program. The Congress turned that down.

Under those circumstances, I had no alternative but to say unless you act, we are going to decontrol all old oil, all domestic old oil. I think at least the leadership in the Congress -- Senator Mansfield and Speaker Albert -- recognized that was not the right answer.

We had a meeting on Friday, and I said that I would hold off the veto until they could get their troops together and come up and agree to the phased program that I submitted about a month ago.

QUESTION: What you are saying is you never were in favor of intermediate and secondary control?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: No, I proposed two examples of phased decontrol, one a 30-month and another 39, but Congress turned both down. In order to try to avoid an abrupt end, I agreed to resubmit a 39-month phased decontrol program and, hopefully, the majority party leadership will be able to work with the Republicans in the House and get a phased program over a 39-month period.

QUESTION: Mr. President, the controls have to come off eventually but New England will have to bear the brunt of those controls because we have such problems with energy, because our economy is in such bad shape right now. What do you say to people who are unemployed here who have to bear up under this energy crisis? Or is the Federal Government going to make any kind of specific commitments to New England to help us get out of this situation?

THE PRESIDENT: Over the last three or four months I have made exceptions as far as New England is concerned. In the first imposition of the import levy, it had no effect on New England, it had an effect on the rest of the United States. When I put the second dollar on to try to prod Congress to do something, the second dollar only affected New England, I think, to 60 cents a barrel. So I tried to recognize the needs, the problems that exist in New England. As I said at the outset, New England has a greater need for a comprehensive solution to the energy problem than any other part of the United States.

So what I have tried to do is to make exceptions for New England and at the same time get the Congress moving to enact an energy program that would solve the problem not only in the short haul but the long pull. Now, in the interim while we had this unfortunate unemployment, and we do have more unemployment not only in New England but elsewhere than I certainly want, we have done a number of things. For example, we have extended the unemployment payments from 39 weeks to 65 weeks. We have broadened the coverage so that 12 million more people are covered under unemployment. I recommended, and the Congress approved, about \$450 million for the Summer Youth Program so that young people this past summer would be gainfully employed.

We have done a great deal with what they call public service employment. I recommended about \$2 billion for that program and I was talking to the Mayor of Providence today and he says it has been a very helpful program. We have also tried to expedite some public works projects. I made available a \$2 billion allocation for highway construction which has been made available in many, many States and I presume here in Rhode Island.

MORE

We have, for example, been trying to get some local projects going. I talked to the Mayor of Providence today coming down here about a \$32 million Federal building in the City of Providence. I am going to give it some personal attention. when I get back to Washington. I think that kind of project would be very helpful. So we try to push forward for an energy program, which is what we need over the long haul, we are trying to take care of individual geographical problems.

QUESTION: And yet, while we are working on it, the unemployment rate in this State here is about 16 percent, 12 percent in Massachusetts, 11 percent throughout New England. Is it possible for the Federal Government to redirect some of its major installations, relocate them, transfer them, create new ones here? After 1972 when military bases were closed in Massachusetts and Rhode Island, the economies were hurt very, very hard.

THE PRESIDENT: Of course I am deeply concerned about the unemployment problem not only in Massachusetts but the 48 other States. But we have to try to rebuild the economy from an inflation-ridden economy from a year ago to one that is solidly based so that over the next few months when we get better employment -- as we are at the present time overall -- we are not going to have a reigniting of inflation like we had a year ago.

So we will do all we can through public works, through unemployment insurance, through public service employment, summer youth employment, in order to meet the unique circumstances of a particular State. But the basic way to solve our unemployment, whether it is Rhode Island or 49 other States, is to get a healthy private sector economy. And we can do that through some tax proposals that I have recommended and some of the other legislation which we will be submitting shortly.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Andrew Brimmer, who used to be a Governor of the Federal Reserve and who is a fiscal conservative, said -- I think he disagreed with you. He said that next year, thanks to the Project Independence, your energy policy, thanks to grain sales, there will be six to seven percent inflation but he says there is no chance really that excess demand will push the inflation higher. And he says now you can do it, now you can lower interest rates, now you can provide jobs by encouraging the economy without the danger of inflation. Have you considered that and talked about that with Dr. Burns?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: Of course, I am sure you recognize I don't control interest rates. Those are basically controlled by several factors; one, the Federal Reserve Board.

I have talked to Mr. Arthur Burns, and we have what I think are appropriate as well as private conversations. He is cognizant of the needs of an adequate supply of money, and he is very cognizant of the problem of higher interest rates.

At the same time, I think you have to recognize that if the Federal deficit goes beyond my \$60 billion deficit -- and unfortunately, the Congress is spending more money than I think they should -- that will contribute significantly to higher interest rates and a shorter supply of money available in the private sector.

So, we have to control the Federal deficit. \$60 billion is too darned big a deficit, but the Congress is continuously pressing to make it bigger.

Now, we are going to hold the deficit as low as we can, and we are hopefully expecting cooperation, and I think we will get it from the Federal Reserve Board.

I respectfully disagree with Mr. Brimmer if he alleged that the grain sales to the Soviet Union are a significant factor in inflation. I respectfully disagree with him. Does he want us to put out that grain in storage and pay \$1 million a day in storage charges, as we did in the sixties? I don't think that is a very satisfactory answer.

QUESTION: I think he did say that energy was the main component, but following up on your answer, I have been talking to people around New England in anticipation of your visit, and I keep coming up with that old folk saying: "Democrats get us into wars, Republicans into depressions." That, of course, may be oversimplified, but previous Administrations and your Administration have chosen to fight inflation first and unemployment second.

I am just wondering when will the time come to switch so that this recovery, which seems as if it is on the horizon, will recover in a hurry rather than just stumble along?

THE PRESIDENT: I would say that the recovery is doing better, and we are coming out of it more quickly now than some people anticipated. For the fifth month in a row, as I recollect, overall indicators show that we are making headway. We are seeing higher housing starts.

MORE

We are seeing better retail sales. We are making some headway, except for the last month, in inflation, and I think that was an unusual example, and we are optimistic in the future.

One thing I would like to point out is I think it is important to talk about some affirmative things. In the last five months, we have had one million two hundred thousand more people gainfully employed in this country. We now have over 85 million people gainfully employed.

We have too many unemployed, but more and more people are being employed and the indications are that that will be a continuing trend.

So, we have to win the battle against inflation. If we let the problems of inflation reoccur, every knowledgeable economist that I have talked to says, if you went back up to 10 or 12 percent inflation, in 12 to 18 to 24 months we would be in a far worse recession than we are at the present time.

So, it is a very narrow line that we are trying to follow: To win the battle against inflation on the one hand and at the same time provide more job opportunities, and I think we are being reasonably successful.

As Jack said over here, New England, or at least Rhode Island, has some unique problems, and we are going to work on it, as I indicated.

QUESTION: Mr. President, let's return briefly to energy. We have dealt with domestic crude oil by saying the approach now is to decontrolling domestic oil prices. The OPEC countries, the oil producing countries, will be meeting to decide soon what price increases they will ask by October 1.

It is widely rumored in the oil industry that you have let it be known that an 8 percent increase in foreign oil prices would be acceptable to you. Is that true?

THE PRESIDENT: I am not familiar with that statement. A lot of statements are attributed to me. I have a pretty good memory, and I don't know where that statement came from.

MORE

QUESTION: What are you looking for from the oil producing countries?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me put it this way, Sarah, if the Congress had passed early this year the comprehensive energy program that I recommended, we would be in a lot better position to meet the challenge of any OPEC oil price increase. Unfortunately, nothing has been done legislatively so we are now more vulnerable today than we would have been otherwise.

I have said that, as far as I am concerned we will do everything we can to defeat any OPEC oil price increase. Unfortunately, without an energy program, we don't have many tools to do that with.

QUESTION: Mr. President, schools open very soon around the country and in New England. And in Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts that means forced busing for desegregation. You have had a position on busing before. Can you take a minute and clarify your position on busing? What is your position on busing? ✓✓

THE PRESIDENT: Before I say anything about what my own personal views are, I want to say most emphatically that I, as President and all that serve with me in the Federal Government, will enforce the law, no question about that.

We will, to the extent necessary, make sure that any court order is enforced.

Now I add one thing that I hope is understood. We don't want any conflict developing in Boston or any of these other communities that have court orders forcing busing on local school systems. So I have sent up the the Attorney General, and the community relations experts -- they have four or five people up there that are working with the court, with the school boards and with parents and with others. At the same time the new Secretary of HEW, David Mathews, has sent up his top man to work with the school system. And that individual, Dr. Goldberg, has authority to spend extra Federal funds to try and improve the situation in Boston.

Now, having said the law is going to be enforced, that we are going to try and moderate and work with the people in Boston, I will give you my views on what we are trying to do.

MORE

The basic thing that everyone is trying to do is to provide quality education. There is a difference of opinion on how you achieve quality education. My personal view is that forced busing by courts is not the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

We have had court order forced busing in a number of communities. There are studies that indicate that it has not provided quality education to the young people, which is of personal concern.

I think there is a better way to do it. In my judgment, if the courts would follow a law that was passed, I think, two years ago, maybe two and a half years ago, it said that in those areas where you have a problem in seeking desegregation, the court should follow five or six rules. Busing was the last option.

There were five other proposals that courts could have followed and I think we would have avoided a lot of this conflict. That is one way I think we could have solved this problem. The other is the utilization of Federal funds to upgrade school buildings, provide better teacher-pupil ratios, to provide better equipment, that is the way, in my opinion, we achieve what we all want, which is quality education.

I just don't think court order, forced busing, is the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

QUESTION: Mr. President, if I may follow up on that, you have come up with an alternative but it would seem that because we were afraid of inflation, you have vetoed bills for more aid to education, you have vetoed bills for more public service jobs, so are you prepared, you know, to turn around on that?

THE PRESIDENT: Arthur, let me just clarify something. The appropriation bill concerning public service employment that you say I vetoed, let me give you the history of it so the matter is clarified. I recommended \$1,900,000,000, \$450 million for summer youth employment and the remainder -- which is roughly a billion and a half -- for public service employment. The Congress loaded it up with \$3 billion in non-essential spending. Sure, I vetoed it. When the Congress saw that the veto was sustained they came back and virtually approved what I sent up there in the first place.

So we had \$2 billion in summer youth employment money and we had public service employment money.

Now, the education bill, the education bill that I submitted in January for the budget that started July 1 had more money in it for education than any other year in recent years. We increased it over previous years. Again, the Congress loaded it up with some programs that I think can't be justified if you are going to have any fiscal responsibility. I hope the Congress sustains that veto, because there is a lot of non-essential spending in it. Now, having vetoed that bill, there was nothing in there, in that proposal Congress had, to do anything more in desegregation cases than I recommended. So that is a moot issue as far as the Boston case is concerned.

QUESTION: Can I move you along to another area completely, and that is fishing, which is of some importance to the New England States. Our fishing industry is dying, and it would appear that foreign fleets, modern fleets, are perhaps wiping out fish for a long time, perhaps forever.

The Senate has passed the 200 mile limit bill, and the House probably will, too. Will you sign it?

THE PRESIDENT: If my recollection is accurate, in this session of the Congress the Senate has not acted. I think they acted last year.

QUESTION: Right.

THE PRESIDENT: The House committee has acted, and it will be on the House agenda shortly. What we are trying to do, through the Law of the Sea Conference, is to settle all of the controversies on a worldwide basis involving fishing, the 200 mile zone, et cetera.

I am for the concept of a 200 mile zone. I think it is better to settle it on a worldwide basis rather than to do it unilaterally just for the United States.

QUESTION: The problem, Mr. President, is that while we are waiting for the international treaty our fish supplies are being depleted.

THE PRESIDENT: We had the second meeting of this Law of the Sea Conference ending earlier this year.

They have a draft proposal at the present time. They are going back to negotiations early next year. It is my hope we can do it on a worldwide basis and the United States, at my direction, is going to fight for a 200 mile zone.

I think that is a better way to solve it than to do it on a unilateral basis, just the United States.

QUESTION: How long are you willing to wait?

THE PRESIDENT: We hope that the Law of the Sea Conference will be completed early next year. As I recollect, the conferees are getting together in January.

We have made a lot of progress and, if we can get it on a worldwide basis in 1976, that is far preferable to unilateral action just by the United States.

MORE



QUESTION: One quick question for New Hampshire. New Hampshire would like to know if you are planning to come up sometime before September 16 and campaign for Louie Wyman?

THE PRESIDENT: It is my expectation that I will. We are working on a date. Louie Wyman is a very good friend of mine. I served with him in the House. I think he would make a fine Senator. I certainly expect to go up sometime between now and September 16 to help him if I can.

QUESTION: Mr. President, why can't the Northeast New England States share in the profits from the leasing of off-shore oil rights off the coast?

THE PRESIDENT: Under the legislation that we are working on -- and there are about ten different alternative proposals -- I think that the coastal areas ought to get some help.

There is a bill in the Senate. It goes, I think, further than it should. Of course, there are many inland States who say, well, this is a United States resource. Why can't we share equally with the coastal States? So, we have these competing interests.

I believe, without any question of a doubt, that coastal States ought to get a high priority, the highest priority, and then we will have to work out some formula where I think we can equitably take care of any other interests that are involved.

Mr. President, two quick ones on politics. We presume you will be back in New Hampshire next winter --

THE PRESIDENT: I am looking forward to it.

QUESTION: -- and that between now and then there will be a lot of pressure on you from the Reagan forces, some people will call them the Connally forces, to dump Mr. Rockefeller.

If it is necessary to do that to get the nomination, will you do it?

THE PRESIDENT: I wouldn't put it that way. I picked Nelson Rockefeller for Vice President because I thought he was an outstanding public servant. He has exceeded any expectations that I have had. He has done a superb job. He has been a good teammate. I don't dump good teammates.

MORE

QUESTION: Okay.

Mr. President, in 1972 when the Soviets bought 15 million tons of grain, food prices went up. Now they would like to buy 21 million tons. Will they get it all? Will they get part of it? Will food prices go up?

THE PRESIDENT: You have more information than I have. They bought about 10 million tons. There are rumors to the effect that they want to buy additional amounts.

I have indicated that we will make no more sales until we get the September crop report. All the indications are that we will have a record crop in wheat, in corn and feed grains, including soybeans.

If we get a record crop and if we can work out some fair and equitable arrangement, I think it is in the best interest of the farmer, the consumer, our relations on a worldwide basis, and best for the country, if we do make some additional sales to the Soviet Union.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I have never seen a President end so neatly. You finished up the question, and we don't have to cut you off.

Thank you. The time went awfully fast.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you, and I enjoyed it. I thank all of you very much.

QUESTION: Thank you and good night.

END (AT 6:28 P.M. EDT)

ARTHUR ALBERT, EXECUTIVE NEWS DIRECTOR,
WJAR-TV, SARAH WYE, CORRESPONDENT,
WJAR-TV AND JACK CAVENAUGH, CORRESPONDENT,
WJAR-TV, Sheraton-Islander Inn
Newport, Rhode Island

QUESTION: Mr. President, schools open very soon around the country and in New England. And in Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts that means forced busing for desegregation. You have had a position on busing before. Can you take a minute and clarify your position on busing? What is your position on busing?

THE PRESIDENT: Before I say anything about what my own personal views are, I want to say most emphatically that I, as President and all that serve with me in the Federal Government, will enforce the law, no question about that.

We will, to the extent necessary, make sure that any court order is enforced.

Now I add one thing that I hope is understood. We don't want any conflict developing in Boston or any of these other communities that have court orders forcing busing on local school systems. So I have sent up the the Attorney General, and the community relations experts -- they have four or five people up there that are working with the court, with the school boards and with parents and with others. At the same time the new Secretary of HEW, David Mathews, has sent up his top man to work with the school system. And that individual, Dr. Goldberg, has authority to spend extra Federal funds to try and improve the situation in Boston.

Now, having said the law is going to be enforced, that we are going to try and moderate and work with the people in Boston, I will give you my views on what we are trying to do.

The basic thing that everyone is trying to do is to provide quality education. there is a difference of opinion on how you achieve quality education. My personal view is that forced busing by courts is not the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

We have had court order forced busing in a number of communities. There are studies that indicate that it has not provided quality education to the young people, which is of personal concern.



I think there is a better way to do it. In my judgment, if the courts would follow a law that was passed, I think, two years ago, maybe two and a half years ago, it said that in those areas where you have a problem in seeking desegregation, the court should follow five or six rules. Busing was the last option.

There were five other proposals that courts could have followed and I think we would have avoided a lot of this conflict. That is one way I think we could have solved this problem. The other is the utilization of Federal funds to upgrade school buildings, provide better teacher-pupil ratios, to provide better equipment, that is the way, in my opinion, we achieve what we all want, which is quality education.

I just don't think court order, forced busing, is the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

ARTHUR ALBERT, EXECUTIVE NEWS DIRECTOR,
WJAR-TV, SARAH WYE, CORRESPONDENT,
WJAR-TV AND JACK CAVENAUGH, CORRESPONDENT,
WJAR-TV, Sheraton-Islander Inn
Newport, Rhode Island

QUESTION: Mr. President, schools open very soon around the country and in New England. And in Boston and Springfield, Massachusetts that means forced busing for de-segregation. You have had a position on busing before. Can you take a minute and clarify your position on busing? What is your position on busing?

THE PRESIDENT: Before I say anything about what my own personal views are, I want to say most emphatically that I, as President and all that serve with me in the Federal Government, will enforce the law, no question about that.

We will, to the extent necessary, make sure that any court order is enforced.

Now I add one thing that I hope is understood. We don't want any conflict developing in Boston or any of these other communities that have court orders forcing busing on local school systems. So I have sent up the the Attorney General, and the community relations experts -- they have four or five people up there that are working with the court, with the school boards and with parents and with others. At the same time the new Secretary of HEW, David Mathews, has sent up his top man to work with the school system. And that individual, Dr. Goldberg, has authority to spend extra Federal funds to try and improve the situation in Boston.

Now, having said the law is going to be enforced, that we are going to try and moderate and work with the people in Boston, I will give you my views on what we are trying to do.

The basic thing that everyone is trying to do is to provide quality education. there is a difference of opinion on how you achieve quality education. My personal view is that forced busing by courts is not the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

We have had court order forced busing in a number of communities. There are studies that indicate that it has not provided quality education to the young people, which is of personal concern.

I think there is a better way to do it. In my judgment, if the courts would follow a law that was passed, I think, two years ago, maybe two and a half years ago, it said that in those areas where you have a problem in seeking desegregation, the court should follow five or six rules. Busing was the last option.

There were five other proposals that courts could have followed and I think we would have avoided a lot of this conflict. That is one way I think we could have solved this problem. The other is the utilization of Federal funds to upgrade school buildings, provide better teacher-pupil ratios, to provide better equipment, that is the way, in my opinion, we achieve what we all want, which is quality education.

I just don't think court order, forced busing, is the way to achieve quality education. I think there is a better way.

JULIUS HUNTER, NEWS ANCHORMAN AND
HOST, ROBERT HARDY, KMOX-RADIO
ANNOUNCER, RICHARD DUDMAN, ST.
LOUIS POST DISPATCH AND JOHN FLACK,
POLITICAL EDITOR, ST. LOUIS GLOBE
DEMOCRAT, Gateway Tower Building,
St. Louis, Missouri

QUESTION: Mr. President, busing is a subject, a practice that is distasteful to a large segment of the American population, both black and white. If it is such a distasteful and wasteful process, why bus? Is there any alternative that you see?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that we have to decide, in the first place, what we are really trying to do by busing before you discuss whether it is good or bad. All of us -- white, black, every American, in my opinion -- wants quality education.

Now, the court decided in 1954 that separate but equal schools were constitutional and the courts have decided that busing is one way to try and desegregate on the one hand and perhaps improve education on the other.

Many of those decisions have raised great problems in many, many localities -- Louisville and Boston being the most prominent at the present time.

Discussing those two communities, let me very strongly emphasize the court has decided something. That is the law of the land. As far as my Administration is concerned, the law of the land will be upheld, and we are upholding it.

But then, I think I have the right to give what I think is a better answer to the achievement of quality education, which is what we all seek, and there is always more than one answer.

I think that quality education can be enhanced by better school facilities, lower pupil-teacher ratios, the improvement of the neighborhood, as such. Those are better answers, in my judgment, than busing under a court order.

Quality education can be achieved by more than one method. I was reading in the Washington Post this morning a column by one of the outstanding black columnists, Mr. Raspberry, and Mr. Raspberry has come to the conclusion that court ordered, forced busing, is not the way to achieve quality education for blacks or whites in a major metropolitan area.

That is a very significant decision by Mr. Raspberry, who I think Mr. Dudman, for example, highly respects.

QUESTION: I certainly do.

In Boston and Louisville, where the court has ordered busing, how well do you think the people of those two cities have conducted themselves in bringing about court-ordered exchanges of black and white students?

THE PRESIDENT: There have been some disorders there over the last year or more.

QUESTION: I am thinking about this fall. There have been Federal agents there, of course, to try to maintain order. Are you reasonably well-satisfied with the way things have happened or not?

THE PRESIDENT: So far, there has been a minimum of local disorder. I hope that that attitude can prevail in the months ahead as the police involvement and the Federal marshal involvement becomes less and less.

I am also an optimist, even though I disagree with the method by which they are trying to achieve quality education.

QUESTION: Are you counseling the people of those two cities to cooperate with the courts, or are you encouraging them to maintain their strong feelings in some cases that this is an improper solution?

THE PRESIDENT: Last year I did a televised tape urging the people of Boston to cooperate with the court and to maintain law and order. I did that then, and I have counseled everybody that I talked with in Boston to encourage their fellow Bostonians to obey the law and follow the court's action.

INTERVIEW OF THE PRESIDENT BY
JULIUS HUNTER, NEWS ANCHORMAN AND
HOST, ROBERT HARDY, KMOX-RADIO
ANNOUNCER, RICHARD DUDMAN, ST.
LOUIS POST DISPATCH AND JOHN FLACK,
POLITICAL EDITOR, ST. LOUIS GLOBE
DEMOCRAT, Gateway Tower Building,
St. Louis, Missouri

September 12,
1975

QUESTION: Mr. President, busing is a subject, a practice that is distasteful to a large segment of the American population, both black and white. If it is such a distasteful and wasteful process, why bus? Is there any alternative that you see?

THE PRESIDENT: I think that we have to decide, in the first place, what we are really trying to do by busing before you discuss whether it is good or bad. All of us -- white, black, every American, in my opinion -- wants quality education.

Now, the court decided in 1954 that separate but equal schools were constitutional and the courts have decided that busing is one way to try and desegregate on the one hand and perhaps improve education on the other.

Many of those decisions have raised great problems in many, many localities -- Louisville and Boston being the most prominent at the present time.

Discussing those two communities, let me very strongly emphasize the court has decided something. That is the law of the land. As far as my Administration is concerned, the law of the land will be upheld, and we are upholding it.

But then, I think I have the right to give what I think is a better answer to the achievement of quality education, which is what we all seek, and there is always more than one answer.

I think that quality education can be enhanced by better school facilities, lower pupil-teacher ratios, the improvement of the neighborhood, as such. Those are better answers, in my judgment, than busing under a court order.



Quality education can be achieved by more than one method. I was reading in the Washington Post this morning a column by one of the outstanding black columnists, Mr. Raspberry, and Mr. Raspberry has come to the conclusion that court ordered, forced busing, is not the way to achieve quality education for blacks or whites in a major metropolitan area.

That is a very significant decision by Mr. Raspberry, who I think Mr. Dudman, for example, highly respects.

QUESTION: I certainly do.

In Boston and Louisville, where the court has ordered busing, how well do you think the people of those two cities have conducted themselves in bringing about court ordered exchanges of black and white students?

THE PRESIDENT: There have been some disorders there over the last year or more.

QUESTION: I am thinking about this fall. There have been Federal agents there, of course, to try to maintain order. Are you reasonably well satisfied with the way things have happened or not?

THE PRESIDENT: So far, there has been a minimum of local disorder. I hope that that attitude can prevail in the months ahead as the police involvement and the Federal marshal involvement becomes less and less.

I am also an optimist, even though I disagree with the method by which they are trying to achieve quality education.

QUESTION: Are you counseling the people of those two cities to cooperate with the courts, or are you encouraging them to maintain their strong feelings in some cases that this is an improper solution?

THE PRESIDENT: Last year I did a televised tape urging the people of Boston to cooperate with the court and to maintain law and order. I did that then, and I have counseled everybody that I talked with in Boston to encourage their fellow Bostonians to obey the law and follow the court's action.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AT THE 18th BIENNIAL
NATIONAL FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN'S
CONVENTION, Dallas, Texas, September 13, 1975

Let me add at this point, if I might, the matter of deep concern to me -- a matter that I am positive is of deep concern to all, those here and 214 million Americans -- we have tried hard, we have written laws, we have appropriated money to accomplish quality education for the young in America. In 1954 the courts of this country decided that one way in their estimation to achieve that was court order forced busing. Now, regardless of how we individually may feel, the law of the land must be upheld.

But if I could give you a view that I have expressed, not just recently but for 10 or more years, there is a better way to achieve quality education in America than by forced busing. We can and we will find a better way.

We can increase pupil-teacher ratios; we can improve facilities, have more and better equipment, rely more heavily on the neighborhood school concept. There is a way and we must find it.



INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY
BOB ABERNETHY, JESS MARLOW
AND WARREN OLNEY, KNBC-TV
Century Plaza Hotel, Los
Angeles, California

September 20, 1975

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have said that State courts in their effort to integrate the schools have ignored less drastic alternatives than busing. What specifically do you mean -- which less drastic alternatives?

THE PRESIDENT: The Congress in 1974 approved what was labeled the Esch Amendment, laid out six or seven specific guidelines for the courts to follow. The last of the recommendation to achieve what the courts should do was busing -- court ordered forced busing to achieve racial integration. Those steps, and I was in the Congress part of that time and I signed the bill that became law, those steps include a magnetschool, utilization of the neighborhood school concept, the improvements of facilities, et cetera. I hope that in the future, as some course in the past, recent past, will utilize those guidelines rather than plunging into court ordered forced busing as the only option for the settlement of the segregation problem in the school.

QUESTION: The whole option to busing tends to get confused with racism and there are a lot of racial epithets and what not being thrown about on the protest line. Do you have anything to say about that? You are opposed to busing but how do you make the distinction?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think opposition to busing really has any relationship to racism on the part of most people. I think the best illustration, one of the rising young columnists in the country, Bill Raspberry, a black, has been most forceful and most constructive, I think, in opposing the court approach in many cases.

I have been opposed to busing as a means of achieving quality education from its inception. My record in the Congress in voting for civil rights legislation is a good one, so I believe that the real issue is quality education. It can be achieved better for disadvantaged people, minorities, by other means.

I have sought, through the support of the Esch amendment, through adequate funding, to help Boston and other communities where this problem exists, to upgrade their school system rather than to have this very controversial approach of forced busing.

QUESTION: Do you think it will be an issue in next year's campaign?

THE PRESIDENT: I hope it won't.

INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY
BOB ABERNETHY, JESS MARLOW
AND WARREN OLNEY, KNBC-TV
Century Plaza Hotel, Los
Angeles, California

September 20, 1975

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have said that State courts in their effort to integrate the schools have ignored less drastic alternatives than busing. What specifically do you mean -- which less drastic alternatives?

THE PRESIDENT: The Congress in 1974 approved what was labeled the Esch Amendment, laid out six or seven specific guidelines for the courts to follow. The last of the recommendation to achieve what the courts should do was busing -- court ordered forced busing to achieve racial integration. Those steps, and I was in the Congress part of that time and I signed the bill that became law, those steps include a magnet school, utilization of the neighborhood school concept, the improvements of facilities, et cetera. I hope that in the future, as some course in the past, recent past, will utilize those guidelines rather than plunging into court ordered forced busing as the only option for the settlement of the segregation problem in the school.

QUESTION: The whole option to busing tends to get confused with racism and there are a lot of racial epithets and what not being thrown about on the protest line. Do you have anything to say about that? You are opposed to busing but how do you make the distinction?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think opposition to busing really has any relationship to racism on the part of most people. I think the best illustration, one of the rising young columnists in the country, Bill Raspberry, a black, has been most forceful and most constructive, I think, in opposing the court approach in many cases.

I have been opposed to busing as a means of achieving quality education from its inception. My record in the Congress in voting for civil rights legislation is a good one, so I believe that the real issue is quality education. It can be achieved better for disadvantaged people, minorities, by other means.

I have sought, through the support of the Esch amendment, through adequate funding, to help Boston and other communities where this problem exists, to upgrade their school system rather than to have this very controversial approach of forced busing.

QUESTION: Do you think it will be an issue in next year's campaign?

THE PRESIDENT: I hope it won't.

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT REQUESTED
BY BOSTON MEDIA REPRESENTATIVES

October 12, 1974

Boston is a fine, proud City. The cradle of liberty. Where many of the freedoms that we all so cherish today in this Country, were born, 200 years ago. The people of Boston share a tradition for reason, fairness and respect for the rights of others. Now, in a difficult period for all of you, it is a time to reflect on all that your City means to you. To react in the finest tradition of your City's people. It is up to you, every one of you, every parent, child, to reject violence of any kind in your City. To reject hatred and the shrill voices of the violent few.

I know that nothing is more important to you than the safety of the children in Boston. And only your calm and thoughtful action now can guarantee that safety. I know that you will all work together for that goal. And have one more thing to be proud of in the cradle of liberty.

INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY LARRY
MOORE, KMBC-TV, GABE PRESSMAN, WNEW-TV,
ALAN SMITH, WTTG-TV, GILBERT AMUNDSON,
WTCH-TV, KENNETH JONES, KTTV-TV, and
HERB KLEIN, METROMEDIA, Century Plaza
Hotel, Los Angeles, California

October 30, 1975

QUESTION: Mr. President, school busing is a problem affecting Kansas City and many other cities in the country. You have not exactly endorsed school busing to achieve integration in the schools, but at the same time, you haven't exactly outlined an alternative.

What hopes can you hold out for cities like Kansas City that run the risk of losing millions of dollars in Federal aid in the not too distant future if they don't use school busing?

NEWS THE PRESIDENT: Really, I have spoken out consistently and for some time on this problem. I was one of the original Members of the House or the Senate that said that court-ordered forced busing to achieve racial balance was not the way to accomplish quality education.

That has been a consistent statement, view, policy of mine for a number of years. I believe it even more fervently today than I did before. So, we have to start out with the assumption that education, quality education, is what we are all seeking to accomplish.

Now, some people say we ought to spend more money, and I think there are programs where you can spend more money at the local level to upgrade schools in disadvantaged areas. There are others who say the long-range and, even to a substantial degree, short-range, is better distribution of housing, so we achieve integration in a different way and you can still rely on the neighborhood school system.

Dr. Coleman, who testified before the Senate Committee on Judiciary just a few days ago, had some thoughts on it. It is interesting that Dr. Coleman, who was an initial proponent of busing to achieve quality education, has now -- after studying the problem in a number of cities -- come to the conclusion that it is not the answer.

I don't think there is any patent medicine that can give us the answers, but I think we ought to spend whatever money is necessary for what we call magnet schools, to upgrade teachers to provide better facilities, to give greater freedom of choice. These are the things we ought to push hard.

QUESTION: There are those who say, including Congressman Jerry Littin from Kansas City, that a separate Department of Education should be established, taking it away from HEW.

Would you be in favor of establishing a separate Department of Education to handle the complex problems of busing?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that, in and of itself, is a solution. That sounds good. Maybe it ought to be justified on other grounds, but I don't think it is necessarily the answer to this problem.

INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY LARRY
MOORE, KMBC-TV, GABE PRESSMAN, WNEW-TV,
ALAN SMITH, WTTG-TV, GILBERT AMUNDSON,
WTCH-TV, KENNETH JONES, KTTV-TV, and
HERB KLEIN, METROMEDIA, Century Plaza
Hotel, Los Angeles, California

October 30, 1975

QUESTION: Mr. President, school busing is a problem affecting Kansas City and many other cities in the country. You have not exactly endorsed school busing to achieve integration in the schools, but at the same time, you haven't exactly outlined an alternative.

What hopes can you hold out for cities like Kansas City that run the risk of losing millions of dollars in Federal aid in the not too distant future if they don't use school busing?

NEWS THE PRESIDENT: Really, I have spoken out consistently and for some time on this problem. I was one of the original Members of the House or the Senate that said that court-ordered forced busing to achieve racial balance was not the way to accomplish quality education.

That has been a consistent statement, view, policy of mine for a number of years. I believe it even more fervently today than I did before. So, we have to start out with the assumption that education, quality education, is what we are all seeking to accomplish.

Now, some people say we ought to spend more money, and I think there are programs where you can spend more money at the local level to upgrade schools in disadvantaged areas. There are others who say the long-range and, even to a substantial degree, short-range, is better distribution of housing, so we achieve integration in a different way and you can still rely on the neighborhood school system.

Dr. Coleman, who testified before the Senate Committee on Judiciary just a few days ago, had some thoughts on it. It is interesting that Dr. Coleman, who was an initial proponent of busing to achieve quality education, has now -- after studying the problem in a number of cities -- come to the conclusion that it is not the answer.

I don't think there is any patent medicine that can give us the answers, but I think we ought to spend whatever money is necessary for what we call magnet schools, to upgrade teachers to provide better facilities, to give greater freedom of choice. These are the things we ought to push hard.

QUESTION: There are those who say, including Congressman Jerry Litten from Kansas City, that a separate Department of Education should be established, taking it away from HEW.

Would you be in favor of establishing a separate Department of Education to handle the complex problems of busing?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think that, in and of itself, is a solution. That sounds good. Maybe it ought to be justified on other grounds, but I don't think it is necessarily the answer to this problem.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AND QUESTION AND
ANSWER SESSION AT THE RECEPTION FOR
THE RADIO AND TELEVISION NEWS
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION, The State Floor

January 30, 1976

QUESTION: Mr. President, busing is very definitely in some States an issue in the campaign. You said previously that you didn't think it was the most agreeable answer to desegregation. Do you plan to propose any other alternative?

THE PRESIDENT: I never felt that court ordered busing was the proper answer to quality education. On the other hand, as President, I am obligated to see that the law is enforced. I signed a bill in 1974 or early 1975 that provided a list of steps that should be taken by the Executive Branch and the court has guidelines in resolving the problem of segregation in school systems. I think that the courts ought to follow those guidelines. I think the Executive Branch ought to follow those guidelines. If they do, I think it is a better way to achieve desegregation and to provide quality education.

QUESTION: Do you have any other alternative to forced busing as we now know it in several states?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the courts themselves are beginning to find some better answers. They have implemented, beginning this last week, a modified plan in the City of Detroit and to my knowledge there has been a minimum of difficulty.

Now what happened was the original order of two or three years ago was a very harsh order, it called for massive busing, not only in the City of Detroit but in the County of Wayne. A new judge took jurisdiction of that problem. He modified the court order, modified it very substantially, and apparently it is working. So I think some good judgment on the part of the courts following the guidelines set forth in what is called the Esch Amendment is the proper way to treat the problem.

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT AND QUESTION AND
ANSWER SESSION AT THE RECEPTION FOR
THE RADIO AND TELEVISION NEWS
DIRECTORS ASSOCIATION, The State Floor

January 30, 1976

QUESTION: Mr. President, busing is very definitely in some States an issue in the campaign. You said previously that you didn't think it was the most agreeable answer to desegregation. Do you plan to propose any other alternative?

THE PRESIDENT: I never felt that court ordered busing was the proper answer to quality education. On the other hand, as President, I am obligated to see that the law is enforced. I signed a bill in 1974 or early 1975 that provided a list of steps that should be taken by the Executive Branch and the court has guidelines in resolving the problem of segregation in school systems. I think that the courts ought to follow those guidelines. I think the Executive Branch ought to follow those guidelines. If they do, I think it is a better way to achieve desegregation and to provide quality education.

QUESTION: Do you have any other alternative to forced busing as we now know it in several states?

THE PRESIDENT: I think the courts themselves are beginning to find some better answers. They have implemented, beginning this last week, a modified plan in the City of Detroit and to my knowledge there has been a minimum of difficulty.

Now what happened was the original order of two or three years ago was a very harsh order, it called for massive busing, not only in the City of Detroit but in the County of Wayne. A new judge took jurisdiction of that problem. He modified the court order, modified it very substantially, and apparently it is working. So I think some good judgment on the part of the courts following the guidelines set forth in what is called the Esch Amendment is the proper way to treat the problem.



QUESTION: Mr. President, I would like you to share with us some of your thoughts on the educational system in our country; namely, do you feel that after two years of busing, the City of Boston now has a better system than two years ago and what are your thoughts on reintroducing prayer into the educational system of this country?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the last question first. I had the wonderful experience of being the Republican Minority Leader in the House of Representatives at the same time my very dear friend, who has now passed away, Senator Everett Dirksen, was the Minority Leader in the United States Senate. We were close personal friends. He and I both agreed that the decision of the United States Supreme Court in precluding non-denominational prayer in public schools was wrong. I think that it ought to be possible to have that kind of time set aside for a non-denominational reflection and prayer. I think it ought to be permitted. I strongly feel that way.

On the question of busing, the Supreme Court has tried to do two things: It has tried to provide quality education, it has tried to end segregation. Those are worthy objectives, I agree with that. I think the emphasis should be on quality education. The emphasis should be on ending segregation, but I think the Supreme Court, and our courts, particularly -- some courts have used the wrong remedies and I vigorously oppose them.

It is my feeling that there has been a developing attitude on the part of some of the courts, however, to take a more moderate view in exercising their Constitutional authority and handle the problem. Let me illustrate it very quickly. Three years ago we had a Federal judge in Detroit who was going to mass bus children from one county to another, not just from the suburbs to the city. He is no longer the judge handling that case. We now have a Federal judge who is handling it and he has understood the problem and the net result of his order which seeks to achieve quality education and desegregation is accepted by the people of Detroit because it is responsible, it is moderate.

So the courts have the authority, it is just that some judges don't seem to understand that it is counter-productive to go as far as they have gone. Therefore, I support what has been done in some cases and I vigorously oppose what has been done in others.

QUESTION: Might I add, sir, do you feel, then, that in the case of the City of Boston that Judge Garrity has overgone his limits?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say that I don't think it is appropriate for me to pick a certain Judge, whether he is right or wrong, and comment on his particular decision. I have an obligation. I took an oath of office to uphold the law of the land, and at least at this point what he has decided is the law of the land, whether I agree with his decision or not it is immaterial. I have an obligation to uphold the law of the land.

I have tried to explain my own personal philosophy and illustrate that in some parts of the country other judges have used their Constitutional remedy to be very effective in achieving both quality education, on the one hand, and desegregation on the other.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I would like you to share with us some of your thoughts on the educational system in our country; namely, do you feel that after two years of busing, the City of Boston now has a better system than two years ago and what are your thoughts on reintroducing prayer into the educational system of this country?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me answer the last question first. I had the wonderful experience of being the Republican Minority Leader in the House of Representatives at the same time my very dear friend, who has now passed away, Senator Everett Dirksen, was the Minority Leader in the United States Senate. We were close personal friends. He and I both agreed that the decision of the United States Supreme Court in precluding non-denominational prayer in public schools was wrong. I think that it ought to be possible to have that kind of time set aside for a non-denominational reflection and prayer. I think it ought to be permitted. I strongly feel that way.

On the question of busing, the Supreme Court has tried to do two things: It has tried to provide quality education, it has tried to end segregation. Those are worthy objectives, I agree with that. I think the emphasis should be on quality education. The emphasis should be on ending segregation, but I think the Supreme Court, and our courts, particularly -- some courts have used the wrong remedies and I vigorously oppose them.

It is my feeling that there has been a developing attitude on the part of some of the courts, however, to take a more moderate view in exercising their Constitutional authority and handle the problem. Let me illustrate it very quickly. Three years ago we had a Federal judge in Detroit who was going to mass bus children from one county to another, not just from the suburbs to the city. He is no longer the judge handling that case. We now have a Federal judge who is handling it and he has understood the problem and the net result of his order which seeks to achieve quality education and desegregation is accepted by the people of Detroit because it is responsible, it is moderate.

So the courts have the authority, it is just that some judges don't seem to understand that it is counter-productive to go as far as they have gone. Therefore, I support what has been done in some cases and I vigorously oppose what has been done in others.

QUESTION: Might I add, sir, do you feel, then, that in the case of the City of Boston that Judge Garrity has overgone his limits?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, let me say that I don't think it is appropriate for me to pick a certain Judge, whether he is right or wrong, and comment on his particular decision. I have an obligation. I took an oath of office to uphold the law of the land, and at least at this point what he has decided is the law of the land, whether I agree with his decision or not it is immaterial. I have an obligation to uphold the law of the land.

I have tried to explain my own personal philosophy and illustrate that in some parts of the country other judges have used their Constitutional remedy to be very effective in achieving both quality education, on the one hand, and desegregation on the other.

INTERVIEW WITH THE PRESIDENT BY THE BOSTON GLOBE,
In the Oval Office, February 21, 1976

QUESTION: We will begin with the Boston busing, specifically your request from HEW and Justice that you get some alternatives to busing and so forth -- any progress?

THE PRESIDENT: I received a memo a day or so ago with five or six alternatives. I have not had an opportunity to analyze the suggestions yet. It is a matter that is being currently studied right here in the Oval Office, but proposals and various options just came to me about 24 or 48 hours ago.

QUESTION: What were the five or six, can you at least tell us that?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think I really ought to discuss the proposals because they cover a wide range of suggestions, and until I have had an opportunity to sit down with the Attorney General and Secretary of HEW and get the benefit of the views of the Domestic Council, I think it is premature to even discuss the various options.



THE PRESIDENT: I have some reservations about that. The truth is, and I said that in a press conference or in a response to a question up in, I think it was, Dover yesterday that actually what the Supreme Court has ordered is that local district courts have a remedy to end segregation on the one hand and provide quality education in disadvantaged areas on the other.

Some judges have gone very far, others have shown a more moderate view in trying to apply that remedy. I refused, and I think properly so, not to identify any particular judge or any particular remedy used, but it is perfectly obvious that in some communities where one judge is used to remedy with moderation the problems have been resolved without tearing up the fabric of the community. What some judges have done is used, to a degree, the Esch Amendment, the seven steps or criteria that the Congress recommended, which I approved of. I feel very strongly that our principal emphasis should be on how you best achieve quality education, and the extreme view of some judges, I don't think, achieves that, and the extreme views of some judges has not, in my opinion, solved the problem of desegregation. So there is a remedy if it is properly used.

QUESTION: Without busing, Mr. President?

THE PRESIDENT: I think in some areas judges have used the remedy of busing without tearing up the fabric of the community and it depends upon the wisdom and the judiciousness of the judge who has to deal with reality.

QUESTION: One last question to wrap up on busing. These alternatives that you have here, when do you expect that you will unveil them?

THE PRESIDENT: I always hesitate to put a deadline, but I would say it would take us --

QUESTION: After the Massachusetts primary?

THE PRESIDENT: It would take us until some time next month to come to some resolution of whether any one or any part of these recommendations would --

QUESTION: One other thing, Mr. President. Have these come from both the HEW and the Justice Departments?

THE PRESIDENT: I have ordered them to undertake the review and I think they are the combination of their joint efforts.

QUESTION: I would like to clear up one more matter on the busing issue, which we opened with. You mentioned how you had these proposals and were going to study them, but you seem to leave open the option that as much as you favor the search for alternatives to busing you might not get into it at all. Is that a fair assessment?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't think I should pre-judge precisely what I am going to do. The alternatives cover a wide range of options and they might take any one of several courses of action but to pre-judge it now I think would be unwise.

QUESTION: Let me just add this one thing. I read a letter to the editor in our paper relating to the violence in Boston last Sunday, and this person said, "This is what happens when you have policy made by the Judiciary instead of the Legislative Branch."

Is it your objective that you could convince Congress to do something in this field so that at least the will of the people could feel represented and not under the thumb of the Federal Judiciary?

THE PRESIDENT: Under our system of Government when you have three coordinate branches and there is a constitutional issue involved and the court has made a finding, even if I disagree, I think the President, first, has an obligation to enforce the law despite any disagreement I have. It would be far better if we could find a solution outside of the court administration -- it would be far better.

Certainly the handling of the administration of a local school system by the Federal Judiciary, I think, is very annoying to literally thousands of people because the public, for almost 200 years, has believed that the education of their children is primarily the responsibility of the community and it is such a stark contrast between that concept which is so deeply engrained with the opposite where a single judge is running a school system. I think that is one of the basic problems, and if we can somehow find an answer that gets away from that, it would be a lot more acceptable to the public.

QUESTION: I know you are very clear about enforcing the law, I am not trying to trip you up on that, but if you lived in a school jurisdiction where a court order had been laid down for busing and your children were going to public schools, would you send them to private schools or move out of the jurisdiction or do something to avoid that yourself?

THE PRESIDENT: That is a very good question. All of our children were brought up and went to school in Alexandria, Virginia, and with the exception of our daughter who went one year to a private school, all of our children started in the first grade because they don't have any kindergarten.

The three boys went from first grade through high school; Susan went from first grade to, I think, the tenth grade, she went one year to private school and then one year there and one year to a private school when we were here.

But Alexandria was either under a court order or under administrative action taken by HEW and they had an imposed restriction of their school system and had substantial busing and our children went to those schools during that period of time. None of our children went to private schools as a result of that action either taken by the court or by HEW.

QUESTION: Were they bused as such or did they go on their own?

THE PRESIDENT: The boys -- Steve had a carry thing, but Susan was bused.

QUESTION: She was. If you had elementary school children who would have to be bused in a particular jurisdiction, would you stand for that?

THE PRESIDENT: I can only reiterate what we did under the circumstances.

QUESTION: Right.

THE PRESIDENT: I think I would rather go by the way we handled it rather than any speculation.