

**The original documents are located in Box 47, folder “1975/06/26 - President and Jim Lynn” 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 Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

PRESIDENTIAL MEETING WITH JIM LYNN  
and JIM CANNON  
Thursday, June 26, 1975  
2:00 p.m.  
Oval Office



## Talking Points on Auto Emissions

- You have tentatively decided to stick with the current standards for the next five model years through 1981. This decision would be conveyed to the Hill as a Presidential recommendation which resulted from an interagency information gathering effort.
- At this stage of the game, while I think that decision was correct (indeed, you will recall that Bill Simon and I are for the less restrictive, Canadian standards), a number of events have occurred which leads me to question whether making such a recommendation remains a viable alternative. These events are
  - The House committee has now opted for relatively strict standards.
  - The Senate committee markup this week is moving ahead toward strict standards.
  - The executive agencies -- EPA, CEQ and HEW -- as well as the National Academy of Sciences have strongly discounted the danger of sulfuric acid emissions, which was the basic rationale for your changing to less restrictive standards from your January 30 announcement.
- Consequently, I have the feeling that it would do little good -- indeed it might be counterproductive-- for you to make specific recommendations to the Congress that the current standards be maintained for the next five years. Clearly, you will be accused of having a "stand-pat" attitude toward environmental issues (after your strip mining veto and failure to push land use legislation) and, as a Michigander, you will be cast as a co-conspirator with the Detroit auto companies in maintaining the status quo.
- Short of coming out with concrete five year recommendations, two other options ought to be considered
  - endorse Russ Train's March 9 two-stage suggestion (would continue current standards for two years and go to tougher standards for the next three -- but not as tough as the standards currently in the law) except for NOX which would be maintained at the current 3.1 level through the next two years, or

- call for Congressional attention -- and possibly further hearings -- on three key issues
  - the relationship between emission standards and ambient air quality standards
  - the danger of sulfuric acid mist emissions, and
  - the three-way trade off between energy use/cost/ambient air quality;

if asked where you come down on concrete recommendations, simply say that if these considerations are given due attention in the light of the information currently available to the Executive Branch, no change in the next several years in existing standards would seem indicated -- but you want to look at these three issues together with the Congress.



THE WHITE HOUSE

*in by full*  
DECISION

WASHINGTON

June 24, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR: THE PRESIDENT  
FROM: JIM CANNON *J.C.*  
SUBJECT: AUTO EMISSIONS

BACKGROUND

Just prior to your departure for Europe, you decided to:

1. Send to Congress, upon their return from the Memorial Day recess, a detailed statement of the environmental, energy, health and cost trade-offs concerning automobile emissions, but hold off making a specific recommendation for legislation until after committee hearings have been completed.
2. On the substance of the issue, you indicated a preference for a five-year extension of the current emission standards.

The committee work is now drawing to a close. The detailed statement pointing out the choices has not been transmitted, because both subcommittees involved (Muskie and Rogers) are proceeding to mark up without calling additional witnesses. These bills are now moving quickly.

Both committees appear headed towards recommending much tighter emission standards. We understand that the Rogers Subcommittee has not decided where to come out, but the Muskie Subcommittee, according to our information, is likely to recommend adherence with the 1978 statutory standards.

If final Congressional action is anywhere near this position, it will seriously jeopardize your energy goal of a 40% improvement in auto efficiency by 1980. Furthermore, such a decision raises substantial health questions concerning the emission of sulfuric acid mist.

Our best chance to focus attention on the energy-pollution-health-cost trade-offs will be when the House bill is considered by the full Commerce Committee and when the Senate bill goes to the floor.

#### ISSUES FOR DECISION

The purpose of this memorandum is to present two issues for your decision.

- A. Should you now transmit to Congress a specific recommendation on the auto emissions issue?
- B. If so, what form should it take?

#### DISCUSSION

1. Should you transmit a specific recommendation to the Congress on auto emissions to continue the present standards for five years?

##### Arguments in Favor

Neither the Senate nor the House subcommittees are expected to call additional witnesses on the impact of strict emission standards on fuel efficiency although they both have a letter on this from FEA. Both committees appear headed towards recommending tighter emission standards.

Submission at this time of a statement of facts only, without a recommendation, probably would not be viable because it would raise more questions than it would answer. If the committees are not going to hold additional hearings, in which they consider the energy impact of their emissions decision, there would be no forum to debate your statement of facts. Furthermore, Administration



spokesmen could expect to be barraged with questions as to where you come out on the issue, and we could not make the response that you wanted to wait until additional evidence was heard by Congress. As a practical matter, a statement by you, along with a specific recommendation, is probably necessary if we are to have any influence on the final outcome.

### Arguments Against

EPA's John Quarles (Russ Train is out of the country), argues that if you take a position, your recommendation should be an endorsement of the Train announcement of March 5, which would impose a set of standards which are stricter than the existing levels, but less strict than your "modified California" proposal in January. They argue that Congress is more likely to respond to the Administration recommendation if you and Train are together. However, Frank Zarb, Jim Lynn and others feel that the Train position will prevent us from achieving our energy objectives.

Another point to consider is how you are perceived by environmentalists. The Hathaway nomination and the strip mine veto have resulted in criticism of your policies. Your decision on the auto emissions question will be controversial--perhaps eclipsing the strip mine veto. Therefore, you may wish to separate yourself from this decision as much as possible by just issuing a generalized statement of facts and leaving specific recommendations up to other Administration officials.

In essence, this would mean stating the facts, but no conclusions. Such a statement should stress: (1) achieving ambient air quality standards does not require strict auto standards; (2) sulfuric acid mist problems, and (3) the fuel efficiency trade-off.

2. If you decide to make a specific recommendation to the Congress, what form should it take?

This issue is:

Should you issue a statement personally, or should this be done by a subordinate?

Arguments That You Should Issue the Statement

This subject is of enormous importance to all Americans, as it touches their lives directly on a familiar issue. It involves the trade-off between conflicting national objectives, none of which fall under the sole responsibility of a subordinate official within your Administration. In short, this is exactly the type of inter-related decision involving many trade-offs which should be made by the President.

Arguments Against a Presidential Recommendation

This is going to be a controversial decision, regardless of which way you come down. This matter involves technical data and conclusions, much of which is in controversy, and much of the subject matter is simply unknown. Therefore, any Statement of Facts and conclusions are bound to be attacked as to their accuracy.

OPTIONS

1. Release Statement of Facts and make specific recommendation to the Congress freezing the current standards for five years.

Recommend: Seidman, FEA (Zausner), DOT (Barnum),  
Cannon  
Approve  \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

Release statement of facts without recommendation.

Recommend: EPA (Quarles)  
Approve \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

2. If it is decided to make a specific recommendation at this time: package it as a Presidential message or statement (draft message at Tab A).

Recommend: Seidman, FEA (Zausner), DOT (Barnum),  
Cannon  
Approve  \_\_\_\_\_ Disapprove \_\_\_\_\_

Transmit from the appropriate Cabinet official.

Recommend:

Approve

Disapprove

Four and a half months ago, I sent to Congress my proposed Energy Independence Act of 1975. As a part of that comprehensive legislative proposal, I recommended that the Congress modify the Clean Air Act of 1970, concerning emissions from automobiles. I proposed strict pollution levels which would still permit this Nation to achieve one of my energy goals, which is a 40% improvement in automobile fuel efficiency within four years.

Since that time, information has been provided to me concerning potential health hazards from certain automobile pollution control devices first used on 1975 cars. In response to the serious issues raised by even the possibility of any such hazards, I ordered a review of the questions raised within the Executive Branch. I asked the appropriate Executive Branch officials to consider the various impacts of a range of emission alternatives on public health, energy goals, consumer prices and environmental objectives.

This review has now been completed. We have surveyed this entire subject matter, with many scientists and other experts, and find little agreement on the data or conclusions. There is, however, general agreement that we really cannot yet predict with precision which adverse impacts are likely to result if we now move to stricter automobile pollution standards. Most of the experts also agree that tighter

Four and a half months ago, I sent to Congress my proposed Energy Independence Act of 1975. As a part of that comprehensive legislative proposal, I recommended that the Congress modify the Clean Air Act of 1970, concerning emissions from automobiles. I proposed strict pollution levels which would still permit this Nation to achieve one of my energy goals, which is a 40% improvement in automobile fuel efficiency within four years.

Since that time, information has been provided to me concerning potential health hazards from certain automobile pollution control devices first used on 1975 cars. In response to the serious issues raised by even the possibility of any such hazards, I ordered a review of the questions raised within the Executive Branch. I asked the appropriate Executive Branch officials to consider the various impacts of a range of emission alternatives on public health, energy goals, consumer prices and environmental objectives.

This review has now been completed. We have surveyed this entire subject matter, with many scientists and other experts, and find little agreement on the data or conclusions. There is, however, general agreement that we really cannot yet predict with precision which adverse impacts are likely to result if we now move to stricter automobile pollution standards. Most of the experts also agree that tighter



emission controls will limit the fuel economy potential of our cars, and all agree that they will increase costs to the consumer.

It is relatively easy to state the problem.

As the automobile manufacturers have responded to Federal requirements to remove pollutants from the car's exhaust, other unregulated pollutants with potentially serious health implications have been produced. The same devices which would help to control some emissions may result in the creation or aggravation of other emissions/pollutants. The result of government-mandated changes to our automobiles could then be further increases in their price tag, without substantial environmental benefits and with possible new risk to the Nation's health.

As a result of actions already taken, the automobile is rapidly becoming less of a contributor to air pollution. A major part of our task is behind us, but it was also the easiest part. We have now reached the point where the further incremental progress we all want can only be achieved slowly, and at higher cost. The relatively short distance remaining is a very rough road indeed.

I therefore urge Congress to consider how Federal laws mandating automobile fuel efficiency and emission control might work against each other, and how, cumulatively, they will impact on other national objectives such as public health and maintaining a strong economy.



In view of all of these considerations, I have decided that the position my Administration has already taken in the Energy Independence Act must be revised. We simply cannot afford to be wrong, or hesitant, where such serious issues are at stake. I have concluded that we should maintain the current automobile emission standards for five years. This will enable us to achieve the following objectives:

- ° Safety. Avoid increasing the potential adverse health impacts of certain automobile emission devices by retaining current controls on known health hazards, such as carbon monoxide and hydrocarbons, without the risk of increasing other imperfectly understood but potentially dangerous pollutants such as sulfuric acid.
- ° Energy. Achieve a 40%, or greater, increase in automobile fuel efficiency by 1980.
- ° Environment. Achieve almost all the environmental objectives we would have achieved by going to stricter standards.
- ° Cost. Minimize the inflationary impact of Federal regulations on the cost of automobiles to consumers.
- ° Economy. Assist needed revival of U.S. automobile industry.

I recognize that this position modifies the auto emission standards contained in my proposed Energy Independence Act of 1975 which I transmitted to Congress on January 30. However, as pointed out in recent testimony during Congressional hearings, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency has



already noted that it is necessary to adjust the strict emission standards that I proposed. Administrator Train concluded after hearings conducted by EPA that sulfuric acid mist is emitted from cars equipped with catalytic converters, which most new cars have in order to meet the EPA emission standards. The Administrator and the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare, concluded that this is a potentially serious health hazard.

Evidence brought out at the EPA hearings and by other government reports, shows that levels of emissions from current catalytic converters do not emit sufficient sulfuric acid so as to constitute any immediate danger. However, if the auto emission standards are further lowered, as would be required if no change is made in the current law, then a modified catalytic converter is likely to be used. This could produce substantially more sulfuric acid. This poses a health risk which my advisers conclude we should not accept.

The Nation needs a long-term automobile fuel and emission control policy so that we can begin to build cars which will meet responsible energy and environmental standards. By getting on with the job of replacing the current fleet with the more fuel efficiency and less polluting new cars, we will be making substantial progress towards our goals of better fuel efficiency, less pollution and economic recovery.

Nothing could be more intolerable than delay in resolving the conflict between Federal energy and environmental policies





and laws. Such delays will only contribute to further economic disruption and the continuing unacceptable levels of unemployment. Lack of a comprehensive and balanced policy would allow one objective to go forward only at the expense of other critical national goals.

It may very well be that additional government standards, such as regulating the sulfuric acid emissions, will be required in future years. This is something which EPA and other government agencies will work on closely with the appropriate committees of Congress.

However, it is clear that we cannot duck our responsibility to make decisions now that establish realistic ground rules. We cannot afford to ignore the sulfuric acid problem, but our response must be more than simply another government decree, setting another standard, that could create another problem. We have a positive obligation to ensure that the steps we take today do not aggravate potentially serious health hazards.

Other technical information was brought to my attention as I reached my automobile emissions decision. In addition to a statement of facts, which I am making public today, I have asked my key advisers in this area to consult with the appropriate members of Congress, particularly the committees now considering legislation in this field. They will be available to discuss these complex and interrelated issues and to provide all the detailed information available to the Executive Branch.



I urge the Congress to carefully consider all the issues involved in the potential conflict that one national objective, attaining clean air, might have on our efforts to reach other goals.






THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

June 20, 1975

ADMINISTRATIVELY CONFIDENTIAL

MEMORANDUM FOR: JIM CANNON  
FROM: JIM CONNOR   
SUBJECT: Domestic Council Committee on  
Illegal Aliens

The President has reviewed your memorandum of June 16th on the above subject and the following recommendations were approved:

Option 2 - Immediate Comprehensive Approach

Option 3 - Review of Immigration and Work Entry  
Laws

Please follow-up with appropriate action.

cc: Don Rumsfeld

June 16, 1975

MEMORANDUM FOR:

THE PRESIDENT

FROM:

JIM CANNON *JWC*

SUBJECT:

Domestic Council Committee on Illegal AliensBACKGROUND:

On January 6, 1975, you established the Domestic Council Committee on Illegal Aliens to develop, coordinate and present policy issues that cut across agency lines to provide better programs for dealing with the national problem of illegal aliens. The meetings of the Committee have revealed the current total lack of solid data on the problem and the difficulty in obtaining it. The Committee is divided on its future course -- whether it should adopt a limited, methodical approach which would take several years to carry out or attempt a quicker resolution with several attendant risks. Your guidance is necessary to resolve this impasse.

OPTIONS:

There are two competing alternatives for the Committee's future activities and a non exclusive third option.

1. Limited Step by Step Approach:

A limited option would be to establish a legislative strategy for the passage of the Rodino Bill, which establishes penalties for the employment of illegal aliens, and determine a position on the Kennedy Bill, which would confer legal status on illegals who have resided in the United States for more than three years. The Committee would also monitor an Immigration and Naturalization study, currently awaiting Congressional appropriations approval, which would identify the number, location and employment patterns of illegals in the United States. Following completion of this preliminary study and building on the data it provides, a series of impact studies could then be devised, if considered necessary, to examine the effect of illegal aliens in areas like jobs, schools, social welfare, etc.



Pro - This option would permit a positive step by step approach without incurring great additional costs or creating mandates for further action. It would furnish data necessary to establishing the parameters of the problem and for the formulation of a logical sequence of studies leading to solutions.

Con - It is a limited approach to the problem and would not do much before the election to solve the larger accompanying economic and social impact of the pressure of illegal aliens apart from establishing sanctions against employment.

2. Immediate Comprehensive Approach:

An alternative approach would encompass the legislative and monitoring activities outlined above plus the immediate commencement of long-range impact studies to examine such problems as:

- a. What are the cost effects of illegal aliens on social services like welfare, unemployment insurance, health delivery and education?
- b. What is the cultural and social impact of illegal aliens on areas in which they settle? Do they make contributions to the communities in which they concentrate or are they parasites?
- c. What is the effect of the illegal aliens influx on our foreign policy and international relations? (This question would be examined in concert with the Secretary of State's Interagency Committee for Study of Problems Related to Illegal Mexican Migration into the United States.)
- d. How many and what type of jobs do the illegals take away and in what industries? Can these jobs be filled by Americans and is the U.S. labor force adequate and willing to work in jobs now occupied by illegal aliens?

Pro - It would provide a large body of background data and accelerate your Administration's efforts to deal with the problem.

Con - This proposal would take time, money and the commitment of a full time staff of agency personnel or consultants. The impact studies could heighten tensions among Spanish speaking groups and the results, particularly in the social services area, could produce evidence of the inordinate cost of illegal aliens on state and local governments. This could create pressures for Federal subsidies to ease the problem.



Review of Immigration and Work Entry Laws:

An option, not excluded by adoption of either of the preceding two, would be an examination of current laws covering immigration and admission of aliens for employment. This study would seek to determine whether or not liberalizing these laws would remove the influx of illegals and their impact on the economy. It could review the policies of other countries in this regard, notably Europe, and evaluate the old Federal "Bracero" employment program, in which Mexican citizens were allowed entry for employment under a quota system.

Pro - Would provide the data for a "legalistic" solution to the problem by examining the feasibility of admitting more aliens as immigrants and legal workers.

Con - The study could incur the opposition of organized labor to whom the "Bracero" program was an anathema.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Option 1 (Limited Step by Step Approach)

- Levi, Buchen, Marsh, Seidman

Option 2 (Immediate Comprehensive Approach)

- Dunlop, Lynn, Cannon

Option 3 (Review of Immigration and Work Entry Laws) - Levi, Buchen, Marsh, Lynn, Cannon

DECISION:

Option 1 \_\_\_\_\_ or Option 2 \_\_\_\_\_

.....

Option 3    Yes \_\_\_\_\_    No \_\_\_\_\_



*D*



\* Who to  
put in  
charge of  
putting together  
plans stop  
on it?

---

UP for Committee  
at time

