

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

NOVEMBER 15, 1975

Office of the Vice President
(Minneapolis, Minnesota)

QUESTION AND ANSWER PERIOD
AT THE MINNESOTA METROPOLITAN COLLEGE CLUB LUNCHEON
REGISTRY HOTEL BALLROOM
MINNEAPOLIS, MINNESOTA

(AT 1:25 P.M. CST)

QUESTION: Now we will go to the questions.
You have all been very patient.

Thank you very much, Mr. Vice President. We would like to, as I said, start out with a group of questions from the panel. I hope the audience will hold its questions until the panel has had a chance, and then it will, as we promised, be open to questions from the floor.

I would like to start with Sandy Hale.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, this is not a question in regard to your speech. We will come back to that probably.

I was curious how you view national sentiment in regard to any Federal assistance to New York City.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Very simple. New York City has, as all cities in our State, the State itself, to present a balanced budget. It is under the constitution of the State. I guess that is true in most States around the country.

For 15 years I worked with the city officials. We used to have a three-day session in Albany with the city officials, the Mayor, the Council, the Board of Estimate, and the leaders of the Legislature and the Executive Branch, and it was sort of like a labor negotiation.

We would go around the clock for three days and come up with a budget for the city. They have a difficult situation. There isn't a political organization in New York City that is strong enough to be able to make decisions.

The very wide range of union organizations has really greater strength than does the structure of the government itself, in either party. So they need to go to an outside force to get support on the tough things and be able to say well, we had to do them, and then they can go back and do them. So we worked it out each year.

But they did manage to overestimate their income and underestimate their expenditures. The result was they had developed a float, a deficit, which they covered with short-term notes.

Those accumulated. They built up to about three billion two. Then what happened was that the State stepped in, this last administration, and set up a board which was

MORE

to approve both the revenue estimates and the budget, and then this was to be adopted and it was to restore fiscal integrity and the balanced budget by 1978.

Knowing the situation pretty intimately, I had said that I thought at that point there would be need for financial help in the form of a guarantee of some kind by the government during that three-year period because it was before they would have restored their viability and credibility with the buyers of bonds on the market.

It just seemed to me the sound way to go about it. It would be taking maybe a government guarantee.

The President doesn't have the authority to do that. Therefore, the Congress has to act. Where the apparent difference between the President and myself was was that he didn't think they would have the political muscle, or whatever you want to call it, to do this and, therefore, the only way they would come to these organizations would be through bankruptcy and being forced to do it. Therefore, he called for a change in the laws for bankruptcy.

The Mayor and Governor had been down two months ago with a drafted revision -- the Governor is the former Congressman -- a drafted revision of a bankruptcy law. They didn't want to talk about it publicly because it seemed to be an admission of failure.

This is essential, too. There is a need for Congress to act on both of these. I have the faith that the city will take the necessary steps. If they don't, then the other would result, and there ought to be a law which permits them then to reorganize on an orderly basis.

We are at the moment right now of truth, and we don't know which way it is going to go. The President really can't do anything until the Congress has acted. So the Congress has front-line responsibility, and the President has to make the decisions after that.

It is unfolding, but I have a feeling that maybe this is a very good example to the whole country. I do have to say, I am sure Bill will understand, that the Congress has been doing exactly what New York City has been doing, only on a larger scale. They are up to a \$60 billion deficit.

(Applause.)

I am sure he is voting against these things. The President has had the courage to veto a lot of very popular measures. But he is doing it because he thinks, and rightly so, that inflation, which is incurred by deficit spending, is the most insidious force, the most insidious tax that was ever invented, because it hits those least able to pay: senior citizens who are retired, on pensions, or social security; people who work whose buying power of their wages is destroyed.

Therefore, he says, number one, we have to stop inflation. The only way we can do it, or one of the major

MORE

ways, is to stop the deficits. He is supported by a very strong group in Congress. They have supported him on many of these things.

But this is where we go through the learning process in a democracy. I have to think this is all part of the democratic process. Churchill said it was the most inefficient form of government, but still nobody had ever invented a better one. I think he was right.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, in your public career, you have been a leader in encouraging better housing for people.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Some people today feel that the housing market, a very important part of the economy, is almost in a depression.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: It is.

QUESTION: What can be done about it and what do you see ahead?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I have to say as one who has really worked for a long time in this field, and we created two government corporations on a self-liquidating basis, the Housing Finance Agency and the Urban Development Corporation.

My father before had tried to develop low-cost housing on a private enterprise basis, which had been a disaster.

But one has to say that there isn't enough tax money in this country to be able to build all the housing that is necessary. Therefore, we have got to be able to channel private savings back into housing. This has got to be encouraged.

One of the methods which is used in many countries is to channel the money that goes into pension savings pension savings with appropriate guarantees, because at about \$9 billion a year in savings and about \$300 billion or \$400 billion accumulate, which is now going, importantly, into the stock market and it has pushed the stock market prices to a point where instead of 10 times the earnings they are running at 20 times the earnings. It is really a gamble instead of an investment.

I think this is a very real and interesting possibility here. In many countries this is where the funds for housing comes, through pension funds.

So I think that we have got to find ways of channeling private capital into this field.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, getting back to the energy bill, with America's growing need for energy, what type of a foreign policy is America developing with Zaire, Angola, and Manila?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Are you thinking of these countries in relation to energy or in relation to just our relations with them generally?

QUESTION: As far as the energy crisis is concerned.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The developing countries have been hit worse than anybody, really, by this energy problem. The mystery to me is how they stood with the Arabs at the United Nations, because they are the ones paying a 500 and 600 percent increase. They have to import food as well because their population is growing faster than their food production. They are really over a barrel.

What the President and Secretary of State have been trying to do is get the consumers and producers together to try and work out an effective, intelligent policy.

I think that there is within that framework a tremendous possibility of developing agricultural productions in these countries which are growing, the populations are growing so fast, with the technology that exists today, with the capital that is accumulating in the Arab countries, or the OPEC countries, and with the cooperation of the countries themselves.

The Mediterranean was the great wheat-producing basin for the Roman Empire. That has been lost.

But you can make fresh water out of salt water, with atomic power plants, desalination, irrigation, transportation, storage, and processing.

To me this can be one of the most exciting projects for international cooperation that exists anywhere, and that we have got to find means of working together to accomplish the objectives to help the peoples of all of these countries. Food is basic.

QUESTION: May we take one more question from the panel?

QUESTION: Would you comment, please, on your views of the current contempt citations by the House Intelligence Committee against Secretary of State Kissinger?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Would I comment on the contempt citations of Secretary Kissinger by the House Committee investigating the intelligence structure.

Well, I was Chairman for President Ford of the committee investigating alleged massive violations of domestic statutes by the CIA. We made a thorough investigation, and if there were violations, they were not massive. We made recommendations.

I have to say to you that we are living in a tough world, and there is a gray area in this world between

diplomacy and war which is this whole area of covert activities. It is a very active area, let's face it. Take Angola right now. It is a known fact that both Cuban and Algerian money and Soviet equipment are pouring in there and that there is a struggle going on, an ideological struggle, and that is what really is called covert action by nations that are involved.

What one tries to do through this, depending on the objectives of the nation, is to preserve freedom or to destroy it, and the struggle goes on in this form.

To answer the question specifically, this is an area which is in conflict with our sort of concepts as a free, open democratic society, but it is a gray area that exists in reality in the world.

One can stay out of it and then wait until you get to military confrontation, or one can defend one's own national interest contributing to this. So one has to just weigh them.

My feeling is if you are going to have an intelligence organization, it has got to be operated on the basis of secrecy, because how do you get people to give information if their names are going to be printed in the Congressional Record and they may well have their heads cut off or be shot in the country in which they live and from which they give the information.

It does two things. It dries up the sources and endangers the lives of people who cooperated. I don't think there is anything that isn't known. I think that the temptation is very great for an individual to demand additional information and, if that information was held in total confidence, then there is no problem.

Our committee recommended there be a joint select committee of the Congress, Senate and House together; all of them would be cleared for security, and the staff cleared for security; and that they have all the information about the intelligence system.

I think this is essential because we have a democratic system with two coequal branches of government. But when one branch gets information and then leaks the information to the detriment of our national interest, then we have got problems. I think that is where we are now.

I think the Secretary and the President are right. There is no reason to hand over these minutes, and this is part of very attractive publicity. We are doing this all with headlines. No other country in the world would do this, but in the United States we have been doing it for a long time. Everybody now has all the facts, and what they need to do is to come to the conclusions and wind this up. But let's not destroy a very essential element of our national security.

That is the way I feel about it. So I support the President and the Secretary very strongly in this. I know their plight very well.

QUESTION: A couple of years ago you launched a Commission on Critical Choices for America.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Yes, sir.

QUESTION: Could you give us an update?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The reason I resigned as Governor after 15 years was because I didn't think the problems of the people of New York State or this country or the world were going to be solved in Albany, New York. So I wanted to devote myself to these problems, and get a group of representatives of citizens from all over the country to try and see what are the critical choices Americans face and what are the options.

We have now signed a contract with the publisher and we will be starting very shortly. The material will be published in probably 10 volumes, covering all of these different subjects: energy, raw materials, food, health, international aspects.

We have a very interesting series on each one of the five continents of the world. We did it functionally and geographically, taking an analysis of the situation in the region: military, economic, political, social; and taking the subjects by subject: military, economic, social and political. So that I hope they will be useful.

We have about 50 professors involved from both this country and abroad in preparing the material, and people from science. There is a very interesting paper by Hans Mark, a doctor who is head of the Ames NASA Laboratory, on the importance of science and technology.

In fact, he feels very strongly, and I agree with him, that science and technology is the thing for the future of America. This is our one great strength in which we can preserve supremacy and stay out in front. We have peculiar ability as a people in this field. He has a marvelous paper on this subject which will be one of the papers published.

QUESTION: Just one last question. Who do you think is the most powerful man in American politics today?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I have a feeling that there is some diffusion in power in the politics of America.

(Laughter.)

That always takes place. However, there is no question that the one who holds the greatest power as an individual is the President of the United States, under the Constitution of the United States.

So that if you are talking about power in terms of government responsibility, it is the President. If you are talking about politics, we have to wait until the elections.

(Applause and Laughter.)

MORE

QUESTION: The Vice President has offered to take questions from the floor. When he recognizes you, would you please stand and state your question so that all can hear?

QUESTION: Thank you, Mr. Vice President. A little background. Mr. Bechtel working in Kansas City under a government contract was working on the coal slurry pipeline project for the Energy Research and Development Corporation.

Mr. Bechtel's company and Lever Brothers owns 40 percent of the company known as ETSI, or the Energy Transport System, Inc., and the Kansas-Nebraska Mutual owns the other 20 percent. The purpose of the coal slurry pipeline is for the Miami coal fields.

They are seeking legislation for the slurry pipeline. There seems to be a basic conflict of interest, and millions of tax dollars will be used to do research study and development for a system. Enormous amounts of water will be used in areas of the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Wisconsin.

There is basic transportation systems now functioning in operation that can be utilized that will use less of our natural resources in energy. What is your opinion on the coal slurry pipeline project?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I would go to one comment you made, that the major beneficiaries will be the companies involved. I would have to assume that the major beneficiaries, being able to transfer non-sulfur coal from the West to the East Coast, where we are totally dependent on oil, to substitute coal, will be the people of this country.

If you believe in a free enterprise system and the creativity and the imagination of entrepreneurship, then I don't think we want to substitute it with bureaucracy.

I happen to feel the major thing the American people are fed up with today is bureaucracy and red tape by the Federal Government, or all government, really, but mostly the Federal Government.

(Applause.)

I understand the concern. We had a very interesting experience when I was Governor. We had to take competitive bids on everything. You had to take the low bidder.

This turned out to be, in many cases, a disaster because the low bidder often turned out to be people who were not qualified, although we tried to determine their qualification. They just didn't have the experience and qualification on that particular work.

Therefore, it ended up costing us a lot more because of failures in the process. I don't really know the details except as you have given them on this particular situation. I would assume from what you say this is a new method of transportation, moving coal through pipes with water, and that there are people who have studied it, and that they

MORE

have knowledge and that the government is trying to get the benefit of the knowledge in order to use that knowledge for the purpose of encouraging action in this area.

I don't happen to know whether there are other companies that are qualified to make a study and have the experience that would be valuable when they finish the study. A lot of people are glad to learn by getting a contract from the government.

(Laughter.)

But I am not sure what they contribute. So it is very hard to judge, but you are putting your finger on the most important question. This is unfortunately the loss of confidence in people in government and in business and in all of our institutions. We are getting over it, but we have been through a traumatic period.

So I am not really in a position to make an intelligent judgment on this subject. But I do think that through observation, government operations are no more efficient, if you can put it that way, than private; and if properly controlled, to protect the interest of the people within a framework of laws, that private enterprise is far more flexible, far more creative, more willing to take the risks to come up with new ideas, than the government is.

The government is a bureaucratic system. Nobody can make a decision. It comes up through this mass of human beings. I have been in government most of my life, so I am not talking against anybody but myself. The only way that many individuals can exercise their own sense of power is to be negative, is to disapprove something. They can't do anything positively, but they can stop it. You can get a great sense of power out of stopping something.

But that is not what America needs. We need to do things. We need to go. We need to roll and get back to where we had been and to what has made this Nation great.

The best way to get this slurry operation going, I don't know. But I know that in this business of moving non-sulfur coal from the West to the East, the railroads at the present time, according to the Department of Transportation, need about \$11 billion spent on their right-of-ways, their tracks, which haven't been maintained; and that today you can't move a coal car at more than 10 miles an hour. That has got to be a waste, because you are afraid of accidents.

So one of the things which was put in this bill the President proposed, Energy Independence Authority, was the right to help, through investment or guarantees, railroads rehabilitate their tracks so you can move coal.

Another thing is the assistance to help finance the construction of coal cars if the companies haven't got the credit to build them. We have got to learn how the government and private can work together in the best interest of our country. We have a lot of things to learn.

MORE

You are putting your finger on one of the very sensitive areas, and we haven't really learned yet. The Japanese have got a much more sophisticated system where government, private enterprise, finance, and labor work together. They make their decisions through other complicated processes.

If you had a totalitarian process in a country, then the government makes the whole decision, because they control it. They can't get the creativity because there isn't the freedom of action. Therefore, they have to go outside of their countries, as I mentioned earlier, to get the manufacturing facilities from the free countries.

So I am not giving you a very satisfactory answer, but it isn't a simple problem.

QUESTION: I understand that. Thank you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Thank you.

QUESTION: I think you will understand my questions when I say the next 25 years is a crisis and opportunity.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Right. I agree.

QUESTION: Do the government leaders need more realistic future rights and creative thinkers to aid in solving our energy problems through interaction with U.S. and foreign oil tycoons and other needed problem areas?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The question is, the next 25 years is a crisis and opportunity, and I certainly agree with that. The question is can we solve the energy problem with the energy management being in the hands of international oil companies. That is an oversimplification.

QUESTION: And under local oil tycoons.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Under local oil tycoons.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: Men.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Men. Men and women, people, persons.

(Laughter.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Let me just say that we are in a very interesting situation here. We believe in a free market system. In energy, the free market system was a world system. And then the President said because of OPEC and the boycott, he said we have got to have energy independence.

Energy independence means the energy has to be produced here. That immediately cuts across the free market system. So you have a totally different situation.

MORE

I am not sure a lot of energy companies wouldn't rather wait until the world price breaks and then import cheap oil. So they may not be as enthusiastic about energy independence as the President and those who worry about national security because that is not their responsibility. They are trying to get energy at the cheapest price.

So once the President has made this decision, then the government has to create a framework of laws and incentives to encourage the free market system to produce the oil here. We can do it. It takes some careful thought. But we are in a new period and this is, in a sense, very much the same as the problem you mentioned.

This is true in the international grain market. We got taken to the cleaners two years ago by the Soviets. You have to hand it to them. They were very clever. They studied how our system works. They wanted to buy \$300 million worth of grain. They sent a mission to Washington. Then the grain companies each thought, three of them, that they were going to be making the deal that was being discussed in Washington. The Russians were smarter and made the deal with all of them. They bought \$1 billion worth instead of \$300 million. It doubled the feed prices and food prices and so forth.

We can't afford to have our economy, which is a free economy, distorted by centrally controlled economies managed for political purposes. How do we work these out?

These are very interesting problems we have to face as Americans. I am confident we will do it. But it will take us a little time. I am confident we will meet this problem. And that when the government sets the policy, and if they just don't keep changing the policy all the time and make a legal one and not leave it in the hands of too many individuals who will then constantly change their thinking, then I think we will have no problem in meeting them.

QUESTION: I am interested in knowing what your opinion is of the Equal Rights Amendment and, in particular, what effect you think it will have on pro-life in this country.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I supported Equal Rights Amendments, both national and State; always have. How it relates to -- what was the last part?

QUESTION: How it relates to pro-life in this country.

QUESTION: Or anti-abortion.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is better. Now we get right on it.

(Laughter.)

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I happen to believe in equal rights. I happen to believe that women should have the freedom of choice. This is a very controversial subject.

The Supreme Court has made a ruling. Therefore, that is the law of the land. Everybody is entitled to their own opinions. Nobody has to have an abortion. So that we will have that freedom.

I can understand those who don't believe in it for moral reasons, that they don't want them to have it, even though the other person doesn't happen to agree with them. This is a freedom, and we have a fundamental belief that we shouldn't impose, by law, those moral convictions that we have on others because we can't convince them morally. That is my own feeling.

(Applause.)

Now I would go back and say I think just as the founding fathers said there would not be, should not be, a State religion, that each person should have the right to make their own decision. I understand the controversial nature of this, and so I treat it with what I hope is sensitivity.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, do you think that the United States will change its foreign policy in regard to the Palestine issue?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The United States is devoted and dedicated to peace in the Middle East, based on the recognition by their neighbors of the independence and right of existence of the State of Israel. That is our basic commitment.

We have some very real stakes in this. We don't want to get involved in another international conflict, and that is always a danger. President Sadat was here. He spoke at a joint meeting of the House and Senate and then spoke at a luncheon of the Senate and House Foreign and International Relations Committees.

He was asked about this question of Palestine. He said that the Middle East question cannot be settled until the Palestine question is settled; these are homeless people who have been left on their own; and that there will be no lasting peace until that is settled. And that will involve at some point their having their own homeland or territory.

His suggestion was that the best way to find a solution was for us as a nation to establish, on whatever basis, contact and open dialogue, because out of contacts and dialogue grow the possibility of finding what are the solutions.

However, I think this needs to be done in concert with Israel, and this is an evolutionary process. I think a major step was taken in the Sinai agreement between Israel and Egypt. I think that was very courageous on the part of both of them. It was politically very difficult.

I think we have to keep the momentum going, and I think we have got to get this thing straightened out because it is a constant source of danger for everybody.

MORE

I think you are right. This is a key element in it, to approach it with great sensitivity. I think progress is being made.

QUESTION: Mr. Vice President, I am an immigrant to Minnesota, having immigrated from Yonkers, New York.

(Applause.)

QUESTION: The press indicates that Yonkers may be the next city in default.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The first one, I am afraid.

(Laughter.)

QUESTION: Given the need for congressional and Federal legislation to handle this problem, how far down the line are we likely to go with other cities and what are the implications of that?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: The State can handle the Yonkers' situation. There is no problem. The State has tremendous power. It can make a first-instance appropriation, based against State aid, to the community, if it is a temporary financial problem.

I set up, before I left, a Charter Revision Commission for New York City because it seemed to me there was a need for structural change in the city government itself. There have been very rapid evolutions. It is hard to believe during the 15 years I was Governor that two million middle income families moved out of New York City, and two million individuals came in, displaced in the rural south, the sharecroppers, or from Puerto Rico, because of mechanization of agriculture. They came without very much education, training, or cultural background.

As a result of this shift in population, the city lost 532,000 jobs with industry leaving the city. Yonkers has in the past experienced some of these same problems. They are difficult. They are not individual problems. They are national problems.

We passed one-year residency in New York. I vetoed the first one because conceptually I thought it was wrong. The situation got so bad I finally signed one. The Supreme Court declared it unconstitutional. We had to control the inflow of people, and we didn't have the capacity as a State to meet the needs financially; and the higher we raised their taxes and the more revenue produced, the more people who left the other States who were on welfare rolls and came up to New York. The more the other States attracted our industry with lower taxes.

I believe in free movement of money and goods within this framework of this free society, but there have to be some compensating factors or we are going to destroy the fabric of our society. But these are some of the exciting problems we face.

MORE

QUESTION: How could you order the murder of 44 people in Attica?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Pardon me?

QUESTION: How could you send the National Guard into Attica and order the murder of 44 people there in '71? How could you do such an inhuman thing? How could your corporation, the IT&T, and TCI order the overthrow of the democratically-elected government in Chile?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: One question, please.

QUESTION: There is a million questions you are going to have to answer, Mr. Rockefeller.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I am glad to answer the first one.

QUESTION: Because you and your brothers, you are the ones that are the problems in this country. You are disgusting and you are vile and you are evil.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Ladies and gentlemen, this is a free country.

QUESTION: Free to exploit people all over the world?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: There is no reason --

QUESTION: I have freedom to speak too, then, right?

THE VICE PRESIDENT: That is right. I just said so. That is why I want to answer you, because I believe deeply in this country's system. I believe we are only going to survive if we understand the issues.

We have got to have the capacity to face Marxist concepts. I think if we examine the 50 years of experience, Marxism --

QUESTION: You are avoiding the question.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I am coming to the question.

QUESTION: I am talking about you.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I appreciate that. I am flattered.

(Applause.)

QUESTION: I am talking about Attica and Chile.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: Let's talk about Attica. I had nothing to do at Attica.

QUESTION: Bullshit. Tell the truth.

THE VICE PRESIDENT: I will, if you give me a chance. Attica went into revolt. There was an uprising.

They took 54 guards captives. The Chief of the Prisons of the State had warned me there was a politicizing of the President at the prison and that it was a very serious situation, and he asked for a dumping of the guard. He was a new reformed director whom I brought in three months before. He had been in business and was in Boston. He was selected by my predecessor who was a Democrat, Averell Harriman, and he had been our Chief of Parole. He was an excellent man.

We were in a financial crisis at the time and we just didn't have the money. He was very worried. He predicted exactly what was going to happen, and it did. We had an uprising.

Under the tradition in our State, the standard procedure, the State police go to the center of the problem, whether a riot or uprising, which they did, and they went to Attica. They started within a matter of hours a retaking of the prison. They had retaken about half the prison. They went in without weapons. They were riot trained. They were very able.

They had retaken half of the prison. They got to a gate which was held by the prisoners, and they held the hostages on the other side and said they would kill them all if the police came any further.

At that point the Superintendent of Prisons arrived on the scene and said, "Stop. I will go in and negotiate. I can settle this by negotiation."

I was in Washington at the time, and he made the decision and so I supported his decision because I believe in picking good people and supporting them in what they do.

He then negotiated for two or three days and did his best, and finally it was clear the thing was getting more and more political. We agreed to 28 so-called reform measures; and then, because we agreed to them, they said that wasn't enough and they demanded amnesty and free passage to a non-imperialist country. That to me is not just prison reform; that is strictly political action of a group who, if they say they want to go to a non-imperialist country, it means they don't believe in the United States. Obviously, we couldn't accept these conditions.

Eighty-three of them were murderers. We have abandoned or abolished the capital punishment. So finally, even though there were, of course, the prisoners, about 32 people, including a very broad spectrum of political thought of an advisory committee -- Angela Davis was arriving on the scene and we had about 200 representatives from the International Press. This was quite a situation.

Finally the superintendent said, "I don't think there is anything more we can do. We have tried in good faith." Nobody did go into prison. They were afraid of getting killed. In the last offer that was made, they lined up the prisoners, or at least about a dozen of them, on the catwalk -- not the prisoners; the wardens, who were prisoners -- with the prisoners with a knife at the throat

of each one and said, "If you come in, we will kill them."

So the head of the prison said, "I think we have done all we can." We gave them a last warning. So the State police, not the National Guard, then went in. I ordered the guard to stay out because I was afraid they would be so emotionally upset by their colleagues being involved that I didn't want them to be there in the action.

The police went in. They are very disciplined. They are well ordered. The instructions were not to shoot unless one of their own was in danger.

In the melee that took place, there were a thousand prisoners, and 54 guards, and three had already been killed. And the tension was very high. This was the fifth day.

Unfortunately, this was not an easy operation. The result was that 42 people, as you say -- three had already been killed -- but 42 died.

If we had not done what we did and restored order, I think we would have seen throughout the United States the same kind of uprising and a destruction of the orderly, responsible management of a free society. It is tough, but if you are going to accept the responsibility of being Governor, you have to accept the tough responsibilities of making difficult decisions. That is what I did.

(Applause.)

END (AT 2:03 P.M. CST)