

General Election Issues

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: General Election Issues; Container 83

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf

JIMMY CARTER WALTER MONDALE



Leaders, for a change.

page 1

Papers in this Book

- ~~21~~ Foreign Policy Briefing • ~~21~~ A
- 21 Cable Television K
- 22 American Indians L
- 23 OSHA M
- 24 Sov. Jewry & Human Rights • B
- 25 Public Citizen Forum - Ralph Nader Speech • C
- 26 ABA Speech N
- 27 Jefferson - Jackson Day Dinners • H
- 28 Energy Briefing • D
- 29 Libraries • E
- 30 Cyprus = 64
- 31 Guns & Hunting • F
- 32 Defense Advisory • G
- 33 Economic Briefing • Ø
- 34 Amer. Legion Speech • I

JIMMY CARTER WALTER MONDALE



Leaders, for a change.

page 2

- 35 New Hampshire Family Speech P
- 20 Foreign Economic Press Briefing S
- 37 Town Hall: CA Q
- 38 Iowa Fairgrounds R



Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

TRANSCRIPT OF FOREIGN POLICY BRIEFING

Plains, Georgia

July 29, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: This will be the last issues session this week. We intend to schedule others for future learning processes for myself and Senator Mondale.

Today we had a joint discussion about foreign affairs. We emphasized the point that we are trying to learn as much as we possibly can about the interrelationship between our nation and others so that we can present to the world a foreign policy that is understood by the American people, which is predictable, which has an acknowledged purpose, which can have bipartisan support, which can regain the trust of other nations in our country and which can accurately represent the character of the American people.

We had specific discussions about the African nations, and particular emphasis today throughout the discussions on the developing nations of the world. Those who have been most sadly neglected in our own nation's emphasis in the past few years under President Nixon and President Ford and Mr. Kissinger. I think this is the first time, certainly, that any presidential candidate has ever spent so much time studying the particular problems of the developing nations but there is a very legitimate reason for it because of the past neglect and because of the importance -- the crucial nature -- for the future. We discussed our relationship on an East-West basis, specifically, of course, with the People's Republic of China and with the Soviet Union. We discussed the Middle East and the Mediterranean area and within the special framework of the developing nations discussion, in addition to Africa, we discussed countries in our own hemisphere.

We also tried to analyze the proper interrelationship derived from the Monday meeting between correlating defense policy establishment and foreign policy -- our political interrelationship with other countries. We discussed some creative approaches to SALT II talks and we were particularly concerned in the Middle East in emphasizing the fact that without a complete confidence in our own government's position on the Middle Eastern question within Israel, that there can be no, or very little, possibility of an ultimate settlement in the Middle East.

We also discussed our relationship with South Africa, and Rhodesia, with an understanding that there would be no yielding on our part on the issue of human rights and majority rule. The other point that we did discuss was South America. The fact that we should get away permanently from an attitude of paternalism or punishment or retribution when some of the South Americans didn't

didn't yield to our persuasion. There was a great revelation, to me at least, that within the third world nations, the developing world, of the unique leadership role that has been played by Mexico, Venezuela, and other Latin American leaders. I think the Latin American nations must be treated as individuals. They must be recognized as far as their own worldwide leadership capabilities of influence. And to treat them in a paternalistic manner, or just in the hemispheric relationship, would be a mistake. Perhaps Senator Mondale would like to add a point or two and then we'll answer some questions.

SENATOR MONDALE: One of the other matters discussed was the very crucial importance of establishing and maintaining an ongoing high level, consistent relationship with our traditional allies in Western Europe, in Japan and in Canada. This is the bedrock of American foreign policy and that the Administration ought to have in mind at the highest level of priorities at all times. I think that is a crucial part of any kind of foreign policy that represents the best interest and ideals of the American people.

We also talked about the crucial need to put a ceiling, not just on strategic arms where we think much lower ceilings are clearly needed, but also a similar ceiling on the arms transfer of tactical armaments. Right now, as you know, the United States is the leading arms sales country in the world. But in order to put that kind of restriction on the transfer of arms, there must be an agreement reached between the Soviet Union, between other countries such as West Germany, England, which sell armaments, but also with the consuming countries because this is a matter which arms-purchasing nations around the world have a direct interest in. And it would be our hope that we could move toward some international agreement between those who sell arms and those who buy arms to bring a dramatic reduction in the amount of the tragic, expensive, arms sales that go on in the world today.

QUESTION: Governor, did you carry forward in any more specific detail today the ideas that you expressed earlier in the foreign policy addresses?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No. A lot of these people have helped me in the past in the preparation of those speeches. One that we did talk about quite frequently was my speech in New Jersey on the Middle East and the fact that this was an adequate expression of my concern at this point. We did discuss some failures of the Ford and Nixon Administrations in dealing with the European nations, in dealing with the Latin American nations. I've expressed some corrective action there. The excessive sales of American arms overseas, the failure in Cambodia, the failure in Angola, and the failure in Cypress. And how to avoid similar mistakes in the future.

We are planning -- I'm planning -- to make additional foreign policy speeches in the future on world food supplies, on East-West relationships (this is, our relationship with the People's Republic of China and the Soviet Union) and also between ourselves in the Northern Hemisphere and the developing nations in the Southern Hemisphere. There may be other particular subjects that I will choose, but those three speeches are already in preparation.

QUESTION: We've heard all week that you've talked about how you desire to establish some kind of predictability in government -- in economic and foreign policy. You were criticized during your term as governor as being intractable. Do you think there is a danger of locking yourself into a policy that may be dictated by events that you can't foresee?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I don't believe so. I think the best way to be predictable is first of all to have a clearly understood policy that has been worked out through direct bilateral negotiations with individual nations and also which is understood by and hopefully supported by the American public and also the members of Congress and other leaders. All these elements that I just described to you as prerequisites for predictability are now absent.

QUESTION: Why would a country like, for example, Saudi Arabia, which buys arms because it doesn't manufacture them and thinks it needs them, be interested in signing up for a treaty that would restrict the transfer of tactical arms?

GOVERNOR CARTER: That's a point that Senator Mondale made, but I don't think that he was talking about the consuming nations agreeing among themselves, particularly, to refrain from buying weapons. I think the initiative has got to be from us, hopefully with the joint cooperation of the Soviet Union, the European nations and others who sell arms. That would have to be the first step. And then as we agree to reduce the rate of delivery of arms overseas then through bilateral relationships, or by decisions based on the furtherance of our own foreign policy, we could decide which nations would have the greatest reduction in arms sales from us to them.

QUESTION: You have a China expert here -- Professor Oxenburg. And the Chinese government has seemed to be saying recently that they want closer relationships with the United States but there hasn't been much movement in that direction. Was anything discussed about possibly bringing about closer ties to China?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes. We discussed the fact that since the initial opening up of direct relationships between our nation and China as a result of President Nixon's visits, and Secretary Kissinger's visits, that the relationships have probably become stalemated or even deteriorated to some degree. We did discuss at some length the special problem that derives from the competition between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China, and how our increase in friendship or sales policy toward the People's Republic would affect our relationship with the Soviet Union and the fact that we had to be careful and to have this relationship well understood either through private information or through public statements. But I think we do have an opportunity to increase our friendly relationships with the People's Republic of China within that framework.

QUESTION: At this time, about Southern Africa especially since it seems to be one of the problems that demonstrates the limitations not only of American power but even of influence. It's all right to deplore apartheid but after that, what can you do that's useful? There's a great debate as to whether you press too hard or maintain reasonably friendly relations with the Republic of South Africa. Which way is your thinking tending toward?

GOVERNOR CARTER: We've had a national policy over a span of several administrations that supports the concept of majority rule in all nations of the world, including our own. I think we also have an increasing awareness of a crisis developing in Rhodesia. I think to a lesser extent in South Africa. I think that we ought to recognize as one aspect of the question the multinational interest in the southern part of Africa in dealing with South Africa. Because there, to a substantial degree, the nations surrounding South Africa are dependent, economically speaking on the progress made in South Africa -- economically. Secondly, South Africa has unwarranted influence in that region on other

countries in some respects. They have a major role to play in the resolution of the Rhodesian crisis. I don't know the answer to what we ought to do specifically. We ought to try to shape our own policies in accordance with what's best for the majority of people in individual nations. We should continue to constrain our relationships with South Africa to encourage the move toward majority rule. We should use South Africa's good offices in trying to resolve the Rhodesian question which might be of a more crucial nature in achieving a majority rule, and overall, never forget that in Africa in particular we've got the overriding question of human rights which still has a long way to go.

I think our country has established through its own experience in race relationships, and particularly in the South, an understanding of this very sensitive issue. How to deal with black and white people within the same community so that both the blacks and whites will be well served. There is no doubt in my mind that in the South, although we feared the elimination of segregation or apartheid here, that the results of this elimination of racism -- racial separation -- has been good for both black and white people. And with that special knowledge in our own country I think we might be a help in Africa in the resolution of that question. I don't know how to answer your question better than that. I think that in general is what we want to do.

QUESTION: Can you give us some ideas of the innovations you have in mind, the innovative approaches you have for SALT?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No. I'm not qualified to give information about specific aspects of the SALT talks. I understand that we have had good progress made in the SALT talks with the major problem being the backfire bomber and the cruise missile. And I think that is generally accepted knowledge -- that's not confidential information. Other than that statement I don't know how to give the technical mechanisms by which the SALT II talks might be improved. But I'm not qualified to answer your question -- that's my problem.

QUESTION: A further question about arms sales. In the absence of an agreement between the purchasing and the selling nations, are arms sales a proper instrument of American foreign policy? Can we afford not to sell arms -- conventional arms -- abroad?

GOVERNOR CARTER: We can certainly afford to reduce our sales of arms abroad. I think in the last ten years we've increased arms sales from about a billion dollars a year to about \$12 billion per year. And my hope would be that we could get a multinational agreement to limit arms sales to reduce the threat of war. In the absence of that agreement, my next preference would be a series of bilateral agreements, and in the absence of that kind of progress, then I would not hesitate as President to assess unilateral reduction of arms sales overseas, making decisions on individual countries in the way that I thought best and that the Congress thought best to effectuate our adopted foreign policy.

QUESTION: Do you have anything further on the kinds of constraints you were talking about placing on South Africa?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I'm not qualified to give those statements now. I wish you would let me wait until I make my North-South speech. We are working on some of those things and I could name two or three but they may not be the most important ones. I'm not trying to avoid your question. I just don't want to list a partial series of action to be taken.

As you know, as Andy Young pointed out inside -- and he's made several trips to South Africa -- the changes that took place in the South were brought about substantially by the interrelationship of government and the private sector. The South never integrated its schools as long as the pressure came strictly from HEW. But once the business and professional community decided, specifically say in Atlanta, that this was a good thing, economically and socially, for black and white people -- when that occurred -- there was an alleviation of tension and a movement very rapidly toward the resolution of the racial problem in the South. And obviously the heavy investments that we now have by the private sector (in South Africa) in industrial opportunities, and in banking, for instance, is a possible mechanism that we might use jointly with government to help bring about that kind of persuasion. But that would be one of the illustrative points that would be beneficial in my opinion.

QUESTION: You said in the past that you wanted to establish a relationship with Vietnam to provide a full accounting for MIAs. I understand that Senator Montgomery's congressional committee that has been set up to look at this problem concluded just this week that our MIAs were probably dead. In other words, they drew a line. Are you prepared to believe that now we ought to proceed on that basis? And how would that effect your thinking?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would insist that there would be an additional accounting. The fact that someone is dead, to me, is not adequate so long as the Vietnamese government has information about how that person died and where they died and where they might be buried. I think the major concern among those families who have members who are missing in action, and we have many of them in Georgia as you know because of our heavy concentration of military bases, is the uncertainty about it. And when I'm satisfied that the Vietnamese government has made a complete accounting of those who are missing in action, whether they be alive or dead, that would be the prerequisite that I described.

QUESTION: Would you expect the Vietnamese to know in every instance? In many cases, they wouldn't know either?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I understand that. I said to the extent that I'm convinced that they have given us the information that they have. That would be a subjective judgement that would be required.

QUESTION: Are you also interviewing people for possible positions in your administration if you are elected?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No, I'm not interviewing anybody for possible positions if I'm elected and I don't intend to make that sort of interview at all between now and the election date. Obviously, as I meet with people who give me advice on defense, or welfare, or tax reform, or foreign affairs, I assess their qualities and their knowledge and their methods of expressing themselves, their compatibility with me and so forth, and that would be one of the mechanisms that I would use to decide ultimately whom I might choose to help me in various positions, but I'm certainly not in a role of trying to choose anyone yet.

END OF COMMENTS ON FOREIGN POLICY BRIEFING

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON CABLE TELEVISION INDUSTRY REGULATION

The regulatory role of the federal government, including the FCC, in the field of public communications, is vital because it represents and protects the public interest. But there has been a tendency for government regulation to grow to the point where it may no longer be serving this purpose.

Since some regulation is clearly desirable, the Carter Administration would reexamine federal government regulatory activity in the cable television industry, among others, including such specific subjects as the origination and content of local program material, to insure that regulation exists to serve the public but does not, by imposing excessive federal controls, stifle the responsible growth or expansion of services.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON AMERICAN INDIANS

I am deeply concerned with the present condition of American Indians, and believe there must be a greater sense of federal responsibility to meet our obligations to them. We must obey and implement our treaty obligations to the American Indians, and in so doing, I pledge an all-out effort to assist in the protection of their land, water and their civil rights.

As part of my reorganization of government, I will review and revise as necessary the federal laws relating to American Indians and the functions and purposes of the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The guiding principles of my review will be a strengthened reaffirmation of our legal and moral trust responsibilities to the American Indians, and a strong personal respect for the dignity of each of our first Americans.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON THE OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION

The safety and protection of the American worker must be guaranteed. As many as 100,000 working people die each year due to occupational illnesses and accidents. This terrible toll cannot be tolerated.

The basic concept behind OSHA is excellent. The complexity and sheer magnitude of the problem exceeds the capabilities of individual states. The problem with OSHA has been the lack of focus on meeting the vast problems in this area. Efforts should be made to clarify and expand state roles in implementation of standards.

If investigation demonstrates that current programs are inadequate, we must take all steps necessary to insure that those who earn their living by personal labor may work in safe and healthy environments. In Georgia, we took positive steps to improve working conditions and work-related health and safety programs. Nationwide efforts in this vital area must continue until our working citizens are safe in their jobs.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON SOVIET JEWRY AND HUMAN RIGHTS

"I would do everything I possibly could as President to encourage the Soviet Union to liberalize its emigration policies for Jewish citizens who want to move. I would not hesitate to use the trade pressures to effectuate that purpose, but I think it can best be done by diplomatic means which would preserve the honor and independence of the Soviet leaders, rather than with a legislative act, which I believe cut down rather than increased the out-migration of Soviet Jews."

March 31, 1976 St. Louis Jewish Light

"I would keep the right of Soviet Jews to emigrate to other countries as one of the preeminent considerations in all my negotiations with the Soviet Union. In my private discussions, in trade negotiations and in other relationships, we would discuss mutual advantages between their country and our own. One of the advantages I would hope to secure for our own country would be the release or the freedom of Jews from Communist Soviet Union."

May 14, 1976 Baltimore Jewish Times

"I believe strongly that the Soviet Union and other countries should abide by the human rights commitment they had made at the Helsinki accords and elsewhere and that the United States should voice its support for such compliance."

July 14, 1976

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE PUBLIC CITIZEN FORUM

Washington, D.C. - August 9, 1976

First of all, let me say that I am very pleased and proud to be here. To be sitting at the head table with such a distinguished group of courageous and effective Americans is an honor in itself. The accumulated talent and ability and sensitivity and commitment of those who have just been introduced is indeed inspiration to us all.

The only one about whom I have any concern is our host, Ralph Nader. I was talking to Jack Brooks a few minutes ago, and when Ralph's people went out to the audience to collect the question cards, Jack Brooks said, "I'm sure, knowing Nader, that he is taking up a collection." I said, "He is way ahead of that. He takes up a collection before you get in the house. He doesn't wait until after you get in."

I made the mistake of inviting Mr. Nader down to Plains this past weekend. I really wanted to make an impression on him because I have admired him so long. And in order to do so, I took him out to the Plains softball field. I was very pleased when Ralph and I got out of the car that all the tourists, who now fill our tiny town, rushed forward with their autograph books. I turned to get my pen out of my pocket. I turned around to see all the tourists gathered around Mr. Nader instead of me. He also brought me some bad luck. I had a seven-nothing record as a pitcher on the softball team on which I play. I lost my first game. In the midst of the game, my brother's gas station exploded. I wound up with two Charlie horses -- one in each leg. And his performance as an umpire -- I'd rather not comment on it. He said that he was fair because both sides said he was lousy, and I can't disagree with that.

I hope that this forum is not one of a series of catastrophes he has brought on me so far. I think that this is an unprecedented thing, for the nominee of one of our parties to appear in a no-holds-barred talk and interchange of ideas and questions with the leading consumer advocates of our country.

I come here as one who has spent the last 20 months traveling throughout our nation to seek votes, and I have been successful in that. When I began my campaign, as you perhaps know, I didn't have a built-in organization. I was not well-known. I didn't have much money, only a small staff. I didn't have command of the news media as I would have here in Washington or I would perhaps have in New York. But my wife and I and many others went from one living room to another; one union hall to another; one high school auditorium to another. Sometimes only three or four people would come, but I would make about a 10-minute speech and answer questions for 45 minutes or so, and I began to form a relationship with individual voters that paid rich dividends as the campaign progressed.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

And I learned in the process. A lot of news media representatives sociologists and political scientists and professors have asked: "Are you a liberal or a conservative?" I never have tried to answer that question. In some areas I would be considered quite liberal: consumer protection, environmental quality, human rights, civil rights. In other areas, I would be considered quite conservative: tight management of government, careful planning, strengthening local government, openness of government. One way to categorize my beliefs would be populism, if you would let me define that word. I would almost equate it with consumerism.

I have been deeply hurt, as have many other Americans in the past few years, by the deterioration of the quality of our governmental processes. This has been demonstrated in a few minor ways but also in a few major ways: the Vietnamese and Cambodian Wars, the attempt to become involved in Angola, the CIA revelations, the Watergate scandals. There has been a deep sense of alienation of people from our government and a sense of disappointment, a sense of embarrassment, sometimes even a sense of shame.

These feelings, perhaps, are justified and legitimate, but there is a reservoir of deep commitment that exists in the minds and hearts of the American people that is waiting to be tapped. I have always felt that -- to the extent that government in all its forms can equal the character of the American people, to that extent -- our wrongs can be redressed, our mistakes can be corrected, difficult answers can perhaps be given to difficult questions, and there can be a restoration of confidence of people in government.

The government must be well-organized, simple, efficient, so that the average person can understand what goes on there. So that there can be some access to the person or persons within government who can meet the needs, receive a complaint, or discuss it as a legitimate public criticism or attack. We now have bureaucratic structures in the federal government and many state governments, but because of their complexity, they are almost impervious to the entrance of a human being into their decision-making processes. That needs to be changed.

In many instances, when agencies or departments become obsolete, their usefulness having been performed, they then try to wrap themselves in secrecy. When a new, vigorous, badly needed function of government is originally instituted, there is a strong natural motivation to let people know what is going on there because there are things being performed which are sources of legitimate pride and a surfacing of ways of letting people know what goes on in a department. But once a department serves its function, there is a strong inclination toward self-perpetuation and for the enshrining of that agency in secrecy. This occurs too often and we need to pursue the legislation, of which Jack Brooks is the father, to open up the deliberations of government -- not only in the Executive Branch but hopefully in the Congress as well -- to public access, to public scrutiny, to public knowledge, to public involvement, to perhaps even public control for a change.

We must also have the involvement of citizens in the preparation of decisions. The budgeting process should be open, revision of major legislation should be open, and there should always be a sense that what government does is for the best interests of those who have no powerful lobbying group, who have no direct access to those who have power in the White House or otherwise, and who quite often have no intense interest because they lack understanding.

When the regulatory agencies were being established about 40 years ago, when Franklin Roosevelt was President, he said -- an almost humorous remark now -- "Regulatory agencies will indeed be tribunes for the people." They have not turned out that way.

No matter what the hopes have been, the regulatory agencies were first formed to protect the consumer alone, against the encroachment of a selfish interest. Quite often the average consumer, the average citizen, has no awareness of procedures, never sees the issues clearly defined, and because of that has a notable absence of interest. And, almost by default, there evolves a "sweetheart" arrangement between the regulatory agencies themselves and those in the industry who are being regulated. Many Presidents have perpetuated that deterioration in making appointments to regulatory agencies. There has been a kind of "revolving door" between the industry being regulated and the regulatory agency. I would like to stop that if I am elected President.

First of all, I would like to see Congress pass a law that would make it illegal for the members of regulatory agencies to move back into the industry from which they have come. In the last eight years, over half the appointments to the nine most important regulatory agencies have come from the industries being regulated. And, of course, quite often they don't serve the whole term, because of the free movement back into the industry from the regulatory agency itself. If it is impossible to pass a law, then through Executive Order and through a firm commitment from those whom I am considering for appointment I'll prevent that continuous ingress and egress between those two entities in our society.

We also need to have within the government structure itself a competent group who can speak for consumers. Senator Magnuson and Congressman Brooks have thus far been successful in getting this legislation passed -- Consumer Protection Agency or Agency for Consumer Advocacy. I am strongly opposed to the proliferation of new agencies, departments, bureaus, boards and commissions because they add more to an already confused federal bureaucratic structure. This agency, in my opinion, is different. If I am elected President, I would look on this group -- a very small group by the way -- to help me probe constantly to discover agencies or functions which ought to be eliminated, to publicly reveal inadequacies and inaccuracies that exist within the people's own government. I believe that every year, because of the process of screening out obsolescent aspects of our government, the agency would more than pay for itself. There would also be a very low operating cost -- I think \$10, \$11, \$12 million each year. This is about the amount of money that HEW spends every hour. So I strongly favor this legislation. I hope the conference committee will pass it quickly and that it will be adopted. I hope that President Ford will sign it into law; if he should veto it, I hope that Congress can override his veto. If the veto should be sustained, I will continue to make it a major issue in the campaign this fall. If I am elected President, I hope it will be one of the first bills pass during the next Administration.

There has to be another means for citizen involvement in our government. The President is the major spokesman of our country. Access to the President from groups represented here today is crucial. Too often in the past the White House was surrounded by an impervious obstacle which was open to those who were powerful and influential, but was not open to those who spoke for the average citizen. That ought to be changed and it will be changed if I should be elected President.

At the same time we ought to pursue an idea that Georgia initiated while I was Governor called "Tie Line." We set up an in-coming WATS line. When anyone in the state has a problem or a need they can call without cost on a nearby telephone, perhaps their own, if they have one, to one number which is highly publicized through welfare checks, public advertisements on radio and television, and ask their question. While they hold onto the phone, without delay, the answer will be provided. If a welfare check or social security check doesn't arrive, while the person holds the phone, perhaps an illiterate person, they are connected automatically to their own Congressman's office in Washington to give their expression of concern and perhaps to receive attention. If they go into a local grocery store to buy a chicken and they pay for 3 pounds of chicken and when they get home they find it weighs 2½ pounds, they can call the same number and say they got cheated at their local grocery store, and while they hold onto the phone they can be connected to the person in the Agriculture Department who is responsible for the accuracy of grocery stores' scales, etc. I think we now have over 26,000 categories of complaints on microfiche and we keep a record of complaints in addition to answering questions of that kind. A similar arrangement could very well be instituted after the executive bureaucracy is simplified enough so that the experts can find the source of an answer to a question.

In closing let me say this: I don't claim to know all the answers. Many of you in the audience are experts in a field of special interest to you. One of the reasons I came here was not to teach, or even to promise, but to learn. A lot of legislation has already been passed to help those who look to specific leadership and perhaps because of your own instigation. As that legislation has been passed, quite often it has not received support and adequate financing from our executive leaders in the White House.

Another point I would like to make in closing is this: next year perhaps there is going to be a different climate in this country. Can you imagine the change that is going to take place in matters that are of great concern to you when the President and Congress work in harmony, with mutual respect, in close consultation, supporting one another in the open? And when we have a natural inclination to be supportive of suggestion which help the consumers of this country? That in itself can be a tremendous step forward, even if we never pass another consumer protection or advocacy bill. Of course, we'll pass them. But think for a moment how it would be -- in the field of poisonous materials, safety, transportation, energy, taxation, access to government, environmental quality and many others -- if you felt that there was a receptive ear in the White House to your problems, to your suggestions, and your criticisms.

This is not a partisan speech but I would like to point out that in the last 24 years we have only had Democrats in the White House for eight years. I think in general, and there are obviously some exceptions, our Party has stood for a close relationship to the voters themselves, with an emphasis on individual citizens and a minimal emphasis on powerful intermediaries who have quite often been an obstacle to close and regular access between citizens and the government. But that's going to change and I think it will be a good change. As Ralph Nader pointed out when I spoke to the Citizen Forum a few months ago, I hope to challenge him in the future for the title of top consumer advocate in the country.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER TO

THE AMERICAN BAR ASSOCIATION

ATLANTA, GEORGIA

August 11, 1976

"We will not lie, cheat or steal, nor tolerate among us those who do."

These words comprise the ancient code of honor which was adopted and still is used by the Air Force and Military Academies, and which has recently been questioned as being too strict and rigid for the future leaders of our nation's armed forces.

Is this too strict a code for cadets? I think not. Is this too strict a code for senior military officers who defend our country? I think not. Is this too strict a code for any public official who serves our nation? I think not.

All too often in recent years laxity and the abandonment of rigid high standards among our leaders has caused our nation to suffer and to grieve. It has been the law, and our national commitment to the law, that has kept the fabric of our society from being ripped apart. Even with a total commitment to the law we are not perfect, but we have a framework within which we can work toward a more just and perfect society.

During this post-Watergate era our nation has been struggling anew with the question of how to establish and maintain standards of morality and justice. So far we have failed.

Unfortunately, there has been little progress toward enacting reforms that are needed to get our government's house in order. There has been strong political opposition to legislation designed to secure more openness, accountability and increased integrity in government.

Nearly forty years ago President Franklin Roosevelt had a proud vision of regulatory agencies. He said they would be "tribunes of the people" and would provide "active and positive protection of the people against private greed."

But in fact, regulatory agencies and other important government positions are still used as dumping grounds for unsuccessful candidates, faithful political partisans, out-of-favor White House aids, and representatives of special interests.

For instance, if a recent nomination is approved by Congress, the Consumer Product Safety Commission will have a majority of its members who have come directly from the Ford or Nixon White House staffs.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

Of the forty-five appointments to the nine most important regulatory bodies in the past five years, more than half have come from the regulated industries themselves. This unprecedented abuse is a sign of contempt for the regulatory agencies and for the public they are supposed to defend and protect.

Bribery is a crime in every nation in the world, but the administration solution to the embarrassing problem of international bribery is, in effect, a proposal to allow corporations to engage in bribery so long as they report such illegal transactions to the Department of Commerce. Of course, the proposal is that the reports can be kept secret from the public, perhaps forever. "Confidential disclosure" and "authorized criminality" seem to be contradictions in terms.

This is not the kind of reform the American people want nor the kind of moral leadership the American people deserve.

Our nation has seen crimes discovered, publicized, and then condoned. This almost inevitably produces a subtle lowering of standards, and a pervasive acceptance in government of the right to break the law.

Almost 50 years ago Justice Brandeis wrote in a legal dissent: "Our government is the potent, the omnipotent teacher. For good or for ill it teaches the whole people by its example. Crime is contagious. If the government becomes a lawbreaker, it breeds contempt for the law; it invites every man to become a law unto himself; it invites anarchy."

In times of crisis where is our protection from this threat? Ostensibly from the Department of Justice.

But following the recent presidential elections, our U.S. Attorney General has replaced the Postmaster General as the chief political appointee, and we have on recent occasions witnessed the prostitution of this most important law enforcement office.

It was disgraceful that because of actual crimes within the Department of Justice and a lack of trust in the Attorney General a special prosecutor had to be appointed just to enforce the law. As much as is humanly possible the Attorney General should be removed from politics, and should enjoy the same independence and authority and should deserve as much confidence as did the special prosecutor during the last few weeks of the Watergate investigation.

Recently the U.S. Senate overwhelmingly passed a bill establishing a permanent special prosecutor, to be appointed by the president. If a special prosecutor is needed, we should strengthen the Senate bill and let the courts and not the president make the appointment. My own preference is that the special prosecutor be appointed only as needed and not comprise another permanent government agency. These opinions are, I understand, shared by some of the foremost investigators, prosecutors and congressional leaders who were active in resolving the Watergate crisis.

It is obvious that our executive branch of government cannot be assigned all the blame. Scandals in the Congress involving the improper spending of public money have not been prevented, nor have they been instantly and vigorously investigated.

If I become president, I will never turn my back on official misdeeds. I intend to take a new broom to Washington and do everything possible to sweep the house of government clean.

Change is difficult to implement and to accept, but it is inevitable. As Alvin Toffler has said, "change is the process by which the future invades our lives." In the scientific and agricultural world, I always saw change and innovation welcomed eagerly. It seems to be different in government and in law.

We need not fear change, so long as we hold fast to an unchanging core of personal integrity and ideals.

A woman who had a great influence on my life was Miss Julia Coleman, my high school principal who gave me an early introduction to the world of art, books and music some 40 years ago. As a retired school teacher in 1962 she wrote these words in a Christmas letter to some friends:

"We have to adjust to changing times and still hold out for unchanging principles. It is not easy. But neither education nor religion promises us an easy life. Anyway, I like it better with challenge and effort -- with ideals of service to causes good and true."

"To adjust to changing times and still hold out for unchanging principles..." I don't know how a Justice Holmes or a Chief Justice Marshall could have expressed it any better.

A combination of unwise and impractical rules and procedures, lack of effective management of cases, and increasing case loads has priced the poor and middle American out of the judicial system. Now even the wealthy citizen and big business are finding the price of justice too high to pay.

Thus we have the very poor, the very wealthy, and all of us in between joined in one goal and purpose -- to create a workable system of justice. We must examine and change our own judicial system so that it serves all justly and at a price one can afford to pay. We must move boldly, quickly and with persistence until we reach this goal.

I note with concern that the current administration has recently recommended a one-third cut in the budget of the Legal Services Corporation.

The best deterrent to crime is swift and certain justice. Civil justice is of no practical value to the average citizen when cases are intolerably delayed. Of the \$4.4 billion spent by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration over the past eight years, only 6% was allocated to aid state and local courts. This is a grossly misdirected set of priorities.

There are demands for complex and controversial changes in your own profession, and it is obvious that you are concerned about such issues as:

- Reduced jury size,
- Legal assistance for indigents,
- Reorganization of the court system,
- Administrative officers and balanced case loads,
- Simplified civil and criminal court procedures,
- Compulsory arbitration outside of court,
- Prepaid legal service,
- Public legal clinics,
- The use of paraprofessionals,
- Expanded class action rights,

Broadened definitions of legal standing,
Funding of public interest law,
Elimination of fixed fee schedules, and
Relaxation of advertising restriction.

This agenda shows that the American Bar Association is becoming increasingly active in assessing change in the infrastructure of our legal society.

As lawyers you are in a superb position to analyze other changes that are inevitable and necessary in our society. Your knowledge of the past, your educational background, your influence at the point of debate and decision and your constant involvement in the multi-faceted aspects of our private and public life equip you uniquely to shape the future of our country.

As Governor of Georgia, I studied court records, and visited our prisons and noted how few wealthy, influential criminals were ever punished. I talked with inmates and heard convincing stories of injustice and inequality. I traveled the state and listened, again and again, to the questions and frustrations of average citizens who had come in contact with our system of justice.

So, with the cooperation of the Georgia Bar, I went to the legislature and we were successful in implementing a series of reforms in our judicial system:

- A nominating system to insure merit appointment of judges;
- Mandatory retirement for judges and a method of hearing citizen complaints and removing incompetent judges from office;
- Automatic review to insure increased uniformity of sentencing among judges;
- A uniform and unified court system (to allow a more efficient and timely dispensation of justice);
- Prison reform with emphasis on rehabilitation;
- A professionalized Georgia Bureau of Investigation;
- A reduction of emphasis on victimless crimes;
- Expanded staff aid for judges and administrative officers for the courts.

It is of course difficult for all of us to lift our vision beyond the specific issues of our daily lives, such as tax law and torts, and to concern ourselves with the broader issues of a free society and social justice. We deplore the present circumstances in our nation but we often refrain from an inspired and aggressive search for better laws or better administration of those we have.

Whether we are lawyers or candidates or peanut farmers, we tend to avoid controversial issues because we are afraid we might lose a customer or a client or a vote or a dollar. But almost every important improvement is going to be controversial.

The laws must be constantly changing to accommodate the forces and counter-forces in our dynamic society and the total law at any time is an expression of the structure of society. There simply must be a close correlation between law and justice.

It is no secret that most professions, including your profession, are in great disfavor with the American people. So are the courts, businessmen, politicians and the government in general. Many people believe that they are denied fairness in the courts, in the marketplace and in the government generally. Fundamental to this attitude is the lack of a workable system of justice in the broadest sense.

I hope that you will think grandly of your role as attorneys in providing equal justice for all. If elected president, I will be an eager partner with you.

A prime responsibility of our next president will be to reestablish the confidence of the American people in the professions, in business and in the various departments that make up our government. In other words, to reestablish confidence in the American system.

The question is not who caused the problems but who will correct them. It is not merely whether we want to make some incremental corrections but whether we wish to preserve the system. Time is running short and only by making our system of justice fair and workable can it be preserved.

Substantial improvements are needed in our government, and as one of our noted Supreme Court justices said, "sunshine is the best disinfectant." We need a comprehensive sunshine law in Washington so that special interests will not retain their exclusive access to the decision making process.

Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official.

Complete revelation of all business and financial involvement of major officials should be required, and none should be continued which constitute a possible conflict with the public interest.

The sweetheart arrangement between regulatory agencies and industries being regulated should be terminated, and no personnel transfers between agency and industry should be permitted until after an extended period of time has elapsed.

The activities of lobbyists must be more thoroughly revealed and controlled.

Public financing of campaigns should be extended to members of Congress.

Minimum secrecy within government should be matched with maximum privacy for private citizens.

All federal judges, diplomats and other major officials should be selected on a strict basis of merit.

Every effort should be made to encourage our people to participate in government, including universal voter registration for elections and the strengthening of citizen advocacy groups.

Tax inequities must be rooted out. This will be a major and urgent project if I am elected president.

Even when these difficult changes in laws and regulations are made the search for true justice will of course not be complete.

There are limits to what the law can do. It can establish the outer limits of acceptable conduct in a civilized society, but it cannot teach us or force us to do what is right. That understanding and that moral imperative must come from institutions even more ancient and more personal than the law -- from family and community and the ethical and religious training which they alone can impart.

We must be dedicated to the preservation and enhancement of these basic institutions of family and community which can give rise to a more perfect justice than any written code can hope to compel.

I have traveled in this country for the past 19 months perhaps more than any other individual. I have talked a lot, but I have also listened. I can tell you that our people have been hurt and embarrassed but they have not given up, they have not yet turned away.

There is a reservoir of honesty and decency and fairness among our people that can, in a democracy, find expression in our government.

Our people are willing to give our nation's leaders one more chance to correct our mistakes, to answer difficult questions, to meet legitimate needs, and to achieve a higher standard of freedom, equality and justice. If we disappoint them again -- we may not get another chance.

There is a great responsibility on us. We must not fail.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT JEFFERSON-JACKSON DAY DINNER

Charleston, West Virginia - August 14, 1976

First of all, let me say it is a great honor for me to be back in West Virginia. This is a state where I feel at home. You have a lot in common with my own state. You have tremendous coal deposits under your surface lands. As you know, peanuts grow under the ground also, so I have a lot in common with you there. I also want to say that I feel at home with the people at this head table. We have a lot in common.

The first year that I was Governor of Georgia we had our State Democratic Committee Meeting. Our choice to come and be a speaker to that group was my good friend Robert Byrd. And if I am elected, and if you'll help me get elected in November, I look forward as President to working with him in a major position in the Senate.

I've learned a lot these past twenty months traveling around the country. I've learned to appreciate my home. Plains is a little town of 683 people, almost all of us are farmers. I never knew Plains was anything very special but now when I go home there are 500 or 750 or 1,000 tourists in town every day. I hope that after November 2 they will still be there.

I have learned to appreciate the country, the rural area. And I've learned to understand the people who live in the country, who move to the city to earn enough money so they can afford to live in the country. We have ever Sunday morning at our church a large number of people who come to visit. I started to say worship with us. Some of them apparently haven't been in church very often, but we always make room for them and welcome them there. A couple of Sundays ago there were two tourists from Miami who left the church after the service and one of them turned to the other and said, "How did I do in the service?" And the other fellow said, "Well, you did okay, but the word is hallelujah and not Hialeah."

I also feel proud to be here because of your own heritage. West Virginia has a Democratic heritage. All of us were impressed in 1960 when you opened your arms and opened your hearts to John Kennedy. It was the turning point in the nomination of that great man.

And you've had in Congress a superlative Congressional delegation. And I look forward next year to working with that delegation and with your new, great, Democratic Governor, Jay Rockefeller.

Shortly after the California, New Jersey and Ohio primaries, when it seemed assured that I would be the nominee, I went to Washington to meet with Senator Byrd and with Jennings Randolph and all the Democratic Senators. And following our meeting, at which they endorsed me unanimously, one of the network television reporters asked Senator Byrd, "You've been here a long time, you've heard a lot of presidential candidates promise that the government is going to be completely

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

reorganized and made efficient, economical, and purposeful and manageable. Do you believe that Jimmy Carter, who's promised this, can carry out the promise, knowing about the opposition that's going to be there from the massive special interest groups in Washington?" And I was afraid to hear the answer. But Senator Byrd said: "Absolutely. It will be done if he is elected, and we're going to help him." I'll never forget that. And obviously he knows that I am counting on him.

Last night I wrote Senator Jennings Randolph a thank you note. He sent me a book that expresses very clearly his own concept of what government ought to be. It's a book that relates to ethics -- honesty, integrity, openness, purposefulness, in public service. And along with it he sent me a letter outlining what the Congress had attempted to do under his leadership in the field of energy. That's a remarkable condensation of what he's meant to the country. A man whose reputation is justifiably great. A man who's been in the Congress since 1933, I believe. Who was there during the Depression years, working with Franklin Roosevelt. Who was there to help form the REA program that turned on the electric lights in the isolated farm house where I lived. And who's been present as the major decisions have been made that shaped our country. And I'm deeply grateful for his friendship and thank West Virginia for letting the nation have a leader like Jennings Randolph. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

I just want to say a few things tonight. Things that are important to me as a Democratic nominee for President. Someone told me, I think it was Sharon, that I'm the first Presidential nominee who's ever come to West Virginia to speak at a Jefferson-Jackson Day banquet. I'm glad you honored me by letting me come.

I've tried to single out a few things that are important to you uniquely in this state. One I know is the energy problem. As I've traveled and campaigned throughout the country, particularly in New England, I've pointed out that we must have a comprehensive energy policy for our country. That the major thrust of it is inevitably going to be a shift from primary dependence on oil to primary dependence on coal.

In 1950, 35% of our energy came from coal. We've got about 40 years supply of oil left in the whole world. In our country alone, we've got six hundred years, at least, supply of coal. Three hundred years of which is clean burning and readily accessible. And as you know, major portions of it are in the Appalachian regions. One statement that I've made throughout the country is that as we shift our efforts toward increasing use of coal, the emphasis ought to be on extraction and use of coal from Appalachia and not the Far Western deposits.

Last year we produced 650 million tons of coal -- about 110 million came from your own state. A lot of people say that we haven't got any ability to expand production because in the last few years we've not seen it expand at all. But a study by the American Institute of Engineers says that by 1985 we can be producing 1,250 million tons of coal -- about twice as much -- that's clean burning, efficient and near the point where the energy must be consumed, that is, the Eastern Seaboard.

So the future of West Virginia, Appalachian coal, is indeed bright if we can have a government policy that recognizes this tremendous resource, has research

and development money going into better extraction, better safety, cleaner burning coal supplies. I'm committed to that proposition and you can depend on it.

As that change takes place, we must be very careful to honor and protect the courageous men and families who have for generations gone into the deep mines. About half the coal now is produced from deep mines in this country. The other half from strip mines.

I was distressed to read in a speech Jay Rockefeller made recently that on the average for the last five years West Virginia has lost forty men per year in coal mine accidents. Our present laws are not being adequately enforced. Inspection is not rigid enough. And this tragic loss must be reduced or eliminated. I agree with what Jay Rockefeller said, that the goal we set for ourselves must not be 30 deaths, not 25 deaths, not 20 deaths per year, but zero deaths among those who serve us so well, so sacrificially, and so bravely in the coal mines. I want to make it certain that it doesn't have to be an act of bravery to supply our energy needs from your coal mines.

Government can be sensitive. Government can be well-organized. Government can be honest. Government can be open.

In recent years, it hasn't been. Our country has suffered from it. We've been embarrassed. We've been alienated. We've withdrawn. We've been concerned. We've been ashamed at times. That need not be. Our people's spirit has not been broken. In the last 24 years, we've had Democrats in the White House only eight years -- only eight years. There's been a reason for it, and I'll get to that in a few minutes.

But what do we want from government? We want to work. We want jobs. We haven't got them. In 1968, when Richard Nixon defeated Hubert Humphrey, the unemployment rate was 3.6%. Today, it's more than twice that high -- about 7.8% and going up.

There has been a philosophy within the Republican Party that the best way to hold down inflation is to create a buffer supply of unemployed human beings. Any economic concept that thinks that the best way to control inflation is to keep people out of work is bankrupt, and our country cannot tolerate this any longer.

Even with an emphasis on inflation -- let unemployment go where it will -- what has been the record under John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson? Do you know what the average inflation rate was per year? 2%. Under Nixon and Ford, do you know what the average inflation rate has been per year? 6.9%. This is not progress.

And it shows that an understanding of economics, when the human factor is left out, is not good for our nation in any respect. Recessions hurt those who are weakest, who are already poor, who are rural or isolated, who have marginal educational opportunities, whose family ties are weak, who are timid and inarticulate. Under the Kennedy and Johnson Administrations, for eight years, we had zero recessions. Under Eisenhower, Nixon and Ford -- five recessions.

The Republicans have always claimed that in spite of the statistics at least they don't waste money. The Democrats, in their inclination to help human beings with social programs, create enormous deficits. But what's the record? The accumulated deficits for the last two years and under the Administration's current budget are \$170 billion, more than the last thirty years combined. Under Kennedy and Johnson, the average deficit was

less than \$7 billion a year. Under Nixon and Ford, the average deficit has been more than \$24 billion a year.

I don't want to paint a black picture, or a frightful picture of our country. I don't want to criticize those who struggle with these needs. And here's a legitimate question -- is anyone trying to do anything about our human needs? The answer is yes. Under Jennings Randolph's leadership, there have been a series of public works bills passed by the Congress to put our people back to work, to provide services for those in communities where the services are actually needed. Not to waste money, but to spend it wisely as a tremendous investment in our own citizens.

The last time President Ford vetoed a bill -- the next to the last -- he let the Senate leadership know, "I can't accept that bill, work out one that's more modest." And that's what Senator Randolph did. And then the bill passed. And did President Ford sign it? No. It was vetoed. Seven hundred thousand jobs lost to our people.

Unemployment hurts every family almost. And particularly those who are unemployed for a long term. So the Congress passed a bill and said that for a family that is unemployed, let's help them simply make the payments on their own home mortgages until they get another job. The Congress passed this bill. President Ford vetoed it.

Children need to eat, even if their fathers and mothers don't work. So the Congress passed a school lunch bill. A program that was started originally by my own Senator, Richard Russell. This was designed to provide school lunch room services for the poorer families. And President Ford vetoed it.

My middle son, Chip, his wife's name is Caron. She teaches a pre-first grade class of children who can't quite make it because of their devastating poverty. Almost all those students happen to be black. When they cut off the funds for the school lunch program, my daughter-in-law, without telling me or Rosalynn, took the money out of her own pocket and bought food and milk for those children. Later, when she could afford it no longer, she asked her father to contribute money. And he did, to buy milk for those children.

But the veto of such needed legislation is not typical of the attitude of our country or public servants.

There was another bill passed to provide better medical care in rural areas and inner cities, to let doctors go there. It was vetoed. There was another bill passed to give Vietnamese veterans, the most unappreciated heroes in our history, an educational opportunity. It was vetoed by President Ford.

These vetoes don't help our nation's economy. They don't save money. They cause human suffering. And wisely, the leaders on the platform with me tonight overrode those vetoes. Too long, we've had government by veto. Negative government. That's got to change.

I very seldom say anything good about Richard Nixon. But he only vetoed an average of seven bills per year. President Ford has vetoed 27 bills per year.

I don't want to go into much more detail about governmental problems. But I want to make one point that I made in New Hampshire the other day that causes me deep concern. And that's the impact of inadequate leadership on our families. Forty percent of all marriages today end in divorce. In 1960, children born of unwed

mothers comprised one out of twenty. Last year, one out of eight. There's a tremendous increase in crime brought about primarily by unemployment, a shift toward drug addiction, alcoholism, emotional problems for young people. Among those in our society today, black and white, rich and poor, between 15 and 19 years old, the second most frequent cause of death is suicide. This is coupled with a lowering of moral standards. In the last ten years, the gonorrhea rate has tripled among our children less than 14 years old. This has got to be dealt with.

Government leaders -- Presidents, majority leaders, committee chairmen, governors, members of congress -- can't do it alone. There has got to be a surge of commitment and concern among those of us, like the 3,000 to 3,500 assembled here tonight, who care and who've been blessed by God with material wealth, social prominence, leadership capabilities, and community influence. I think you all noticed at the Democratic Convention the remarkable demonstration of unity, of binding together. And that includes you, no matter what your position in life might be. You're an American citizen. and when our kids have gonorrhea, when our young men commit suicide, and drug addiction is with us, when fathers and mothers are unemployed, when families break up, when health care is not there, it's a responsibility of us all.

There are some things which must be done that I've spelled out very clearly over the last twenty months and in my acceptance speech. Our income tax system in this country is a disgrace to the human race. It's got to be changed. The surest income to be taxed is the income earned from manual labor. There are all kinds of loopholes and special privileges for people that are powerful, and nowadays, the average family that makes a million dollars a year pays a lower percentage of their income in taxes than does the average family that makes less than \$10,000 a year. We need basic reform. Not amendments, one section at a time, but a comprehensive analysis of a fair way for our people to be taxed.

Health care is a problem. In this country now we spend an average of \$550 per year for every man, woman and child in our nation. There is no other nation on earth that spends as much on health care as a percentage of their gross national product. But we still have gross inequities. And sometimes with a poor family, or even one with fairly moderate means, when someone gets sick they are reluctant to go to a doctor. I heard the other day a story that illustrates this point. I don't know if it was a coal miner or a peanut farmer, but he went to the doctor and the doctor said, "Sir, you need an operation. Do you believe that you have enough money to afford it?" And the fellow thought for awhile, and he said, "Doctor, I want to ask you a question, if I don't have enough money to pay, do you think I still need the operation?"

Well, the fear of enormous medical costs is bad enough. But we still have a tremendous affliction on our people in unmet preventive care. I grew up on a farm in an isolated area. I got good medical care. But the emphasis was on the prevention of disease. Those of you who are as old as I am remember those diseases: typhus, typhoid, diphtheria, whooping cough, mumps, measles, and polio. But the emphasis was on prevention. We need a comprehensive nationwide mandatory health care system in this country. And if I'm elected, that will be a major goal of mine.

In closing, I would like to say one other thing. We need an open government to let our people know what our government leaders are doing, including the President.

Every time our nation's made a serious mistake in the managing of foreign affairs -- in Watergate, Cambodia, Vietnam.-- it's been because our people have been excluded from the process. We've know what was going on. We've been held at arms length and separated from our own government.

I grew up on a farm. I never wasted my own money. I saw what good government services did to change my life. My family's lived in Georgia more than 200 years. Nobody in my father's family ever finished high school before me. I had a good chance in life. And I want to be sure that government gives our young people today a good chance in life.

I don't believe in giveaway programs. I don't believe in wasted money. I don't believe in confusion in government. I believe in tough, competent management. And I also believe in delivering services to people who legitimately need those services in an efficient and economical and sensitive way. This is what the American people want. It's not liberal or conservative. It's just what's right.

I want you to help me this fall. To be elected, yes. But also to set a standard of service. To help tear down the wall that exists between our people and our government. To help tear down the wall that exists between the White House and the Congress. To tear down the wall that exists among the regions of our country. To tear down the wall that exists between different races or religions.

These walls have kept us from one another. They've kept us from sharing the responsibilities for our own future. They've isolated us and weakened us and drained the strength that's there. I know as much about this country, I believe, as any other person because I've campaigned so hard. And I've seen it as an innate strength that hasn't been shaken. Our economical strength is still there. Our system of government is the best on earth. And our people are our most tremendous resource of all. I want to see investments made in people and not just in buildings and atomic weapons. I want to see our country go back to work. I want to see defects eliminated in government delivery of services.

If we can put a space vehicle on Mars, I believe that we can four-lane the highway between Charleston and Princeton in less than twenty-five years.

We've accomplished the most difficult task already. And that is to unify the Democratic Party. I believe that we can go from there to unify our nation. But we Democrats have been bound together, not because of Jimmy Carter, not because of Chairman Bob Strauss, not even because of great Senatorial leaders. We've been bound together because we have a common concern and a common purpose and a common hope and a common ideal and a common dream that gives us strength. But we derive our strength from the factory shift lines, and the barbershops and beauty parlors, and truck drivers and farmers and miners and carpenters. People who don't want anything selfish out of government. But who want to see us once again have a nation that's strong, and honest, and sensitive, open and of which we can legitimately be proud.

We've got to deserve -- we Democrats -- have got to deserve the trust and the support that we ask the people of this country to give us. We've been wounded deeply, this nation. And many people, I know, particularly the young, say, "I'm disgusted but I'm going to give my country and its leaders one more chance."

If I should do anything to betray the trust that's been put in me, it would have a devastating impact on this country. The smallest lie, the smallest mis-

leading statement, the smallest betrayal of confidence, would be enormously magnified. I'm not a perfect man. I'm sinful like everyone else. I make my mistakes. But I think I can minimize my mistakes in the future by tying myself, as I have in the past, directly with you. I don't ever want there to be any powerful, big shot political intermediary between me and the average citizen of this country. We've got to be melded together. That's a characteristic of the Democratic Party when it's at its finest. Senator Byrd, Senator Randolph, Jay Rockefeller, your members of Congress, your state party chairmen, and others see this very clearly.

As we went through the convention proceedings in New York, I saw again and again as special interest groups -- good groups -- came to my apartment at the hotel with all kinds of demands. Some of which were quite selfish. And they were willing to yield to create a commonality of purpose and a mutual resolution of our nation's problems and to search for answers unity. That's got to be your purpose here in West Virginia. You can turn this state around politically and have a close working relationship between your Democratic Governor and your assembly and between your Governor and the Congress, between the Congress and the White House.

So we can see the greatness of the people of your state mirrored in a better quality of life. I think we are willing to make the sacrifice as Democrats to bring that about and as the nominee of our party I'm going to expect the Republicans to make a sacrifice too. Specifically tonight, in West Virginia, I want them to sacrifice the Governor's office and the White House next year.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

TRANSCRIPT OF ENERGY BRIEFING

Plains, Georgia
August 17, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: I believe that everyone who looked at the list of those who came to advise me this afternoon would be impressed with the diversity of background and experience and interests that comprise this group. There is a remarkable degree of unanimity among them on some of the basic principles. One is the extreme importance of conservation.

We had a temporary dip in the consumption of energy in this country in '73 and '74 and it's now picking up. We've arrived at our pre-embargo level of consumption in spite of the fact that in fall of '73, President Nixon said that we were importing 25% of our oil. We are now approaching the 50% level. And we're getting into a very vulnerable position as far as our nation's security is concerned in over-dependence on foreign supplies of oil. I think it is also a general agreement that we can never avoid completely imported oil. As long as oil exists in the world, we are probably going to have to have a policy of importing a substantial portion of it.

Leaving the vulnerability factor -- one that we can accommodate if there is a temporary embargo -- I think we also have agreed that if we can stabilize or reduce the present worldwide consumption of oil -- and the United States can contribute a major factor to that -- then the OPEC nations' influence will decrease over a period of time. If the worldwide consumption of oil increases substantially, their influence will increase.

We also have had quite a long discussion today on the trends in consumption of overall energy. Our present consumption in the country is roughly 70 Quads -- which I think is one and 15 zeros -- ten to the 15th power BTU's. According to studies that have been done by the scientific community -- and I think this is a very conservative figure -- by the end of this century, the year 2000, that will increase to 100 Quads. Other estimates have placed it much higher than that. This is a 2% or less annual growth rate, compounded. Right now the rate of growth is perhaps more than that but with decreasing estimates of population increases in our country, with an estimated population by the year 2000 of about 250 million, then that relatively low and slow rate of increased energy usage is a possibility even without external constraints like mandatory conservation measures.

Another point that was made was that our country does now utilize a great deal of energy per person. We consume about 64 barrels per person per year, or its equivalent, whereas in the Scandanavian countries or West Germany, it's about half that much. And in Canada, next to us, it's considerably less than that. So we do have a long way to go as far as having more efficient use of energy.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

Another point that I think was agreed to was this. That anything that's done to deregulate the price of energy, and I believe that everybody agrees that over a period of time energy prices are going to go up substantially, that it ought to be done in a carefully phased and predictable way. That the greatest adverse impact on our economy and on peoples' individual lives comes with the shocks of abrupt unanticipated energy price increases. To the extent that we can do this in a carefully planned, predictable and phased fashion, those inevitable price increases can be accommodated best in our economy.

I think there was also a general agreement that we now have no comprehensive, long-range, understandable energy policy. And this absence of a policy hurts all of us. It makes whatever inevitable problems arise be greatly exaggerated in their adverse impact on our lives.

Another point that was made was the comparison between present use of major forms of energy and available reserve supplies. These figures are quite interesting to me. 16% of our energy now comes from coal. 90% of our energy reserves are from coal. So we're under-utilizing coal compared to its reserves. Oil -- we get 40% of our energy now from oil; oil comprises only 3% of our reserves. 30% of our energy now comes from natural gas; only 4% of our reserve supplies are natural gas. So another inevitability, in addition to conservation, is a shift over a period of time to coal.

We had quite a discussion about the relative advisability of continuing to emphasize the use of coal from the Appalachian region or continuing the present apparent Nixon-Ford government policies to shift strongly toward increased use of coal in the Far West. We had a very long discussion about how the sulphur -- SO2 -- content as a component of the use of coal from the different regions of our country, and it was pointed out that the sulphur content in the coal on the Eastern Seaboard now is too high. Only about 10% of the present eastern coal -- that's east of the Mississippi -- can comply with present air pollution standards. That's with known technology. But that obviously can and probably will be improved. It's also a factor that's very important that the present concentration of labor and investment is in the Appalachian region primarily, and the move toward the West will create some disruption in labor opportunities and will require the shift of the coal mining profession to the West.

Another factor that was raised by Dr. Weinberg, a scientist here, was that after we use 20% of our total fossil fuel supplies, the percentage of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere would double. And this would create very severe environmental questions. Possibly, problems that could not be accepted by human beings. So in addition to the depletion of our energy supplies, you also have an inevitable build up in pollution problems with the higher concentration of carbon dioxide.

Another frequently expressed concern is that we now have ten or twelve different major agencies in the federal government which are directly responsible for energy policy. And it's almost impossible for a consumer or a state or an environmentalist or even an oil company or a coal company to go anywhere in the federal government and get a definitive answer from any one of those entities in the federal government.

I think the general advice to me as a possible President was the I would have a great opportunity to help derive a comprehensive energy policy in the absence of a crisis. We can consider this in a careful methodical way now, and for the first time perhaps, open up the decision-making process to involvement by

the states in addition to the federal government. And by consumers and environmentalists in addition to the oil companies. And this broad ranging involvement in the establishment of a national policy, absent a crisis pressure, is a great opportunity for me or for the next president.

Another question that was discussed, and I think this is very interesting, is that we now in some oil wells leave 60% of the oil in the ground. And once that point is reached with 35 or 40 or 50% extraction, the environmental consequences have already been felt. So we have a good opportunity there with the new extraction techniques which might be more costly, to get a substantial amount of additional oil and natural gas from the ground without the concurrent environmental degradations of our quality of life.

Governor Boren, of Oklahoma, suggested as one of the alternatives perhaps to vertical divestiture, what he calls vertical accountability. So that the oil companies for instance, would be required to file income tax returns for the different levels of oil exploration, extraction, refining, distribution, wholesale and retail sales. So that there could be an analysis made to further ensure that there is competition within the oil industry.

Just a couple of other points. One experimental program that's been described and is quite interesting is, I think, in Seattle, Washington, where the bank, or at least one of the banks there, gives reduced interest rate on loans to purchase a home or to build a new home if that home meets rigid insulation standards. It gives also reduced interest rates on loans to buy an automobile if that automobile will get greater than 25 miles per gallon efficiency. So through the financing structure, which can be extrapolated as you can well and quickly see toward even government guaranteed loans, there can be built in an economic incentive to comply with stricter conservation measures. This is in some ways voluntary and not mandatory, as you can understand.

Dr. Weinberg pointed out several times that we need to coordinate in the governmental structure our energy policy with research and development allocations. Quite often these two decision themes work at cross purposes, and we have research and development allocations made which are completely incompatible with an overall energy policy for our country. He also points out that we ought to keep all energy options open and not completely wipe out as a possibility in the future any particular kind of energy until we know much more certainly what a long range policy would include and which would involve world supplies, the rate of exploration and discovery, the rate of depletion of our present supplies, price pressures over which we have no control. We ought not to close out any particular aspect of energy policy. What he was referring to specifically is not to have a nationwide moratorium, for instance, on the use of atomic power for the production of electricity until we can make sure that we have some alternative to it and I agree with this statement.

And we had Mr. Harris Arthur here who represents a Navajo tribe of Indians in New Mexico. I think he made a very vivid presentation to us about the human aspect of energy policy. Sometimes we only think about the price of gasoline or we think only about different governmental policies, but as a member of the Navajo tribe in New Mexico, they're facing a complete change in their style of living and perhaps even a termination of the existence of their tribal life as a consequence of insensitive government decisions.

So these are some of the things that we discussed this afternoon, just hurriedly. There are a number of them, I didn't try to make the list complete.

But I think you can see the kind of exploration of ideas that we covered in the short four-hour period. The group will be preparing over the next few weeks to put all these factors in a more comprehensive form, four or five of them, and then this will be submitted back to these persons and also to others who are knowledgeable about the energy field, and I'll be deriving from this advice my own attitude as the next President so that I can help to shape, with a major role, a comprehensive and fair and predictable and sensitive energy policy for our country. We don't have an energy policy now that meets any of those criteria. I would like first of all to give the folks standing behind me an opportunity to correct any errors that I made. And don't be reticent about it because I don't want to inadvertently...

JAMES GRIFFIN: I think the level on imported oil has gone from 25% to right at 40%, instead of 50%.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think somebody said almost 50% -- well, between 40% and 50%. I know that in the month of March it did reach 50%. So it's between 40% and 50% imported oil.

QUESTION: The other day, in West Virginia, you said, if I understood you correctly, that you felt coal production should be mainly maintained in Appalachia and that there should not be a major shift out West. Now here today, you seem to be raising that possibility of labor shifts and so forth.

GOVERNOR CARTER: You can't freeze production exclusively in the Appalachian region. In my speech the other night I pointed out some figures that I think were confirmed to be accurate today. We now produce about 630 million tons of coal per year. About 110 million of that comes from West Virginia, coincidentally. There is a feasibility study by the American Society of Engineers that shows that by 1985 this can be roughly doubled. The needs following 1985 to the year 2000 call for another doubling. The technology to be used in doubling the production of coal and the environmental quality standards for sulphur dioxide reductions to make that coal possible to be burned, is a very serious question. If there is a choice to be made, my own attitude would be to strengthen the production of coal in the Appalachian regions. You've got some very serious problems in the West. One is that the source of coal is distant from the point at which the energy is consumed. Another one is that you would have to have a substantial shift of an entire industry across our country. Another one is the extreme shortage of water. As you know, with liquification and the gasification of coal you have a doubling or a tripling or a quadrupling of the price of either gasoline or liquid fuel or natural gas as compared to the present cost. And we also have the additional problem of the change in the kind of life that is lived in those areas. And in addition to that, of course, you have the policy of protecting the public lands, the Indian lands, grazing lands, farm lands and natural areas that are in our parkland areas. So as a general proposition I would favor accentuating the production and the use of coal in the Appalachian region.

QUESTION: Could you tell us in more detail how vertical responsibility or accountability will lead to greater competition and what if anything was discussed about horizontal divestiture?

GOVERNOR CARTER: The position that I've maintained is that I'm not in favor of divestiture of the oil companies in a complete vertical way as long as I'm convinced there's an adequate degree of competition. And that's a very important caveat.

My own concern has been more in horizontal investment -- the oil companies investing in coal and uranium and geothermal -- than it has been in the vertical integration. This was a proposal that Governor Boren made and I'll let him answer the question after I briefly respond. One of the allegations that has been the basis of the divestiture proposal is that the oil companies controlling the process all the way from exploration, to extraction, to transporting to the refinery, refinery refining, distributing through the oil pipelines and wholesale and retail sales, it permits the oil companies to eliminate competition by making a heavy profit at the crude oil level and taking an actual loss at the retail level to freeze out competition. But if you require the oil companies -- this is a proposal I never heard about until today, by the way -- but if you require the oil companies to reveal their profit in segments so that you could see how much profit they made at the crude oil level, how much in the refining, how much in the piping, how much at the wholesale and retail level, that would tend to maximize competition. I'd like to ask Governor Boren to develop this further since this is his idea.

GOVERNOR BOREN: Governor, I think you've explained it very, very well. I think that what the people of the country want to be assured of is that if they're being asked to make personal sacrifices in terms of higher energy costs in general that they're not bearing this burden alone. That no one's making excessive profits from it. And I think that we've been in a sense putting the cart before the horse in talking about divestiture. When at the present time the oil companies, the large companies, that are in all of these levels, file comprehensive tax returns which don't break down their profits by area. I think if we have accountability at each level -- in other words, what profits are they making in production, in marketing, in transportation and so on -- this will give the people of the country much more information than they've had in the past. This of course will be public record so the people would know themselves what levels of profits are being made. If abuses were found at any level then within the system, the anti-trust laws could be applied to that particular level effectively. So I think it's really a matter of public accountability is what we're talking about.

QUESTION: Governor, do you endorse this idea? Or is it just an idea you're considering?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think it has interesting possibilities. I would like to go into it further before I make an unequivocal endorsement, but I think it's a good one to pursue. I might say that this is a question that came up at the Public Citizen Forum the other day. Not relating to the oil industry, but say relating to General Motors. There is no requirement now that stockholders in General Motors, for instance, be acquainted with the profits that are made from, say, the Frigidaire Division, which manufactures home appliances. And the public disclosure of corporate profits, as it would relate to an easier enforcement of anti-trust laws, is a proposal that I favor as a general proposition. Specifically, I would rather look into it a little further, but I can say that it is an attractive thing to me and my inclination would be to support it.

QUESTION: What about horizontal divestiture, Governor? What was your discussion on that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: We didn't discuss that, this afternoon, very much. I think that there -- in fact I don't believe we discussed that at all this afternoon. I can't recall that coming up. But my own position is that horizontal divestiture, in my opinion, is a much more worthy subject of discussion than even vertical

divestiture and I, unless I'm convinced that there is an adequate amount of competition there, I would look with favor on horizontal divestiture. But my own first preference would be to insure competition through other means. I have been concerned in recent years that there has been very little increase in the production of coal. Some of that perhaps is because of inadequate competition. But the other part of it is artificially low prices for natural gas and, for a number of years, artificially low prices of imported oil. And of course other governmental policies concerning air pollution standards which makes the burning of coal now much less attractive by some power producers. So it's a complicated thing, but if I'm convinced that there is adequate competition I would not favor divestiture. If I'm not convinced, and I'm going to be very strict about that looking at it from the consumer viewpoint, then I would favor divestiture.

Does anyone here feel that you ought to add something to what I've outlined? I've tried to keep notes and do the best I could, but if any of you have a comment that you'd like to make ...

SHEARON HARRIS: I could live with my utility colleagues if I just got on record as saying that I urged you to give nuclear equal footing with coal.

JERRY DECKER: I'm Jerry Decker from Dow and I'd just like to make a strong plug for conservation in industry and also the use of coal of industry, getting back to the kind of percentages that we used to use in industry before 1950. I think we can also take care of all the environmental aspects of this from a standpoint of strip mining that you've just mentioned and the transportation and burning.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I might say this, I wish we had more time because Dow Chemical, for instance, which has been a company that suffered severely during the Vietnamese War for other reasons, they pointed out that in the last five years they have cut down, I believe 40%, their consumption of energy for the production of the same products. And one particular company in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, I believe he said, has a procedure worked out now so that an additional 30% savings in the consumption of energy for the same production might be realized. So there's a tremendous opportunity here for industry, for home owners, for the transportation sector of our economy, all to conserve greatly in the consumption of energy. And I don't think anybody felt that it wouldn't be best for our whole economy if we could eliminate waste. Even though the sale of coal, the sale of oil, the sale of natural gas would go down every time you saved, everybody thought that in the long run, and the short range, there would be a strong benefit for the economy of our country if we could eliminate waste through strong conservation measures.

I want to thank all of you again, I know you have to leave. And you've meant a lot to me already. I think we're going to get more out of you in the future.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON LIBRARIES

Well-stocked libraries open to all are essential to our democratic system of government. As President Kennedy said in 1963, "Good libraries are as essential to an educated and informed people as the school system itself. The library is not only the custodian of our cultural heritage but the key to progress and the advancement of knowledge."

Today, because of shortsighted Republican policies, we are allowing our libraries to deteriorate.

During the last four years under Ford and Nixon, budget cutbacks, freezes and impoundments have forced libraries all over the nation to sharply curtail their programs.

In 1973, the Democratic Congress voted \$85 million for library services and construction, \$100 million for library services under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, and \$77 million for help for college libraries.

In 1974, President Nixon proposed to eliminate funding for all of these programs. And when Congress refused to allow these thoughtless budget cuts Nixon resorted to impoundments of library funds. Only court challenges finally forced release of this critically needed support.

Under President Ford, this damaging policy toward libraries has continued. In 1975, the administration held up release of federal library funds until two months before the end of the fiscal year, making chaos of sound library planning. And under the guise of consolidated funding President Ford has continued to push for the virtual elimination of federal help to the nation's libraries. In 1975 the administration proposed to replace categorical library programs with block grants. But the block grants were slated for only \$10 million in funding, a tiny fraction of the level of previous categorical programs.

Though Congress has consistently overridden these anti-intellectual policies, administration opposition has played havoc with sound planning and sensible administration. And the lower level of federal support has forced many libraries to suspend or reduce some of their programs.

Because of federal cutbacks and local budget stringencies, academic and research libraries have been forced to sharply curtail their acquisition of library materials. Some of the greatest center city public libraries have had to reduce their hours of service, lay off personnel, and eliminate programs. Elementary schools in

some cases have closed their libraries altogether, dismissing library personnel and dividing up the books among the classrooms. We cannot call for a revival of quality education in America and close our libraries. We cannot ask our children to learn to read and take away their books.

We need a new, revitalized effort to save our libraries and to make them strong bastions against illiteracy and ignorance.

This is not simply a matter of more federal support, although that will help. In libraries as in other areas, we need efficiency and sound management of our limited resources. We need to organize our library services so that they can effectively serve the public. We need to coordinate federal help for libraries so that the assistance reaches those who need it and so that waste and duplication are eliminated.

Streamlining of government, and coordination between the federal government and the states must be pursued with vigor. At present, federal assistance is uncoordinated, confused and multifaceted. The U.S. Office of Education administers three library programs designed to assist the states to improve their school libraries, develop their public libraries, and help colleges and universities strengthen their library programs.

The National Science Foundation administers a program of science information activities. The Library of Congress serves as a national library, distributes cataloging data to libraries across the country, makes talking books available to the blind and physically handicapped, and works in a host of different ways to improve the services of all types of libraries in America. The National Library of Medicine supplies up-to-date medical information to health science professionals all over the country.

There are many other federal agencies involved in the nation's library systems. There is the National Commission on Libraries and Information Science, the National Endowment for the Humanities, and the Depository Library program of the Government Printing Office, all involved in one phase or another of library assistance. Grants are available for library construction through the U.S. Office of Education, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, the U.S. Department of Commerce, and through the Appalachian Regional Commission. The list of library-related federal agencies and services could go on and on.

If federal library help is to be truly useful to the states, to the localities and to library users, we must rationalize and coordinate this disconnected system. We need a clear, ongoing national library policy, coordinated by a well-organized centrally controlled federal agency.

A logical agent for delivery of library support to the nation is a national library. The Library of Congress has been allowed to assume some of these functions. It is possible that it should assume others. As part of my overall effort to reorganize govern-

ment I intend to study the feasibility of strengthening the role of the Library of Congress in coordinating national library policy.

Along with greater coordination in Washington, we need to strengthen the leadership role of state governments in the provision of library services. The local libraries should be able to look with confidence to the state government, and in turn the state should know what kinds of assistance and advice can be sought from Washington. We will coordinate the myriad federal agencies and programs assisting libraries and draw the lines with simplicity and clarity. The states must do the same, by simplifying and modernizing their own bureaucratic structures. Paperwork and bureaucratic red tape must be eliminated in Washington. In turn, the states must reduce their own bureaucratic complexities and eliminate their own red tape. It is no help to our cities, counties and towns if the federal paperwork burden is simply replaced by the state paperwork burden. Proper management and a reformed bureaucracy may themselves make more money available for books and direct services to the public.

We must have rationalized library development. The large research libraries should be strengthened so that they can serve not only their primary clientele but also smaller libraries in every state. Major research collections should supplement the more general collections of the smaller libraries. Each library should be coordinated with other libraries in its region, so that it will know where it can turn to borrow a book it does not own. Through coordination of this kind, every American will have access to the library holdings of our greatest research libraries.

Improved research and development are required, so that automated techniques of information retrieval can be applied to libraries. But we must be careful to implement only the most cost-effective and carefully tested systems. It is easy to waste money on sophisticated technology that is unnecessary or inadequate, or that makes the provision of service more difficult or more time-consuming.

If we are to succeed in developing libraries to their full service potential we must have the interest and participation of large numbers of the American public. The President is authorized to hold a White House Conference on Library and Information Services not later than 1978 for just this purpose.

This conference should be the culmination of an extensive process of citizen involvement in library policy making its beginning at the grassroots. Through preliminary conferences in each of the states, the local citizenry can take a close look at their libraries and decide whether perhaps there are overlapping roles and responsibilities of public libraries, new services needed or other changes that need to be made.

These are decisions that must be approved at the state and local level by an informed and knowledgeable citizenry. The White House Conference process will help to develop a public knowledgeable about alternative ways of providing good library service, and it

will help create public support for libraries. Results from the state conferences can be pooled at the White House Conference. We will then have a sound foundation upon which to devise complementary local, state and federal plans for library and information services in the decade ahead.

Let me summarize the points I have made. First, I believe that federal help for the nation's library system should be funded on a sustained and stable basis. If we are to have an educated and informed population we need a strong and open library system supported by a committed administration.

Second, I believe that federal library help must be rationalized, consolidated and streamlined. This process of cutting red tape must be accompanied by a commitment at the state and local level to do likewise. Consolidation, however, is not a codeword for cutbacks. Adequate funding must be assured.

Finally, I believe that the library-using public should have more input into the decisions concerning the role of their local libraries. A nationwide series of library conferences culminating in a White House Conference is one method of implementing this process.

Libraries are a national resource, and all of the nation must share in their upkeep. By the same token all of the nation must have access to the information contained in our many and diverse libraries. The strength of our system of government is the collective wisdom of our people. Our libraries are one crucial foundation of that wisdom.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON CYPRUS

AUGUST 19, 1976

TO:

Supreme President William G. Chirgotis
AHEPA 54th Supreme Convention

Congratulations on the occasion of the 54th Annual Supreme Convention of the American Hellenic Educational Progressive Association. I have the greatest admiration for the impressive contributions which Greek-Americans have made to American industry, education, the arts and political life, without your losing your strong ties to church and community. Your heritage lies in a land where democracy was first born, and where, thankfully, it has seen a recent rebirth. You are still among democracy's staunchest defenders. I salute you.

As you deliberate I want you to know of my deep concern over existing tensions between Greece and Turkey. The United States for many years has had a major role and responsibility in helping to preserve the security of both Greece and Turkey in the context of the NATO Alliance. The United States thus has made a large contribution to the military postures of both countries. For this reason, the United States must help to resolve the differences between our two allies peacefully.

The absence of progress in the Cyprus negotiations is tragic and dangerous. Administration's record is a record of one lost opportunity after the other, it failed to deal with the situation in three respects: it failed to bring about a settlement in Cyprus during the five years before the Cyprus crisis; it failed, despite repeated warnings, to prevent the 1974 coup against Makarios engineered by the former military dictatorship in Athens; and it failed to prevent or even to limit the Turkish invasion of Cyprus that followed. Secret and personal agreements, vacillation and cynicism, are no substitute for a clear commitment to an early settlement which gives Cyprus its independence.

I hope there will be successful initiatives from the Greek and Turkish governments and Turkish Cypriots to end the impasse which now exists in the talks between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot communities. To contribute to an enduring peace, any settlement must provide a solution to the territorial problem, bearing in mind the proper balance between the two populations and the need for a viable economic base for the two communities and the island as a whole. It must protect the rights of both the Greek majority and the Turkish minority on the Island, including the rights of those displaced from their homes by the Turkish invasion.

I hope both Greece and Turkey will avoid any action that would increase existing tensions and the possibility of conflict over the issue of oil rights. Both these nations have infinitely more to gain from friendship than from enmity. Therefore, I would hope they would sit down together to resolve their differences on a just basis with such help from any international organization they may deem appropriate and useful. Perhaps the International Court of Justice can clarify some of the legal issues involved in the oil rights dispute in the Aegean. Effective diplomatic steps to support the rule of law must be taken.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON GUNS AND HUNTING

"I remember that first quail. I was ten years old, hunting alone with my bird dog and my bolt-action .410 and I was so excited when that bird fell, that I ran all the way home to show it to my Daddy. After suitable admiration, he asked, 'Where's your gun?' It took three days to find where I had thrown it down in my excitement."

I wrote those words in the introduction to a book entitled Prince of Game Birds: The Bob White, published in 1974 by Georgia's Department of Natural Resources. This educational volume was one small part of the program adopted during my administration as Governor of Georgia to preserve our precious traditions of enjoying the wild through hiking and fishing, canoeing and hunting.

Such enjoyments were my first love, because my playmates and I grew up close to the earth. We regularly hunted rabbits, squirrels, possums, raccoons, woodchucks, and sometimes a fox or a bobcat. As an adult, I have kept up as much as possible with these joys -- especially on weekends hunting the bobwhite quail.

Tragically, we can no longer take these pursuits for granted. The times have changed in many, many ways. Few of these changes have done our wildlife any good. Millions of farm and forest acres have been transformed into roads, shopping centers, housing developments -- acres that once teemed with wildlife.

Many sportsmen are troubled not only by the threat of uncontrolled development, but by proposals to help curb urban crime by outlawing cheap handguns and related measures. Their concern is based on a kind of "domino theory." While attempts to stop the criminal misuse of handguns in metropolitan areas are not harmful in and of themselves, it is feared that such steps may lead to impairment of sport shooting.

I oppose any further restriction of our opportunities to enjoy the wild outdoors. This is a life-long commitment for me. Through personal experience I know that it can only be fulfilled through determined struggle. There is no time for us -- sportsmen who love God's earth and the beauty of it -- to compromise or retreat. If proponents of extreme gun control recommend misguided regulatory controls, which would be contrary to the legitimate interests of sportsmen, I would do all I could to oppose them.

As sportsmen and concerned citizens, we must work in many ways to protect our wild heritage. We must oppose unnecessary channelization of our streams and damming of our rivers. Abusive strip mining of our land and irresponsible clear-cutting of our forests must end. When I was Governor of Georgia, we took strong steps to meet these needs. Through our Heritage Trust program we acquired and protected over 20,000 acres of wild lands -- and more areas have been added since then. We established 12 new wildlife management areas, expanded our game

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C.

management program, and introduced game birds into new hunting areas throughout the state. I vetoed the proposed Spewrell Bluff Dam, which would have dammed the last free-flowing stream in Georgia. If I am elected President, I will apply these concerns to every aspect of federal policy.

As a resolute defender of our national resources and the sportsman's right to enjoy them, I do not believe we have anything to fear from responsible programs to combat the criminal use of handguns in urban areas. As my own experience has shown me, the vast majority of hunters and other gun sportsmen use their firearms respectfully and responsibly. We should not be penalized because of the small number of individuals who use their firearms carelessly, or because criminals use firearms, particularly handguns, to commit crimes.

I propose three principles for controlling the abuse of firearms while protecting the sportsman's rights:

1. A ban on cheap handguns or "Saturday Night Specials." This provision should preserve the citizen's right to purchase quality handguns.
2. Prohibiting criminals who use guns and the mentally incompetent from owning guns.
3. Handgun registration, reasonable waiting periods, and appropriate licensing provisions.

Some of these measures can best be left to the states.

These regulations will not end our crime problem. They must be accompanied by strong measures directed at the real culprit -- the criminal himself. I favor strong sentences for persons who use firearms to commit crimes, whether under federal or state law. We must also insure a swift trial for those accused of crimes and appropriate punishment for the guilty.

There are some political leaders who promise a pure "hands-off" approach to handgun control. Some would leave all types of handguns, including "Saturday Night Specials," legally free to fall into the hands of any felon or disturbed person who has \$10. I am a sportsman by background and instinct. And I simply cannot view this as a proper and balanced policy for our President to adopt.

We sportsmen who cherish our right to use firearms bear particular responsibility to see that they are everywhere used carefully and well. This is what my father taught me when I first learned to hunt. It is what I have taught my children. And it is what I intend to do if I am elected President.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

PRESS BRIEFING ON DEFENSE ADVISORY SESSION

PLAINS, GEORGIA

July 27, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: I thought we had a very productive session with the advisers on defense policy. The major overall objective of the session yesterday was to see how to coordinate much more clearly the preparation of the overall national budget -- our ultimate foreign affairs commitments -- with defense policy. Most of the advisers who were here today have been involved either as technicians or as specialists or in some major capacity in the Defense Department. And they expressed their frustration, from their past close working relationship, that a budget for the Defense Department is prepared in the absence of coordination with the foreign policy leaders -- the Secretary of State and others.

And everyone agrees that this has to be a major responsibility of the President himself. That when you have either the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Defense attempting to coordinate efforts between the two major department staffs, it is an impossibility. It's been tried in the past and failed. But I am determined that if I should become President that this would be well coordinated in the initial stages of the preparation of the budget for these major departments.

There was also an expression of concern that our agriculture policy, our foreign trade, the functions of the Commerce Department, which are heavily involved, as you know, along with many others in the Federal Government, with foreign affairs, has never been coordinated with the establishment and confirmation of our foreign policy.

The second major thing that we discussed yesterday was our commitments of troops overseas. I think there was an unanimous agreement that our commitments to NATO, which have been confirmed repeatedly by Congress, the President and the American people, will have to be sustained. The NATO commitment needs to be reassessed. This has not been done since 1967. And as I mentioned in my last foreign policy address, the advance technologies that have evolved in the last seven or eight year period has called for a reassessment of the basic sharing of the responsibilities among the nations involved in NATO, certainly including ourselves. There was unequivocal commitment on everybody's part that the relative strength of the NATO countries has to be maintained. Vis a vis the strength of the Eastern European and Soviet Union forces.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

The same agreement was unanimous with respect to our present commitment in Japan. We have about 25,000 troops in Japan proper and I think about 35,000 additional troops in Okinawa. As an aftermath of the Second World War, these commitments have been ratified over and over. Our position about maintaining the concept was reconfirmed I think unanimously yesterday that over a period of time, often with careful consultation with the South Korean and Japanese government, we could very well reduce our ground forces there over a four or five year period, withdrawing them completely but maintaining adequate air cover for South Korea. And I think that this, if done within that time schedule, would be a good move. We now have about 42,000 troops in South Korea.

The next point that we discussed was the ineffectiveness of our nation's reserve forces. As a Governor who attended National Guard Training sessions every summer, and as one who has had military training on a professional basis, I am quite concerned about the absence of a proper role for the reserve forces. Both the regular reserve forces and also the National Guard. There was a great deal of concern expressed by Mr. Vance, Mr. Warnke, Mr. Nitze and others that served in the Defense Department, about a shift toward a much more highly trained, much more effective and much more crucial role to be played by our reserve forces. And the political obstacles that have been placed in the path of making changes have been considered by them to be almost insurmountable. My own belief is that the President, the Defense Department leaders, and the Governors should be involved in the initial stages of planning for the strengthening and the most helpful coordination of the reserve forces. That is to be a major objective of mine, and I think it is something that I will be commenting on throughout the campaign.

The next discussion was on manpower. I've mentioned many times about the heavy overburden of excessive rank in the military forces. This so called grade creep is almost inevitable unless strong leadership is exerted to prevent it and to undo it. We've got a highly excessive percentage of our total armed forces in the higher ranks and this must be reversed. We also need to have some attention given as to how manpower can be expended in a more effective way. One example, of many we discussed, was longer assignment times on a particular post for those who serve in the military and a substantial reduction in the amount of transit time and the amount of time spent in the armed forces in training programs. We've now got less than two students per instructor in the military, and a reassessment of these commitments will be a very good project to undertake.

The last point that we discussed was arms transfers or the sale of military weapons overseas. We've now become the major supplier of the weapons systems of all kinds to foreign countries -- to the so-called neutral countries, those who have relationships between us and the Soviet Union, to our own close allies and friends, historically speaking, and those, sometimes, who have not publicly expressed animosity toward us. I think that arm sales in the last 10 years have increased from about \$1 billion per year to now close to \$12 billion per year. And I believe very strongly -- I think that belief was shared almost unanimously yesterday -- that the next President should move to reduce arms sales abroad. We ought to assess

every arm sales policy on an individual nation basis. In other words, if we think the sale of arms can better preserve peace in a portion of the world, and carry out our committed foreign policy, then let the arm sales be made on that basis alone. Not just to try to secure sales of our products or to give us an advantageous balance of trade ratio.

The most important single impression that all of us got yesterday was the inevitable devastation of any nuclear war. American leaders and private citizens of all kinds tend to forget, as time passes, the unbelievable destruction to human beings that would result from any sort of nuclear war. Even if we could insure that the war would be "limited in nature" it would still face the prospect of approximately 10 million Americans being killed if an attack was made on our country. And an equivalent number, perhaps even a greater number, would be killed if a limited war, so-called, was permitted to occur in Europe. In an all-out war, the ten million Americans that would be killed would increase to 200 million. Obviously, these figures are unconscionable and almost unbelievable. But they are true. And when we change the phraseology, talking about 40 megaton capability for our atomic submarines or 800 megaton capability for our fixed silo ICBMs or 800 megatons for our bomber fleet, we forget that in human terms this is an unbelievable degree of death.

So the major purpose of our country, obviously, is to continue to be the preservation of peace and the security of our country. But the holocaust that would result from any sort of nuclear weapons use was very vividly impressed on everyone's mind yesterday.

Those are some of the points that we discussed. I would like to ask Senator Mondale if there are additional things.

SENATOR MONDALE: I might just make one point, and that is the principle of rough equivalence. It would be our hope that the Soviet Union could be persuaded in serious negotiations with the United States to restrain on an agreed basis from deployment both in numbers and in quality of so-called strategic armaments. And that both nations could slowly negotiate downward the outer limits of the numbers of such weapons, the outer limits of new technological deployments of such weapons. It's that way, that together we can reduce our defense budget, increase our security, and increase the prospects of getting along with each other. The Soviet Union should know, and when I spoke to Soviet leaders a few years ago I said as much, that the United States is not going to be in a position where we unilaterally find ourselves in a posture where our defense is not credible. But we will be fully prepared in practical and hardheaded negotiations to reduce those ceilings downward so that both nations may use those resources for human needs and at the same time reduce international tensions.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Does anyone have a question about these matters first?

QUESTION: Governor, could I ask you, in your campaign obviously you are going to have to address this, can you tell us whether the defense budget you will be recommending in your campaign will be roughly equivalent to the present defense budget, somewhat higher, or somewhat lower?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I can't answer that question yet. My belief, which has not been shaken, is that compared to the present defense budget, as it evolves from one year to another, no matter what the level is, that a saving can be realized of roughly 5 percent through some of the changes that I've advocated over a long period of time. But I can't give you at this point an exact figure for the next year or the following year's defense budget.

QUESTION: I take it the savings may be eaten up by the need for development of weapons or other matters.

GOVERNOR CARTER: No matter what the level of the defense budget might be, to give us an adequate security force. The changes in the deployment of our armed forces, reduction in troops overseas, a change in the personnel policies of our country, an elimination of unnecessary functions of the Defense Department, all that can still result in the savings that I've outlined -- \$5-\$7 billion, which would be about 5%.

So within the framework of what I and Senator Mondale and Congress and our defense and foreign affairs leaders think our needs should be, the changes that I've advocated could make us have a more efficient and singular purpose in the Defense Department and could result in a savings.

QUESTION: I'd like to ask you again, if I may, if you think the United States should achieve a first strike capability, as that term is used by weapons managers today.

GOVERNOR CARTER: When you say first strike capability, obviously we now have, and so does the Soviet Union have, the ability to make a first strike and create devastation on the enemy. There is no way to prevent a massive retaliatory strike. Because for all practical purposes, atomic submarines are invulnerable. There is no way for us to detect or destroy the Soviet Union's atomic submarines. And neither is there an ability that the Soviet's have to detect or destroy ours. So if they should be successful in destroying every single fixed silo ICBM in the country, the estimate is that 60-70% of our bomber fleet would still be in the air with nuclear capability -- our B-52's, primarily -- and also every one of our submarines, which would be at sea. And I would think the same thing would apply on the other hand, except that the Soviets do not have as many bombers as we do. So there would be no possibility under the sun that a first strike capability could be adequate in preventing massive destruction on the country that originated the strike.

QUESTION: May I follow that up then? Over the opposition of people, I believe like Senator Mondale, in the Senate last year, when the military appropriations bill was voted last June, a series of amendments allowed R&D to continue on perfection of accuracy for our land based missiles, of "marving" the MIRV" something I barely understand and I trust you do, of increasing the ability to knock out silos in the Soviet Union which opponents like Senator Mondale argued, it might make the Soviet Union believe that we were aiming at the first strike capability and cause them to become more trigger happy.

GOVERNOR CARTER: In the analyses that have been done, that have been publicized, and I don't have any secret information about it, there is absolutely no possibility of a successful first strike that would prevent unbelievable destruction on the originator of the attack. Now, the Soviet Union has a much greater dependence on fixed silo weapons than do we. Primarily because of our relative superiority in the air, with bombers. But their weapons are much heavier than ours, their throw weight is much greater than ours, and their missiles are larger. And they are moving toward the higher accuracy that we have. I think yesterday I tried to draw a distinction between our tactical strategy or commitments or plans, and strategic plans.

In our tactical plans, to speak in simplistic terms, means that you try to define combat areas and limit the attack to that area and preclude the enemy from trying to attack your own civilian centers, mainly cities. That still would create a tremendous devastation and death. But I think the first strike capability which used to be thought of as a possibility is no longer possible at all and this has been the case now for fifteen or twenty years since atomic submarines have been available to both sides.

SENATOR MONDALE: The question is, how do we continue that basic principle of assured retaliatory destruction, that has, I think, assured vanity in the use of nuclear weapons since their discovery. The balance of terror. It is an eerie concept but you would have to be insane under the present circumstances to commence an attack, because if you did you would be certain of your own destruction. And that has been the key basis for stability. And both sides realize this. And what I was saying for the last few years was that the way to handle that in light of the fact that the Russians are developing, or are trying to develop, a counterforce strategy to more maneuverable counterforce weaponry. So that we continue that fundamental principal of assured retaliatory force and for that reason, for example, last year I voted for the B-1 bomber, not because I was for that particular bomber, but because I felt it made a lot more sense to follow on with an advanced sophisticated bomber that was maneuverable than it was to proceed on a publicly acknowledged policy of counter force which I think inevitably puts a hair trigger on nuclear warfare, and scares the Russians -- as does their technology scare us. For the same reason, I have been a strong supporter of submarine forces. A few years ago, I offered an amendment to authorize the NORWAL class of submarines, because it is the perfect, stabilizing influence in this era. It can't be found, it can be maneuvered beyond the reach of the Russians, it has long range missile capacity, and it helps persuade the Russians that it would be foolish to commence an attack against us. So my emphasis has been on a strategy that would continue the present balance

that brings us to a situation that only an insane person would commence a nuclear war.

QUESTION: So you would suggest to the Governor that you not pursue a manner of force that, am I correct, is known as first strike capability?

SENATOR MONDALE: It's a matter of emphasis. The key to our strategy ought to be the maneuverability of our retaliatory force.

QUESTION: (Most of question inaudible. Concerns nuclear proliferation and acquisition of nuclear weapons by "irresponsible" governments.)

GOVERNOR CARTER: As you may remember, I made a major speech on nuclear proliferation at the United Nations a couple of months ago. And the major thrust of my speech then, and I think it was a good speech -- we put a lot of time and effort into it -- was that our country ought to do everything we can to decrease the spread of nuclear weapon capability. This would require the tight control of nuclear waste, particularly plutonium waste. It would encourage the nations who have not yet signed a non-proliferation treaty to do so, it would involve a cessation or an ending of our own inclination to test so-called peaceful nuclear devices, even unilaterally if the Russians don't even agree, but it would encourage them to do so. And this is a very serious problem. As you know, there are a growing number of nations in the world that have a nuclear capability, there may be a few nations who have nuclear capability who haven't yet admitted it, or tested a weapon so that it can be discerned. But this is a matter that is most heavily influenced by the attitudes of the two major forces -- that is our own and the Soviet Union. France and China, I would guess, are the two next nations who have nuclear capability and maybe four or five hundred weapons, and then perhaps England in that category. But we are trying to do everything we can, in the campaign, to project the horrors of nuclear proliferation and obviously the horrors of any use of atomic weapons in a limited fashion. But I do favor strongly our country doing everything it can to discourage the proliferation of nuclear capability.

QUESTION: Did you have any discussions, Governor, or have you been turning over in your mind the desirability of reassessing the balance between nuclear capability and limited conventional warfare capability? The second question is, you were talking about the NATO commitment, you're not yet married to any particular troop figures abroad, are you?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No, I'm not. I think what the Soviet Union and we both would prefer is a general understanding by the world, including us, that any altercation in any region would be settled by non-nuclear forces. Now, that puts on us, as you could very quickly discern, the requirement that our ground forces and air forces, excluding nuclear weaponry, should be sufficient in Europe to discourage the Soviet Union from believing that they can mount a successful non-nuclear attack. There was a general agreement yesterday, and I think it is one that our nation's leaders have assumed for a long time, that we do have that sort of combined strength in Western Europe, with our

own forces and those of the other NATO nations. So I think if we can keep before us, one, a mutual commitment along with the Soviet Union to avoid using atomic weapons at all. Secondly, to maintain a rough equivalency, and third, to achieve constant "rough equivalency" with reductions in weapons or limitations other than a continued arms race, then in capsulated form that would express our purpose.

QUESTION: Governor, you were discussing with the advisors the ineffectiveness of reserve forces. Did they agree among themselves as to this ineffectiveness? What kind of ineffectiveness does this mean? What can't these forces do?

GOVERNOR CARTER: There is very little correlation between reserve forces, say Army Reserve and National Guard, on the one hand, with each other or with the regular forces. There is very little sharing of tactical responsibility within a certain region of our country. The readiness of reserve forces is doubtful, there is very little compatibility between promotion, pay and training on the one hand for the reserve forces, and for those in the regular forces. There is a sharp distinction between all the peaceful functions within the reserve forces and the National Guard which comes under a governor, with the immediate transfer of that responsibility to the President if the reserve forces should be needed. And the degree of quality, weapons, is almost completely absent in many of the reserve forces. One of the things that is obvious to me is that the reserve forces, say, in the state quite often are shot through with politics -- promotion procedures, quality of training -- are heavily protected by Governors and Adjutant Generals, and other leaders of the National Guard, from encroachment of influence from Washington. I agree that this should be independent, but I think the only way to circumvent that desire for autonomy on the part of the Governors and the Adjutant Generals, is for them to be involved in the initial study of the changes that need to be made. And I believe that if this is done successfully, that these long needed changes can be consummated.

QUESTION: This sounds like there are drastic changes ahead for these local units.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would guess that's true. And the changes would come in two categories. One is increasing substantially their ability of readiness for defending this country. And secondly, a much tighter interrelationship, a much greater sharing of responsibility with the regular forces. That's where the two problems lie. And I don't believe you will ever have a president who is politically strong enough to run over a Governor, or to run over fifty Governors and to institute changes unilaterally from Washington. But if the Governors as a group, or representatives of the Governors, can work with the Defense Department, the President, in evolving preferred changes, I believe that is the avenue for possible success. There was unanimous agreement yesterday among everyone who has ever served as an adviser to the Defense Department that this is a gross need in our country.

QUESTION: Could I ask each of you what your present position would be on the B-1 bomber?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think this is one point where we might disagree. I don't favor at this point construction of the B-1 bomber. I do favor a continued research and development program on the B-1 bomber if it should become necessary in the future. But I don't favor construction at this point.

SENATOR MONDALE: I think we agree on that. When I voted for this B-1 authorization, it was for research and development. At the time I issued a statement that I thought the B-1 could be restructured. We needed a follow-on bomber, and we wanted to get around this counterforce strategy that was then sort of the upfront official policy of the Defense Department. I think we need a follow-on bomber. I think that research and development ought to go forward, and I voted for the Culver Amendment just a few weeks ago to do so, but I don't think we should make the decision to go into production until we've decided that that's the best follow on bomber to have.

QUESTION: Senator, how are you going to vote on that this week?

SENATOR MONDALE: It depends on what form it is in. If it's research and development I will vote for it. If it's a delay until next year on the question of procurement, I will vote for that.

GOVERNOR CARTER: We have not discussed this with each other, and in fact we agree.

I might say this, this is such a complicated question, with the alternative bomber fleet we presently have, the 111, the B-52, the upcoming increased dependence on cruise missiles, the possible inclusion of Backfire, the Russian bomber in the SALT II talks with the cruise missile. It's a fluid situation. But I think that Senator Mondale has expressed it very well. We ought to keep the B-1 bomber as a potential weapon, and not authorize its construction until it is obviously needed. I would personally like to see all weapon systems that are capable of delivering nuclear arms included in the SALT talks. Including the Backfire and the cruise missiles. I have not discussed with the SALT negotiators opposition or the reasons for avoiding this subject. But I think that if we are going to have SALT talks, including all delivery systems that involve nuclear weapons would be advantageous for humanity and I believe in the long run that would benefit our own country as well.

One other point, I spent most of this morning working on the Postal Registration Bill. The Senate passed its charter a long time ago, it's been bogged down in the house. And I talked to Congressman Tip O'Neil. I also talked to the Speaker and they talked to Representative Frank Thompson, who is chairman of the committee, and to Representative Madden who's the Chairman of the Rules Committee, and I'm very eager to see the restraints on voter registration removed. In my acceptance speech I called for universal registration, which I favored. As a matter of fact, when I announced for President in 1974, I also called for universal voter registration. I see no

reason for the government to put an obstacle in the way of someone who wants to vote. And my assurance this morning was that the Postal Registration Bill would be coming out of the Rules Committee no later than this week, and I'm going to do all I can to encourage the House to pass the bill, and encourage the President to sign it. If the President should veto the bill, removing the right of American people to have the chance to vote, then I'll also do everything I can to encourage an override of that veto. I think it is a very important point, particularly in our 200th birthday year, to give the American people, for a change, an easy way, an unrestricted way, to register to vote in the upcoming election. The Republicans have always opposed it, and I think it's time for us to put the issue in the forefront of the consciousness of the American people and I believe it's a very important one, and I believe it has a good chance this year of finally getting it signed.

QUESTION: Are you encouraged with the relationship that you have developed with the Congressional leadership? Is it going well so far do you think?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes. I think it is going very well. I believe it is accurate to say that my phone calls to the Majority Leader, to the Speaker, were a major factor in their willingness to revive the bill that has been bogged down in committee for a long time, and this is a normal circumstance. Yes, I think the relationship is very good. I don't ever intend though, to be reticent about speaking out on things which I consider to be at fault, even within the Democratic Congress. I think that, for instance, the present consideration of the Tax Reform Bill, which concerns me very much, this is one of the things that I will be talking about after our meeting this afternoon. And I think that this ought to be done in a way to carry out the statement that I made in my acceptance speech that the present tax laws are disgraceful, that they ought not to be considered in secret, that the doors ought to be open and the American people ought to understand these special tax breaks in these bills. In our session this afternoon, that is one of the things that will be covered. We're going to try to get to taxation, budgeting, and economics or finance. And their interrelationship with one another. And this will be a very important learning process for all of us.

#

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

TRANSCRIPT OF ECONOMIC BRIEFING

Plains, Georgia

July 28, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: This morning, Senator Mondale and I are going to divide up the responsibility on the briefing that we had yesterday on economics. Later, we're going to have a full session on tax reform.

I thought we would divide it into three parts and then let you ask us questions on those subjects or others.

In the first place, the Nixon-Ford Administrations have been responsible, in my opinion, for a major part of the nation's economic woes. Their standard policy is to depend on a small recession to deal with the problem of inflation. And it has been evident on many occasions that their small recessions degenerate into very large recessions. Their response to this has been, under both Nixon and Ford, to assume that a seven to eight percent unemployment rate was normal for our country and they presently have that rate of about 7½ to 7.6% with no prospect before the end of next year according to their projections, to get it below 7%.

In addition, the inflation rate now is the highest it has been since 1952 and under present conditions it is still up around 5% and as you know, is increasing.

Under the Ford-Nixon Administration we've also had the highest peacetime deficits in the history of this country. And had it not been for the Congress, which Senator Mondale will cover in a few minutes, it would be much worse.

One of the reasons that they have been so unsuccessful is the lack of purpose or the lack of policy or lack of planning or goals for our country to achieve in the field of energy, agriculture, transportation, economics. There is no certain purpose in our nation's growth or tax policies, or any other policies. This has a lot of additional adverse effects. When President Nixon, with a great deal of fanfare, in the fall of '73, announced Operation Independence, we were importing about 25% of our oil. In March of this year, under Nixon and Ford, we imported over 50% of our oil. And so, what they've done is to aggravate potential problems that exist. This has had other very serious, adverse effects in addition to those which fall to every family with inflation and those families that are unemployed because of the problem. The interest rates which are always high in a Republic Administration are now still very high with 9% being a good, an optimum interest rate on mortgages. And our balance trade has now degenerated from a very high

surplus to almost a negative figure this year. We do have a slight surplus of goods and services, we have a slight deficit now on goods alone. And of course as I mentioned yesterday, a lot of this surplus is derived from excessive sales of weapons overseas. The last point that I would like to make is this; we have lost confidence in the programs that the administration now has decided to put forward for dealing with unemployment. Including the recent bill that was passed over President Ford's veto, we are spending about seven billion dollars a year just to provide jobs for people. But in many ways the Nixon-Ford Administrations have made it obvious that they don't really believe in these programs. They are not pushing them aggressively and of course this results inevitably in the failure of programs that have been financed by Congress, most often over Ford or Nixon's veto. These are some of the problems that have befallen us because of the policies of the present administration.

Senator Mondale will now comment on how the Congress and the President have worked together in the past and how the congress has helped to overcome some of these problems. Then I'll come back in a minute and outline some of the additional things that we propose to do in the next administration if we are successful this year. Then we'll open the session to questions.

SENATOR MONDALE: Despite the fact that even now, we have the highest inflation in 18 years, the highest unemployment since World War II, except for a few spots in the Eisenhower years, it would have been much worse had not the Congress fought the Nixon-Ford Administration economic policies in the midst of a very, very deep recession. We must recall that it was President Ford's proposal not to decrease taxes on the average American, but in fact to increase them. And we had to resist that policy. Then when we finally persuaded them to reduce that, the proposal was for a very modest tax cut most of which was supposed to go to the very high income Americans -- persons with \$40,000 or more, and it was to terminate in a single year. We fought that policy and deepened the tax cut, made it progressive, so that the average American got some relief from inflation and was able to buy goods and services that were needed.

In the interest and credit field, the Congress has consistently and strongly pressured the Federal Reserve Board to back off its high interest and tight credit policies, and while they're still much higher and less accommodating than they should be, I think there's probably a more forthcoming federal reserve policy, almost as surely would have been the case, had it not been for Congressional pressure. In addition to that, the Congress rejected the strong and consistent advice of the Nixon-Ford Administration that there should be deep and profound slashes in the Federal budget for human programs and particularly for jobs. And most of the vetoes have been in that area, and we've had a strong struggle to try to keep some of those programs going in order to provide employment, in order to provide some relief for persons of average income. And that is an additional source of strength in the economy today. Finally, the Administration, over a year ago, and people sometime forget this, proposed the immediate -- immediate -- I underscore that -- deregulation of oil. So that overnight the price of oil was soared to the Arab price levels on U.S. produced oil. That would have added something like \$400 to the cost of living for every family in America. We were able to head that off after a long and bitter fight. So that despite the unimpressive performance of today's economy, in which both unemployment and inflation are excessive, it would have been far worse had it not been for the insistence of the Congress in these crucial areas.

GOVERNOR CARTER: The last thing I'd like to do is to establish for you the results of our long discussions yesterday, and outline the goals we hope to achieve, with I think a very good chance of success, and then list ten or twelve things -- I haven't counted them -- that would lead to the achievement of these goals.

Our first goal would be full employment for all those who are able to work in this country. We analyzed in depth how this might be achieved with a minimum adverse impact on inflation, and by targetting the emphasis on job opportunities in certain sectors of the unemployed Americans, we believe and the economists who advised us yesterday believe, that we can reduce unemployment by a full one percentage point without having the adverse effect of inflation compared to what would be the case if it was a broad based approach. So unemployment reduction is one goal.

The next one is to achieve an inflation rate of 4% or less. This is by the end of the administration.

Third, is to have a balanced budget. I believe that this is an achievable goal and is one that would be a good achievement to be sought. And I would be deeply committed to this under normal, economic circumstances. And we believe that our projections, based on studies of the Wharton School of Business, by the Conference Board, and others, is that the budget can be balanced and any surplus generated can be spent to carry out the promises of the Democratic Party Platform.

Fourth, a steady growth. We project a conceivable growth rate conservatively speaking of 4-6% per year.

And the last goal that we would attain is to stabilize a percentage of the gross national product which is absorbed by the public sector through taxes and is spent by the public sector. It has been growing in recent years and is now about 20 to 21 percent and we would hope to level off the percentage of our gross national product that's collected through taxes and spent by the public sector.

Now, how to do these things. One would be to have as a major goal, not just the control of available money supplies, but the stabilization of interest rates. High interest rates are a very serious problem in expansion of industrial capacity, the generation of new job opportunities, particularly important in a field like housing or construction. To have long range policies on economics, agriculture, energy, transportation and so forth which we do not have now. Third, is to do everything we can to increase competition within the business sector. By rigid enforcement of the anti-trust laws, and by giving as much attention as we can to removing unwarranted regulation to protect industry and emphasizing the advantages to be derived from regulation for the consumer.

To redefine the purpose of our strategic stockpiling. In the past, we have had strategic stockpiles based exclusively on national defense. But we need to maintain adequate stockpiles in some strategic goods, I can name any one of them, that would be conducive to stabilizing prices on products that fluctuate wildly on the international market. Third, strengthen the Council on Wage and Price Stability and to increase our efforts through jawboning, through persuasion, through involvement of labor and industry, and

to hold down voluntarily unwarranted pressure on the economy through rapid rises in prices or wages. The first step would be to strengthen the Council of Wage and Price Stability.

This is a very important consideration that we discussed at length yesterday and that this is to increase investment by the business community through equity financing as compared to debt financing. There has been a major shift in the past number of years, particularly under the Ford-Nixon Administration toward a dependence on debt financing.

And the last thing that we discussed was a more accurate and current inventory of jobs that are available to be filled, matched accurately with the output of our vocational and technical schools, other educational institutions, and the job capabilities of those who are chronically unemployed.

One point that I forgot to mention is the increase again, in the impetus in our own country on research development. We have now fallen far behind countries like West Germany and Japan, on the amount of research and development that goes into increasing productivity for efficient means of generating goods and services.

Most of our research and development now in this country is going into defense and space. But the orientation of more research and development funds into better productivity would be, we believe, a way to pay rich dividends.

Those are some of the policies of the Ford-Nixon Administration, the goals that we've established, the history of what the Congress has done in the past and their contention over some of these same questions and some of the means that we would use to achieve those goals. And now both Senator Mondale and I will be available to answer questions.

QUESTION: Do you as yet have any specific ideas as to how you would deal with the Federal Reserve Board. Whether you would ask for any statutory changes in the present system?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I personally favor retaining the independence of the Federal Reserve Board. The only request that I would make for statutory change is to let the chairmanship term beco-terminate with the term of the President. I might say that I would strengthen the interrelationship between the Federal Reserve Board, the Council of Economic Advisers, the President, perhaps the leaders in Congress -- Ways and Means and Finance -- of course the Commerce Department and others involved in the inventory of economic strength in this country and long range planning. But that's the only change that I would advocate for the Federal Reserve Board itself.

QUESTION: You wouldn't foresee any problem in getting interest rates to the level that you want them with continued independence of the board?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No, I think not, because there is an adequate flexibility in the President's budget and the Congress' budget when it's finally decided, and also the availability of tax changes that might be derived from the Ways and Means Committee in the house that would help to change interest rates. There are also studies going on with which I am not thoroughly familiar about increasing competition in banking facilities. Giving savings and loan institutions the right to maintain demand deposits and pay interest on them,

and also to permit commercial banks as they presently exist to pay interest on demand deposits. But there are other matters that can be persuaded to stabilize perhaps the lower interest rate level.

SENATOR MONDALE: In my acceptance speech, I talked about the deadlock of American Democracy, this deep gap which existed between the executive and the legislative branch. Perhaps in no other area has it been more expensive and costly to Americans than in the development of economic policy. Today, the monetary policy is basically the province of the executive branch -- of the federal reserve board. And fiscal policy, taxing and spending, being the province of the Congress. And they have been operating in a disjointed and even hostile and suspicious environment. And that's one of the key reasons that the economy has worked so poorly. Fiscal and monetary policy have to work together. And they have to be coordinated very carefully. There is a role for taxes and tax reform and there is a role for government spending or government restraint. There is a role for credit, there is a role for money supplies. It has to be tied together in a balanced and steady -- and I emphasize the word steady -- policy. One of our problems has been this stop and go, up and down, uncertain environment in which business and workers have to operate. They do not know from day to day what our policies are going to be, because frankly we haven't had a government that could govern. And I think one of the most helpful things about the Carter Administration is that we'll have a single, coherent, coordinated economic policy, which we haven't had for years.

QUESTION: Would you then support, as I believe you did last year, correct me if I'm wrong, a bill which would require the Feds to set money supply, M-1 and M-2, according to congressional desire.

SENATOR MONDALE: That was an expression of the futility of the situation. It makes a lot more sense to have a single, coordinated economic policy, with the executive and the legislative branch cooperating. We said that at the time. But we couldn't get an answer out of the Federal Reserve Board. We knew that their money supply and credit supplies were bringing the American economy to a halt. It had created a depression in the housing industry, and in desperation, the only thing we could reach for was some kind of legislative resolution which if nothing else would embarrass the Federal Reserve Board toward a more accommodative policy. That is a very tough way to try to bring about a coordinated policy. And it didn't work. I think we embarrassed them some. But it is far more preferable -- I mean, we did several things. We passed a resolution that tried to effect guidelines and all of it was designed in our frustration to get the Federal Reserve Board to help us get the economy moving again. And it is far preferable to have a single coordinated national economic policy which we would have under a Carter Administration.

QUESTION: Has the Federal Reserve Board revealed their policies?

SENATOR MONDALE: Yes, they started to reveal their projected money supply target. But it would not be necessary if you had a cooperative arrangement.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I might point out that yesterday Mr. Burns announced he was further tightening the money supply.

QUESTION: Governor Carter, many economists in the present administration think there is an essential tension, if not a contradiction between your goals 1 and 2 -- full employment and inflation. I was wondering if you have any reservations at all about supporting the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, as obviously the Republicans do have great reservations about it.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Well, the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, in my mind, is an expression of a commitment to full employment. Full employment as now being defined by the Congress. I haven't kept up with the day by day amendments to the Humphrey-Hawkins bill. I think that the latest amendment that has been introduced in the House is that this is 3% unemployment among adults and adults is defined as a twenty-year-old or older. The thrust of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill is to have a coordinated approach to unemployment. To reduce it so those who are able to work will be able to find a job. Now, it's hard for me to comment on every day's version of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill. It's a fact that the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill has not cleared either the House or the Senate -- it hasn't gotten out of committee yet, and I think the chances for it this year are highly doubtful. But the overall purposes of the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, yes, I do support it. I did not support the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill when it was originally introduced.

QUESTION: I wanted to ask, is your position essentially as it was in April when you announced that you did support it.

GOVERNOR CARTER: When I expressed my support for the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill, with the unemployment rate at the time as prescribed, and with a minimum of interference of the federal government in the private sector on planning, and with an emphasis on jobs in the private sector, and not in the public sector. I think the amendments, if you want to go into detail, I think the amendments have also been adopted by the House committee that does not require that wages paid to unemployed be equivalent to wages paid to those in the community. I think that was too rigid a requirement. I do favor though the payment of the minimum wage, at least, to those who are unemployed.

QUESTION: Governor, do you accept a definite goal -- full employment means different things to different people. Do you use the Humphrey-Hawkins Bill definition of 3% unemployment for people of 20 years or older?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think that's a reasonable definition. You have to remember that when you are talking about the unemployment rate now, it's 7½% or more. To start arguing about the exact definition of unemployment when it gets down to three percent is really an idle exercise, but I think as a goal, that's a good one.

QUESTION: You also mentioned strengthening the wage and price stability board as one of your goals. Conceivably, could that strengthening process ever extend to the reinstatement of wage and price controls?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would favor, as a last resort, if all the other provisions failed, in sequence, the awarding to the President of wage and price control authority. I don't think that I would ever have to use it. But there are many things that can be done with a President that is trusted by business and labor within the present council if it's strengthened it would avoid any necessity for the imposition of wage and price controls. But if I considered it necessary, I would not hesitate to call for them.

QUESTION: Could you amplify a little bit on the strengthening process? What would you like to see done with the board as far as the board's power goes?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Let me just give you a couple of examples. Because I don't want to go into detail, I'm not qualified to do that yet. One would be our promise that wage and price increases be announced ahead of time -- either thirty days, or sixty days or ninety days. Which would give the President, business and labor leaders, members of the congress, a chance to express their displeasure, their concern about those possible increases. In other words, it would be through consultations with labor, and consultations with business perhaps in the same forum, to get them to establish on an industry-wide basis voluntary goals, say no more than a 6 percent increase, for instance, per year. Another thing that could be done is to continue a policy which I personally favored under President Ford, of limiting wage increases for federal employees to a reasonable figure. I think this sets a good example for the private sector and it's a very good and persuasive argument among the American people who are the ultimate arbitors in a question of this kind. Besides that, there are a series of things that can be done before you impose wage and price controls.

QUESTION: You said you could reduce unemployment by 1% without realizing any adverse effects -- is that correct?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No. The economists yesterday had done a study at my request over a period of some months. Dr. Carolyn Bell was the one who had done this work. Their analysis showed that if you can target special groups of Americans who are unemployed, or perhaps special areas of our country where unemployment is greatest, then you can reduce the unemployment rate 1% or more without having inflationary pressures. Compared to the inflationary pressures that would result if all efforts on unemployment were blanket throughout the country. The targeting aspect can alleviate pressures of inflation.

QUESTION: Are you saying that unemployment can be reduced indefinitely in a number of areas without having any inflationary effect?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Let me just give you an example. If at a time you reach a five and a half percent unemployment rate, which would be 2% less than it is now, you would have a certain degree of inflationary pressure at that level if the unemployment reduction effort was done broad base, nationwide, with no targeting. With targeting, and spending the same amount of money from the federal government which is now seven billion dollars a year, you could reduce the unemployment rate down to four and a half percent and have the same level of inflationary pressure.

QUESTION: May I ask you about the Federal Power Commission's decision yesterday on natural gas, Governor? Whether you agree with it and what you would do with it if you don't?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I don't really know what they decided.

QUESTION: It allows the deregulation of natural gas prices immediately.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I don't favor that. The only deregulation that I would favor is to leave existing contracts in effect at the present level of price stability, many which go far beyond the year 2000, and deregulate for a limited period of time.

QUESTION: About your remarks on federal employees. Because Presidents Ford and Nixon consistently did not accept the recommendations of the board, which is set to recommend comparability pay raises for federal employees. Are you saying that you think a federal employee ought not to get an increase to keep him comparable with the civilian employees for the same job?

GOVERNOR CARTER: What I'm saying is, that as an overall part of the example, if the influence of the President is any good, his policy on federal employees can be a guideline to be used to encourage the private sector to restrain wage and price demands.

QUESTION: You are saying, then, are you not Governor ...

GOVERNOR CARTER: Let me use my language and you use yours.

QUESTION: I'm not clear on what, at the moment, Senator Mondale can correct me on this, there is a board which is set, a comparability board, and it comes up with the recommendations. The President then accepts it and sends it to Congress and Congress may try to override the President's request. The last one, where they should have gotten 8.66% according to the formula, the President recommended five percent, because it was tied in with that congressional business about raising their own salaries. I am trying to find out whether you would accept comparability or whether you would ask federal employees to, in effect, take a cut, an inflationary cut, which you then are saying is an example to private business.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would leave that option open to set an example with reduced increases for federal employees if it was part of an overall agreement with labor and industry in the private sector to hold down inflationary pressures.

QUESTION: I don't know if you got into this broad range of subjects, but was there any long range thinking about equalization of opportunity, what the whole thrust of your economic policy would be, in broad social terms.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes. One of the studies that we'll be continuing is continual analysis of the roughly \$180 billion that the government now spends on income transfers. And how this can best be used with the existing amount of money through welfare reforms, the elimination of unnecessary programs and other income transfers to provide more equity and opportunity. I would not hesitate to use some aspect of tax reform as a part of this composite approach to the right of people to have an adequate income. My heavy emphasis would be that those who can work ought to work. But among those who cannot work, then I think we have a long way to go to provide equity. So I would look at the whole proposition of tax credit, and of income transfer, that presently comprises roughly \$180 billion as a composite amount to be used in an equitable way for income maintenance.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE AMERICAN LEGION
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON - AUGUST 24, 1976

It is a pleasure to appear here today before my fellow Legionnaires and to have this opportunity to discuss matters of common concern to us as veterans and as Americans.

I am, as you may know, a member of Legion Post #2 in Americus, Georgia, as was my father before me.

A tradition of military service runs deep in our family. My first ancestor to live in Georgia, James Carter, fought in the Revolutionary War. Almost a hundred years later, others fought in the War between the States, and my father, Earl Carter, served as a first lieutenant in the Army during the First World War.

Including my time at the U.S. Naval Academy, I spent 11 years in the Navy, most of my sea duty in submarines. I had the good fortune to serve under Admiral Rickover on the development of one of the first atomic submarines, and I have tried to carry over into my business career and my political life the high standards of dedication and competence that I learned from that remarkable military leader.

My son Jack continued our family's tradition in the military, but his service came in an era quite different from my own. Jack left college several years ago and volunteered to serve in Vietnam. He did so because he didn't think it was right for him to escape service simply because he had the money and the educational background to stay in college.

During the Second World War, and even during the Korean War, I always wore my uniform with immense pride, and it was a badge of honor among my civilian friends and neighbors.

That was not the case when Jack came home from Danang in 1969. He and the uniform he wore were all too often greeted with scorn and derision. Many of his friends told him he was a fool to risk his life in a meaningless war that couldn't be won.

Hundreds of thousands of Vietnam veterans were meeting that same bitter reception all over America, and I believe very strongly that those scenes, and the national mood they reflected, amount to nothing less than an American tragedy.

I believe in patriotism. I believe that people should love our country, and be proud of our country, and be willing to fight to defend our country. That is how you and I grew up--never doubting that ours was the greatest nation on earth, and getting, as Senator John Glenn once put it, a warm feeling inside us whenever the American flag passed by.

I know that your patriotism has been demonstrated not only in your military service, but in your work in community and national affairs, such as your outstanding "War on Cancer" fund drive. But we must recognize that for millions of our fellow Americans, patriotism is out of fashion, or is an object of scorn and jokes. That fact is part of the bitter heritage of an unpopular war.

I do not seek a blind or uncritical patriotism. Obviously a government's policies must be deserving of public support. But in recent years, disagreement with our nation's policies too often became rejection of our nation itself. There is a great need for the next President to do everything in his power, by word and deed, to restore national pride and patriotism in our country--and if I am elected, that is what I intend to do.

I also believe in tradition. I was Governor of Georgia when Congress passed the law that changed the observation of Armistice Day away from the traditional date of November 11. I thought that action was unnecessary, insensitive, and offensive, and we kept November 11 as Armistice Day in Georgia.

I did not come here just to get your vote or endorsement, nor just to make a good impression on you. I come here as a nominee for President who has spent full-time the last 20 months learning about this country--what it is and what it ought to be.

I want to talk to you about some tough decisions--as veterans, yes, but also as Americans who are farmers and truckdrivers, doctors and lawyers, fathers and grandfathers, school teachers and civil servants, employed and unemployed, rich and poor.

We must maintain adequate military strength compared to that of our potential adversaries. This relative strength can be assured:

by a commitment to necessary military expenditures;

by elimination of waste, duplication among forces, excessive personnel costs, unnecessary new weapons systems, inefficient contracting procedures;

and by a mutual search for peace so that armament levels can be reduced among nations, because the most important single factor in avoiding nuclear war is the mutual desire for peace among the superpowers.

I would never again see our country become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another country unless our own security was directly threatened. But it is imperative that the world know that we will meet obligations and commitments to our allies and that we will keep our nation strong.

We seek friendship with the unaligned and developing nations of the world. Many of them are weak and vulnerable and they need allies who can contribute to their peace, security and prosperity. Yet we must remember that excessive foreign commitments can overtax our national ability. We must therefore be cautious in making commitments, but firm in honoring them.

I have spoken recently with many experts in national defense matters, and I believe we have, overall, adequate ability to defend ourselves, to meet obligations to our allies, and to carry out a legitimate foreign policy. But we must be constantly vigilant to recognize and correct adverse trends.

Our total American ground combat forces are less than half those of the Soviet Union, and the number of men under arms in that country has increased by a million while ours have decreased by 1-1/2 million since 1968. During the same period the number of U.S. ships has been cut in half. For every tank we have, the Soviets have at least eight. Because of our greatly improved anti-tank weapons, this heavy Soviet investment in tanks

may prove to have been an unwise investment.

Of course there are counterbalancing factors of strength such as superior quality of our weapons, the relative security of our own borders, our more ready access to the sea, and the trustworthiness and military capability of our allies.

There is now, in my opinion, an overall rough equivalency in direct military strength. This balance must be maintained.

Yet, as we seek an adequate defense, we must face the fact that the very words "national security" have fallen into disrepute. I want to hear those words spoken with respect once again. Too often, those words are now viewed with scorn, because they have been misused by political leaders to hide a multitude of sins, and because they have been used to justify inefficiency and waste in our defense establishment.

Whatever the price and whatever the pressures, the President must insist on a national defense posture that is lean and muscular and flexible.

It is sometimes said that the threat of war has receded. But in Europe, the Middle East, in northeast Asia, potential for conflict still exists, powerful armed forces are deployed and Americans have recently been brutally killed. To deny that these situations pose a potential danger to peace is to turn away from reality.

Our military power must be continually reviewed. In Europe, NATO must increase its combat readiness and adapt its forces to new military technology, if it is to offset steady improvements in Warsaw Pact forces. In the eastern Mediterranean, strong U.S. naval power must be maintained. We must also assure a close and confident defense relationship with South Korea and Japan.

We must maintain rough equivalency with the Soviet Union in strategic nuclear forces. Equally important, we and our allies must have conventional military capability adequate to reduce dependence on nuclear striking power. In a world where massive mutual devastation is the likely result of any use of nuclear weapons, such strategic forces cannot solely be relied upon to deter a vast range of threats to our interests and the interests of our allies.

We must always recognize that the best way to meet ideological threats around the world is to make our own democratic system work here at home.

The strongest defense grows out of a strong home front--out of patriotism. Our defense must come not only from our fighting forces, but from our people's trust in their leaders, from adequate transportation, energy, agriculture, science, employment, and most of all from the willingness of our people to make personal sacrifices for the sake of our nation. Not until we restore national unity can we have a truly adequate national defense.

Only then can we, in Theodore Roosevelt's phrase, speak softly but carry a big stick.

I recognize, of course, as you do, that it is not enough for the president to talk about patriotism and national security. He must take positive, aggressive action to ensure that our defense establishment is worthy of national respect. That calls for leadership, and it calls for management.

In any given annual budget, now or in the future, there is a limited amount of money available for national defense. When any resources are wasted, our nation's security is weakened. We now have an excessive drain on defense funding from waste and unnecessary expenditures.

We must better coordinate long-range planning and budgeting among departments responsible for military, foreign, fiscal, economic, transportation and social affairs of our government. A spirit of cooperation must be restored.

Foreign aid must be consistent with our national purposes, and designed to strengthen our allies and friends and to fulfill humanitarian purposes. I'm tired of our taxing the poor people in our rich country and sending the money to the rich people in poor countries.

We must frankly and constantly assess the effectiveness of our present voluntary recruitment program. As unemployment drops and civilian jobs become more plentiful, it will be much more difficult to maintain our present military strength.

We must ensure that an oversized support establishment does not prevent us from maintaining needed combat force levels.

We must recognize that our military personnel are transferred too much. At any given moment, about one out of seven of those personnel is in the process of moving, or away from their family on temporary training duty. This year \$2.5 billion will go simply to move service personnel, their families, television sets and furniture from one base to another. Such frequent moves not only eat up money, they undermine morale. If we extend the average tour of duty by just two months, we could save \$400 million per year.

We need to reexamine our military training programs. Recent congressional hearings by the way, revealed that we now have an average of one and a half military students for each instructor. By moving to a ratio of only three students to each instructor, we could save an estimated \$1 billion per year.

Cost overruns have become chronic. The Pentagon itself estimates that the total current cost of overruns on the 45 weapons systems now in the process of development in the three services--exclusive of inflation--is \$10.7 billion. Over the next five years that would approximate the cost of the proposed B-1 bomber program over the same period.

We need sound, tough management of the Pentagon not only to eliminate waste, but to ensure that force structures are correlated with foreign policy objectives. Tough management will mean that overlaps are eliminated between Pentagon programs and similar programs of civilian agencies. It will mean that we cooperate closely with our allies in our mutual defense, that our weapons systems are integrated with each other, technically and strategically, and that we put a stop to the dubious practice of arms giveaway programs for potential adversaries.

Ever since I was Governor of Georgia, when I attended National Guard training sessions every summer, I have been concerned that our reserve forces, both the regular reserve and the National Guard, do not play a strong enough role in our military preparedness. We need to shift toward a highly trained, combat-worthy reserve, well equipped and closely coordinated with regular forces--always capable of playing a crucial role in the nation's defense.

If we can get the flab out of the Pentagon's budget, I believe that the public will evaluate questions about weapons systems and force levels on their merits in a calm and rational manner. Our people will support an adequate defense establishment without complaint, so long as they know that their tax dollars are not being wasted.

The threat to our security comes not only from states that might be hostile. International terrorism knows no boundaries, recognizes no law of warfare, accepts no standards of conduct. It is brutality at its worst, the law of the jungle in its most primitive form.

Recently at Entebbe the Israelis reaffirmed courageously the old principle that every state has the right to defend its citizens against brutal and arbitrary violence-- violence that in this case was even based on collusion between the terrorists and a government.

The issue of international terrorism must be a priority item for the entire international community. If I become President, I intend to recommend strong multi-national sanctions against guilty nations as a necessary and productive means for crushing this intolerable threat to international law and peace. International terrorism must be stopped once and for all!

In our own country, we must recognize that, in far too many cases, the Vietnam veteran has been a victim of governmental insensitivity and neglect. Large bureaucracies of the federal government have often been incompetent, inefficient, and unresponsive in their fulfillment of responsibilities to veterans. Each month, thousands of veterans are plagued with late delivery of badly needed benefit checks. Hundreds of millions of dollars of benefit payments have been improperly computed. The average VA hospital has only half the doctors and supporting personnel found in the average community hospital.

The poor record of the government bureaucracy has been especially bad in programs intended to help recent veterans to find jobs. In 1973 and 1974 Congress passed legislation requiring special consideration for veterans in public service jobs, in training programs, for jobs with federal contractors, and for jobs in the federal government. None of these requirements has been fully or effectively carried out.

For example, despite the mandates of the law many federal departments and agencies have few disabled veterans or Vietnam veterans serving within them. It took the Labor Department 18 months to establish administrative guidelines to ensure the hiring of veterans. In 1975, 16 federal agencies failed even to submit required plans for hiring disabled veterans until congressional inquiries were begun.

The record of placement in private sector jobs and training has been no better. In 1975 more than two thirds of the 153,000 job training slots went unfilled, largely due to inadequate administrative procedures.

Yet last month there were still 531,000 Vietnam veterans who had no jobs.

The reason for this dismal record is clear:

It is a failure of leadership.

Sympathetic leadership would not submit--as did the present administration--a budget recommending cuts of ten percent or more to veterans' programs and denying full cost of living protection to disabled veterans.

Concerned leadership would not have vetoed a bill overwhelmingly voted by Congress for higher education allowances, better work-study programs, more educational loans, and employment and training preferences for more than two million veterans.

Only because the Congress overrode this veto do Vietnam veterans enjoy some of the educational benefits they deserve.

I believe we need to address the needs of veterans, especially of Vietnam veterans, with sympathetic and active leadership rather than with vetoes and passive resistance. Men who have endured so much suffering, so bravely, fighting in a far-off land, should not now suffer anew in their own country at the hands of insensitive bureaucrats and indifferent politicians.

If I become President, the American veteran, of all ages, of all wars, is going to have a friend, a comrade and a firm ally in the White House. My administration will act to strengthen the competence, the responsiveness, and the independence of the Veterans' Administration. I will appoint the most capable administrators available and I will insist on fair and sensitive treatment for veterans by every employee of the executive branch of government from top to bottom.

I would like to speak for a moment about the single hardest decision I have had to make during the campaign. That was on the issue of amnesty. Where I come from, most of the men who went off to fight in Vietnam were poor. They didn't know where Canada was, they didn't know where Sweden was, they didn't have the money to hide from the draft in college. Many of them thought it was a bad war, but they went anyway. A lot of them came back with scarred minds or bodies, or with missing limbs. Some didn't come back at all. They suffered under the threat of death, and they still suffer from the indifference of many of their fellow Americans. The Vietnam veterans are our nation's greatest unsung heroes.

I could never equate what they have done with those who left this country to avoid the draft.

But I think it is time for the damage, hatred and divisiveness of the Vietnam war to be over.

I do not favor a blanket amnesty, but for those who violated Selective Service laws, I intend to grant a blanket pardon.

To me, there is a difference. Amnesty means that what you did is right. A pardon means that what you did--right or wrong--is forgiven. So, pardon--yes; amnesty--no.

For deserters, each case should be handled on an individual basis in accordance with our nation's system of military justice.

We may not all be able to agree about what was the right course for the nation to take in 1966. But we can now agree to respect those differences and to forget them. We can come together and seek a rebirth of patriotism in which all our citizens can join.

We must bind up our wounds. We simply cannot afford to let them fester any longer. The world is too dangerous. We cannot remain distracted from what must be our overriding aim. Our attention must turn to rebuilding the military, economic and spiritual foundations of a peaceful world order.

Those who most want peace, and who best understand the need for strength as a prerequisite for peace, are our past and present servicemen and their families. As a former submarine officer, I know that fact from experience.

I can still remember hearing President Truman explain to the world that the atomic bomb had been dropped on Hiroshima. I was at sea in an old battleship in the North Atlantic. None of us had ever heard even a rumor of this quantum leap in destructive power. We had no way of comprehending the meaning of this new weapon which had been dropped on Japan. We were mainly relieved at the prospect that the need for invading Japan might be averted, thus saving what would surely have been the loss of hundreds of thousands of American and Japanese lives.

After we saw the destruction in Japan, for a while we understood the terrible havoc and devastation which would follow any use of nuclear weapons. But now we have a tendency to forget. Even if a strategic nuclear war could remain "limited in nature," it would still involve the death of approximately ten million Americans. A so-called "limited nuclear war" in Europe could produce an even greater number of deaths. In an all-out nuclear war, 200 million Americans could die--virtually the entire population.

Obviously, such a holocaust is beyond our capacity even to imagine. Numbers like 10 million dead or 200 million dead seem unbelievable. But they are true.

The Duke of Wellington said in 1838: "A great country cannot wage a little war." In our time that doctrine has acquired new meaning. In a nuclear world, we cannot rely on little wars to prevent big wars. We must maintain our strength and use it to prevent all wars.

Our people have been shocked and hurt over and over again. Things which we used to take for granted are now subject to widespread doubt. Things like trust in our leaders, confidence in our institutions--even love and respect for the flag and support and appreciation for the men and women who defend the flag. But I believe there is no one in this country--certainly there is no one in this room--who does not want to heal our wounds and restore the precious qualities and the national strengths we seem to have lost.

I hope to play a role in that noble enterprise.

I hope you will help.

Thank you.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

STATEMENT BY JIMMY CARTER

Manchester, N. H.

August 3, 1976

The American family is in trouble.

I have campaigned all over America, and everywhere I go I find people deeply concerned about the loss of stability and the loss of values in our lives. The root of this problem is the steady erosion and weakening of our families.

Some shocking statistics are available to document the problem.

Forty percent of all marriages in America now end in divorce.

In 1960, one of every 20 women giving birth was not married; today the figure is about one in eight.

The extended family is all but extinct. According to one study, in 1900 in Boston half the households included parents, children and at least one other relative. Today the comparable figure is four percent.

One out of seven children, 8.6 million, live with a single parent, and we now have a larger percent of children who live in poverty than we did in 1970.

About 350,000 children live in foster homes, at an average cost throughout their childhoods of \$60,000. At least 100,000 of them could be adopted.

Forty-five percent of the arrests for serious crimes are of young people under 18 years of age, and more than 90 percent of the children sent to correctional institutions last year were found guilty of offenses for which adults would not have been punished at all.

The number of gonorrhea cases has tripled in the last ten years among children less than 14 years old.

Among young people aged 15 to 19 the second most common cause of death is suicide.

And alcohol, drug abuse, and emotional problems are steadily increasing among both young people and adults.

As these statistics, and many others, show, the breakdown of the American family has reached extremely dangerous proportions. There can be no more urgent priority for the next administration than to see that every decision our government makes is designed to honor and support and strengthen the American family.

P. O. Box 1976 Atlanta, Georgia 30301 404/897-7100

The problems of the aged would be reduced if we would all obey the Biblical command to honor our father and mother. As Rabbi Abraham Joshua Heschel said: "One father finds it possible to sustain a dozen children, yet a dozen children find it impossible to sustain one father."

The family was the first church.

The family was the first school.

The family was the first government.

And for a child, this is still true.

Our churches, our schools and our state, local and national governments all have major responsibilities to strengthen the American family, and when they fail, they themselves lose strength.

If we want less government, we must have stronger families, for government steps in by necessity when families have failed.

It is clear that the national government should have a strong pro-family policy, but the fact is that our government has no family policy, and that is the same thing as an anti-family policy.

Because of confusion or insensitivity, our government's policies have often actually weakened our families, or even destroyed them.

Our present welfare system is both anti-work and anti-family. We have welfare policies in half our states that deny aid to children unless and until their father deserts them. As President I intend to reform that system so that it encourages work and encourages family life and reflects both the competence and the compassion of the American people.

We have urban renewal programs that shatter homes and families and entire neighborhoods. You rarely see an interstate highway go through a golf course, but you've seen lots of them blast their way through neighborhoods where people have lived for generations. That's the kind of bureaucratic indifference we must end.

We have transfer and assignment policies in our armed services that don't take into account their impact on the families of the servicemen.

We have tax policies that often seem to discriminate against families, particularly lower income families. For example, the so-called "anti-grandmother" provision that disallows a child care deduction if the family employs a relative closer than a cousin. Also, the present personal tax deduction for dependents in effect provides a greater benefit for wealthy families than to middle income or poor families.

Some people argue that income tax exemptions for children encourage large families. But I agree with my running mate, Senator Mondale, who says that at his house the tax laws were never discussed at those moments of decision.

I have pledged to enact tax reform if I become President, and one basic goal of any tax reform must be to help and strengthen our families.

Nixon-Ford economic policies have been dismal failures. We still have an unemployment rate of 7.5 percent, one of the highest in 30 years. We still have an inflation rate of 5 percent, which is higher than any year from 1952 to 1970. We still have an unprecedented budget deficit. The Ford Administration, in its budgets for fiscal 1975, 1976 and 1977, will have a total deficit of \$170 billion--more than the combined total of all budget deficits from the end of the second world war until 1974. And Mr. Ford and his spokesmen like to say that we Democrats are reckless spenders!

Not only have the Nixon-Ford policies failed in their stated purpose, they have failed to consider their human consequences. When the head of a family is out of work, the entire family suffers, and not just in an economic sense. There is a loss of dignity and pride and self-respect.

Leonard Woodcock, the president of the auto workers, recently testified that when the unemployment rate in Flint, Michigan, reached 20 percent, it became the city with the highest alcoholism rate in America, and its drug problem doubled, and cases of child abuse soared.

There are many other areas where our government can do more to support our families.

At a time when teenage pregnancy and illegitimate births are rising sharply, we need a comprehensive program of family planning, which would include adoption and education and moral leadership, and would do everything possible to prevent the need for abortion.

In education, as we struggle with such problems as busing, we need to remember that our basic goal is quality education for every child, and that we need individualized instruction for every student, so that he or she can progress at the fastest possible rate, and that whenever possible we want children to attend schools close to their homes.

In the area of health, we need a comprehensive health care program, with emphasis on children and on the prevention of disease--and we're going to enact such a program when I become President.

We need to recognize the special problems of the single-parent family.

We need a national day care program.

We need to change the ridiculous Social Security regulation that prevents many elderly men and women from being married.

In short, we need a government that thinks about the American family and cares about the American family and makes its every decision with the intent of strengthening the family.

One of the things that has most impressed me about my running mate, Senator Mondale, has been his deep concern about the family and the leadership he has provided, as chairman of the Senate subcommittee on children and youth, on a variety of family-related subjects including child abuse, crib deaths, child health, adoption and foster care. I intend to rely upon him heavily as I chart a pro-family policy in the next administration.

One idea that Senator Mondale has proposed is that each federal program present a family impact statement, to analyze how it would affect the family, much as federal programs now prepare environmental impact statements. We don't need a new bureaucracy, but the president and Congress should routinely conduct such an analysis when any major decision is made, and when I am president this will be done.

As an immediate step toward developing a pro-family policy, I have asked Joseph A. Califano Jr. to serve as a special advisor to me on how federal programs can aid and support the American family.

With Mr. Califano's help, and Senator Mondale's, and that of many, many other concerned men and women, I intend to construct an administration that will reverse the trends we have seen toward the breakdown of the family in our country.

The job will not be an easy one, but it is worth whatever effort may be required. The entire history of the human race teaches us that the family unit is the best way for men and women to live their lives, the best way to raise children, and the only solid foundation upon which to build a strong nation.

Ours is a time of unprecedented change, and of unprecedented pressures on the family structure. The family is a tough, tenacious, and adaptable institution, and I believe it can survive and prosper if given a decent chance. The trouble is that too many of our families don't get a decent chance. We must do everything in our power to see that they do.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY PRESS BRIEFING

Plains, Georgia -- August 18, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: I might point out, just as a matter of interest, that when we start our sessions at one o'clock or whatever it is, we don't ever stop, we don't take a break or anything else, we just keep going. Everybody who comes generally agrees afterward that even the experts learn a lot from one another because it's a source of a major exchange of ideas. I think that all of them would agree that, as contrasted with Congressional hearings, there's a tremendous amount of information exchanged in a short period of time in these unstructured discussions.

At the conclusion of our roughly four and a half hour discussion, we went around the room and everybody suggested a major point on which there was general agreement. I'm not trying to speak for all these people here and I don't expect them to speak for me later on, but I'll go down these points. I know we have both foreign trade and economic journalists here who've come from major periodicals and we'd like to have your questions. If I can't answer them, which is the likely case, I'll refer them to someone in the back.

The first point on which we agreed -- and these are not in any particular order -- is that there is a very close interrelationship between foreign trade, tariffs, the international monetary system, multinational corporation attitudes and investments, and our domestic and foreign policy. There is no way to separate these factors.

The second thing on which I think everybody agreed is that in the present government structure most of these component parts are indeed separated from one another. The decision making process is not coordinated. As someone said, very accurately in my opinion, "The federal government is in total disarray, as far as evolving and consummating a cohesive foreign or domestic economic policy."

This responsibility is spread among multiple major agencies and at least eight departments, including, obviously, Treasury, Agriculture, Defense, State and Commerce. This is almost an insurmountable obstacle to evolving a coherent, long-range, comprehensive policy within which our private sector, the Congress and the President and foreign nations can function most effectively.

Another point is that our nation's economic strength is substantially unshaken by recent international and domestic events. And this strength is recognized not only by leading economists and other analysts in our own nation, but also among foreign governments. The rest of the world still looks to the United States to provide leadership. In some instances, in recent years, that leadership has not been forthcoming. There are major negotiations going on now concerning the international monetary system, future modifications in trade, controls over foreign investments, and multinational corporations. These kinds of things must

be addressed in the upcoming years, and the United States, because of its economic strength and influence, is going to be the major spokesman or shaper of these events.

Another point that was made was that quite often in recent years the selection of leaders to head up major departments and serve in major diplomatic posts, and our preparations for international discussions on population, food, environmental quality, freedom of the seas and so forth, have been completely inadequate. Quite often leaders or spokesmen have been selected not on the basis of merit or competence but on the basis of political payoff or some other consideration not associated with competence.

One tremendous recent development has been the increase in agricultural exports. And this has been a major factor in helping to compensate for increased prices of oil. We've had, I think, roughly a tripling of agricultural exports in the last five years, from roughly \$7 billion to a little over \$22 billion. There was also a general consensus that in the long range future our nation and Canada -- North America -- plus Europe, are likely, almost inevitably, going to be the suppliers or the producers of food. Almost the entire balance of the world is going to depend on us to make up their deficits in food production.

This brings up a question about foreign aid. Now we have multiple, sometimes uncoordinated, programs related to foreign aid: our support for the World Bank and regional banks on the one hand; bilateral aid with specific nations on the other; technical assistance; capital investments; reduction of tariffs or quotas to help developing countries strengthen their own economies. These kinds of things are at the present time in a state of confusion. In many crucial areas, like our contribution to the World Bank or regional banks, and so forth, we are far behind in meeting the commitments we have made previously. We have violated our own agreements and are not providing the amount of contributions that are necessary to meet our own agreements. And we have fallen far behind almost every other developed nation in the world in the percentage of our gross national product allocated to foreign aid in a general sense.

Most of the other participants would, I believe, agree that instead of the continual piecemeal allocation of gifts or surpluses to countries, the best approach is to permit these countries to have capital formation investments and productivity as a first priority, and also we ought to provide some lessening of obstacles to trade, particularly with the less developed countries so that they can sell their products on the open market and have a chance to process their basic raw materials.

Another point that was made is that the President has a great responsibility in the future not only to be a spokesman for our country and to select qualified people to represent our nation in negotiations in economic and political and military matters relating to foreign countries, but has a great responsibility to educate, to be frank with, to involve the American people in the decision making process. Quite often we have a duality of national policy, one for foreign consumption and the other one for domestic political consumption. Frankness ought to prevail in the relationship between the President, the White House, the Executive Branch on the one hand and the Congress and the American people on the other. As well as our relationship with foreign countries.

Another point was that in the foreign aid field, the bilateral aid provisions -- that is aid from us to one particular country -- ought to be designed to reach people who actually need it. Not to buy another Cadillac for tin horn dictators. And in the past, this abuse has been one of the major factors in turning the

American people against a natural inclination toward legitimate foreign aid.

I think an overall conclusion drawn is that to the extent that we can solve problems in the foreign economic field -- increased trade, stronger relationships with other countries, less tariffs and quota obstacles, a stable and predictable economic policy, better international monetary stability -- those solutions will contribute directly to solving our own domestic problems of inflation and unemployment, and vice-versa. To the extent that we can make our own domestic economy strong and viable, it will contribute tremendously to the alleviation of foreign economic problems.

The initial long conversation that we had was on exchange rates. I think there's a general agreement that floating exchanges rates are a permanent fixture on the economic or foreign scene.

And the last point I would like to make before we take questions is that I believe there is a unanimous agreement that I, if I'm the next President, should take a strong stand against international bribery, and against the yielding to boycotts against our own domestic corporations because they happen to have Jewish citizens or others in positions of executive leadership. And I myself find that tertiary boycott to be morally obnoxious and I believe that it would be a serious mistake for us to continue to condone, as our government presently does through quiescence or reticence, the concept of legitimate bribery.

Those are a few of the points that we discussed during the four and a half hour period, and now if you have specific questions to ask about these or other matters concerning international economics, I'll call on one of the teachers in the back to help with those points. Does anybody have a question?

QUESTION: In foreign aid, you made the point that we ought to give it to people who need it, not to what you called "tin horn dictators." Can you give some examples?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I don't particularly want to spell out specific examples. Maybe somebody back here would want to volunteer to do that. But there was a general agreement that it has been quite often. We've not monitored in many instances the ultimate consumer or recipient of American aid. Congress, I think, has moved much more aggressively than has the present administration in trying to eliminate those abuses. But to call the name of a national leader who has channeled some of that money into the purchase of additional Cadillacs I think would be inappropriate for me to say.

QUESTION: Governor, did you discuss the issue of international commodity agreements? And if so, would you take a more sympathetic view toward them than the present administration?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, we did discuss that quite at length. I think that we would take a more sympathetic view. We did discuss the existing commodity agreements that relate to coffee, tin and cocoa, and how those might be extended to other commodities. The general consensus was that although we don't participate directly in the cocoa agreement, it was a successful achievement and in some other areas, for instance I think copper was named, there might be an opportunity for additional commodity agreements. The idea, of course, would be that there would be some stability of pricing, except in extreme shortages of supply where the price is inevitably going to go up. That there would be a moderate investment in reserve stocks, there might be a purchase when the price was low, and then the stocks could be consumed or sold when shortages did occur in the supplying countries.

That was one of the discussions. And I think I would be in favor of that general concept and the expansion of it.

QUESTION: Governor, on that question of floating exchange rates, did you get down to anything as specific as the suggestions that some people have made that Japan is now fluctuating the rate of the yen to our disadvantage and what we might do about it?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, that was discussed. And we discussed the problem and I specifically asked the question of what would be a legitimate way for us to deal with that problem, and the response was either through diplomatic means or I think there was a quick analysis made that the Japanese have already begun to correct that problem in that the value of the yen has increased three percent in recent weeks. The view was expressed that the Japanese have already become aware of the concern about the inclination to buy dollars, to sell yen, to lower the price of the yen, and this trend has already been somewhat reversed because of action by the Japanese Government.

QUESTION: Are you in favor of any more direct or any more specific international control or surveillance of these rates?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think that could best be done through multinational mutual agreements. Of course it can be done through quiet diplomatic channels. But not being the President now, I think it would be improper for me to say what else ought to be done. I think my voice as a nominee would be a significant factor in international understanding and I would be reluctant to go any further than that because of my own unofficial influence. I'm going to be cautious about that.

QUESTION: Did you get into any discussion of what the effects would be of these grain agreements we've had with the Soviet Union and their sad result on the American economy?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Indirectly. We didn't specifically discuss the excessive sale of American grain when we had a shortage ourselves. It was devastating, I think, in its inflationary impact on our country, combined with general shortages of commodities and the increase in the price of oil, which came simultaneously in 1973. But there was a discussion and I certainly agree with the fact that we should not use the withholding or the boycott of shipments of food overseas to try to effectuate some sort of international policy as it relates to other countries.

QUESTION: That's doesn't exactly jibe with the AFL-CIO's views.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I realize that.

QUESTION: Did you discuss the tax benefits that multinational corporations enjoy and what changes ought to be made in the tax laws, if any?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No, and my own position on that has been clearly spelled out in the press. I think that we ought not to continue the deferral of payment of multinational profits that are earned overseas. I personally believe that that does work to the disadvantage of employment in this country. But I think that there's a general recognition that the payment of taxes to foreign countries ought to be considered when we collect taxes from the same income. But we did not go into that this afternoon.

QUESTION: In connection with this briefing, and others that you've had, are you inviting people who you know are in accordance with your candidacy, or have you tried to invite people across the board, and are we to draw any conclusions at all as to whether some of these gentlemen might be in your administration?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Most of the people that have met with us down here in Plains, I've never known before. Some of them were helpful to me during the primary campaign, the vast majority of them were not. We have tried to invite participants in these discussions based on their own qualifications and their earned reputations in the subjects that they've discussed. We've also made a specific effort to get people to participate who have divergent responsibilities and background, experiences and political philosophies. There is a fairly heated discussion that developed quite often in these meetings among those who do disagree. So it hasn't been based on who supported me in the past. Unfortunately, the superb judgment that many of the participants show in domestic and foreign affairs was not mirrored in their political judgment in the spring. But I think from these people who do participate I would certainly get advice from, when and if it comes time for me to choose leaders in these fields in government. When I put together a cabinet and choose major advisers in domestic and foreign affairs, if I don't ask any of these people to serve specifically in government, I would certainly ask their advice on who might be the best qualified people to serve. But it would be improper and I have never mentioned to a single person in this country any position in the administration if I should be elected.

QUESTION: Do you make notes to yourself as to who might have impressed you and not impressed you? Does this affect any future judgments of yours?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, it certainly does. One of the most immediate responsibilities and perhaps one of the greatest responsibilities that I will have if I win in November is immediately to select people to help me run the government in January. And that would only follow my concept of what the organizational structure of the government ought to be over which I have control before we reorganize the complete government. The interrelationship between domestic and foreign economic policy making. The expansion or contraction or changes in the posture of the National Security Council. How the White House staff would relate to cabinet members. These kinds of questions will have to be addressed by me even during the campaign itself. I am certainly forming opinions as I meet with these leaders about their compatibility with me personally, their compatibility with me on philosophical or political matters and attitudes, their ability to express themselves, and the submission of magazine articles or books that they've written. I very carefully read them and am therefore forming my own opinion about who would be best qualified.

QUESTION: Could I take that question one step further? Some of your opponents have from time to time suggested that you are deficient in various areas of expertise and therefore should not be president. Is it also your intention in these meetings to send out the impression, via a network that seems to be building by geometrical and mathematical jumps, that you are in fact qualified and that you know what you're talking about?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think that my opponents are accurate in saying that there is a great deal about the nation's government with which I am not familiar and where I need help and advice. And I would guess that statement would be accurate even when I complete my service as President. I'm trying as best I can to compensate for that inadequacy by gathering around me people who can supplement my own knowledge and experience. And I feel sure that the people of this country would better trust me to the extent that they believe that I will have good advice in areas where I'm

not experienced myself. So politically speaking, I think it's an advantage, but to my mind it's a mandatory requirement for me if I hope to lead this country. I need to have people to help me who participated in the Kennedy Round, who negotiated ever since the Point Four program, in agricultural interchanges with other countries, who are familiar with international economics and international monetary funds, and I think that's a legitimate part of governmental processes to admit one's own deficiencies or needs and to turn without constraint or hesitation to people who know more about a subject than I will know.

QUESTION: A two part question. First of all, why was Senator Mondale not included in these sessions this week? I know he's been out politicking.

GOVERNOR CARTER: That's why.

QUESTION: Second, do you plan on any more of these sessions before you start out on Labor Day?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think I've asked Stu to take eight more hours for these sessions. We'll have at least two more sessions. Senator Mondale has staff members present. I talked to him yesterday about the progress that we were making. He has been gracious enough to fill a lot of invitations that I've had that I could not myself accept. And this has been a mutual decision that we've made. As you probably know, as a member of the U.S. Senate, he has had a lot of opportunity to participate in public hearings on these matters too, and he has an advantage over me particularly in the one we had Monday on domestic problems -- welfare, health, social security, veterans affairs, and so forth. He and I together just have to decide how best to allot his time and my time. I think my time is best allocated here. I don't particularly want to be highly visible traveling in the nation on a full time basis. I think I made three speeches last week and we'll be going to California this weekend and so forth, but it's not anything other than he and I have both agreed that his priorities would be higher to go somewhere else right now.

QUESTION: Why do you not want to be highly visible?

GOVERNOR CARTER: That's not the overriding consideration. The main consideration is that I need to be here learning and putting together the campaign structure. For instance, one of the major responsibilities I have is to learn about proper relationships between me and the Congressional leaders. And Congressman Ullman has been nice enough to come down here. I've asked him to spend the night with me tonight. So we will have had a chance to spend eight or ten hours discussing the mechanism by which we can improve the relationship between House leadership and the White House, and talking about the practical application of my own commitments in the field of health and welfare, tax reform, social security and so forth. And I just believe that's a higher priority for me. On occasion, maybe two or three occasions every week, I will make appearances to raise money for the Democratic Party or to make a speech on a certain subject or perhaps to help Democratic candidates as was the case the other night in West Virginia. I think that's the proper balancing. There's no particular reason for me not to campaign full time. I just have to assess the best use of my time.

QUESTION: Would you come back for a moment to that question of international bribery and boycotts? What might be the component parts of that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: If I am elected President I would make it clear in my initial

major speeches, State of the Union address or some other major speech or series of them that I am personally committed against bribery. I would call on the multi-national corporations or others to voluntarily police themselves and point out that I would consider it a crime if any evidence of bribery was presented to me as President. And that I would proceed with the prosecution of those who are guilty. That would be a proper thing for me to do. I would also seek legislation to make it illegal for companies or for the national policy to include yielding to the tertiary boycotts against banks or corporations that happen to have Jewish citizens in positions of executive leadership. I know that some states have already done this, like New York State. I don't know of any deleterious consequences that the State has suffered. And I think that if I make my position clear as President, that would go a long way toward resolving those two problems which I consider to be a matter of principle.

QUESTION: Are you for full disclosure of companies who bribe officials overseas who seek bribes?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, I am. I'm also in favor of punitive action to be pursued by those who voluntarily admit they have bribed or are bribing, and also the prosecution of any one who is convicted of bribery.

QUESTION: So if it came to the attention of the U.S. government that X number of cabinet officials in Japan, or Norway, or Pakistan, had received bribes from American corporations and there were reasonable indications that they had in fact accepted those bribes, you would be in favor of disclosing those names publicly?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would. That's correct. I would disclose that information to the government involved. I'd have to assess each case, but my inclination would be to make it public. I made a speech on this subject in San Francisco; I think at the largest gathering that I had during the primary campaign. I called for our own government to reveal completely the circumstances around the Lockheed bribery case. I think it would be better for the nation of Japan if that information were made public. I don't see any reason for the President to participate in concealing evidence of a crime. To me, it's just that simple. There may be some other complicating factors that I don't discern, but I could never bring myself to join in the concealing of a crime. Perhaps you have questions to ask of some of those behind me. I'd like to call on these people to correct any mistakes that I've made in my comments.

We've got some very fine people here. I think if you'll look down the list of those who have attended you'll be as impressed as I was with the credentials of those who volunteer to come here and help me. I might say, not specifically relating to this afternoon, that we have had remarkable success in having our invitations to Plains accepted, and I want to express my personal thanks again to these people who have given up their valuable time to come down here and help to educate me. I'm not being presumptuous in assuming that I'm already elected. I've got a long, hard, tough campaign to pursue, but if I am elected President, and I intend to be, then I hope that I can be as well qualified as possible. And people like those standing behind me will deserve a great deal of credit to the extent that we can resolve the present problems that afflict our country, and we can reinvolve the American people in the consideration of these complicated but very important matters, and also help to resolve the difficulties. So I want to again express my thanks to them and say that they have responded very unselfishly to my request that they come down and help me prepare for possibly the biggest job in our country. Thank you very much.

QUESTION: (For Marina Whitman) We have observed that you were in the recent Republican Administration, and I was wondering if you see any differences in attitude or approach?

MARINA WHITMAN: Obviously, there are some disagreements between us about the nature of the conduct of policy in the international economic arena in the last four or five years. However, I think I can say quite seriously that this area of international economic policy is not an area of great partisan division. Obviously, there are feelings that this has been inadequate, this could be done better, and so forth, and as I say in some of these areas, of course, I would have some disagreement. But basically, I think this is an area where there's a very wide range of consensus on what the problems are, the basic approaches to tackling them, and the very great difficulties involved in tackling some of these problems, some of which have been plaguing us for a long, long time.

#