

Presidential Questionnaire

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Presidential Questionnaire; Container 91

To See Complete Finding Aid:

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

September 2, 1976, ACTIVITY REPORT

SUBJECT: Science and Technology Publications/Liaison/Information

FROM: Fred Wood

TO: Distribution

1. Our response to the Presidential Questionnaire submitted to the campaign by 23 engineering organizations has been drafted, reviewed and revised, cleared with the Atlanta and Washington issues departments, and submitted to the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) for publication in the October issue of Mechanical Engineer.

[Copies of both the final full and edited versions of the questionnaire response will be forwarded to you under separate cover.]

2. ASME is supplying camera-ready copy to each of the other 22 engineering organizations listed in Attachment A for publication in the October editions of their respective journals. Total combined circulation is estimated at about one million.

3. Starting today, Mr. George Humphries will be working with me to:

- o Contact other scientific and engineering organizations (beginning with those listed in Attachment B) as to their interest in an article about Jimmy Carter on issues of concern to their membership.
- o Edit the questionnaire response and other existing material, and prepare new material or write articles where necessary, for use by interested publications.

4. The above activities are being coordinated with Paul Suplizio (organizational liaison) and Steve Armstrong (publications). All articles and new written material are being cleared prior to submission with the Atlanta and Washington issues offices.

5. Your suggestions or ideas on any of the above are welcome.

Copies to:

Paul Suplizio
Jack Brebbia
Steve Armstrong
Peter Bourne
Joe Duffey
Dan Dozier
Dave Colton
Harry Schwartz
Carl Shepherd
Landon Butler (Atlanta)
Janet Oliver (Atlanta)
Kitty Schirmer (Atlanta)

Melvin Krantzberg
William Sangster
Stothe Kezios
James Ledvinka
Everett Lee
Michael Michaelis
George Humphries

✓ Noel Sterrett (Atlanta)

Attachment A

Our response to the Presidential Questionnaire will be printed by the following 23 engineering organizations/publications (October editions):

American Nuclear Society (The Nuclear News)
Air Pollution Control Association (APCA Journal)
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
(Aeronautics and Astronautics)
American Institute of Chemical Engineers (Chemical Engineering)
American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and
Petroleum Engineers (Mining Engineering)
American Society for Engineering Education (Engineering Education)
American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and
Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRA Journal)
American Society for Quality Control (Quality Progress)
American Society of Agricultural Engineers
(Agricultural Engineering)
American Society of Civil Engineers (Civil Engineering)
American Society of Mechanical Engineers (Mechanical Engineering)
Engineers Joint Council (Special Mailout)
Federation of Materials Societies (Special Mailout)
Illuminating Engineering Society (Illuminating Engineering News)
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE Spectrum)
Institute of Transportation Engineers (Traffic Engineering)
National Institute of Ceramic Engineers (Newsletter)
National Society of Professional Engineers (Professional Engineer)
Society of American Military Engineers (Military Engineer)
Society for Experimental Stress Analysis (Experimental Mechanics)
Society of Fire Protection Engineers (SFPE Bulletin)
Society of Manufacturing Engineers (Manufacturing Engineering)
Society of Women Engineers (SWE Newsletter)

Attachment B

As the next step, the following organizations/publications will be contacted with respect to their interest in printing our response to the Presidential Questionnaire and/or related materials or articles in the science and technology area.

American Chemical Society (Chemical and Engineering News)
American Chemical Society (Environmental Science and Technology)
American Institute of Planners (Newsletter)
Association for Educational Communications and Technology
(AV Communication Review)
Broadcasting
World Future Society (The Futurist, WFS Bulletin)
American Industrial Arts Association (Man/Society/Technology)
Mass Transit
American Society for Public Administration
(Public Administration Review)
American Association for the Advancement of Science (Science)
Science News
National Science Teachers Association (Science Teacher)
Society for General Systems Research (General Systems Bulletin)
International Society for Technology Assessment (TA Update)

American Astronautical Society (Journal of Astronautical Sciences)
American Institute of Biological Sciences (Bioscience)
American Consulting Engineers Council (Newsletter)
American Society of Certified Engineering Technicians (Newsletter)
American Society for Information Science (Newsletter)
American Society of Naval Engineers (Naval Engineers)
Zero Population Growth (National Reporter)
Institute of Traffic Engineers (Traffic Engineer)
Federation of American Scientists (Public Interest Report)

Noel Sterrett

Attachment A
Science & Technology articles etc.

Our response to the Presidential Questionnaire will be printed by the following 23 engineering organizations/publications: (October editions):

- American Nuclear Society (The Nuclear News)
- Air Pollution Control Association (APCA Journal)
- American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics (Aeronautics and Astronautics)
- American Institute of Chemical Engineers (Chemical Engineering)
- American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers (Mining Engineering)
- American Society for Engineering Education (Engineering Education)
- American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers (ASHRA Journal)
- American Society for Quality Control (Quality Progress)
- American Society of Agricultural Engineers (Agricultural Engineering)
- American Society of Civil Engineers (Civil Engineering)
- American Society of Mechanical Engineers (Mechanical Engineering)
- Engineers Joint Council (Special Mailout)
- Federation of Materials Societies (Special Mailout)
- Illuminating Engineering Society (Illuminating Engineering News)
- Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers (IEEE Spectrum)
- Institute of Transportation Engineers (Traffic Engineering)
- National Institute of Ceramic Engineers (Newsletter)
- National Society of Professional Engineers (Professional Engineer)
- Society of American Military Engineers (Military Engineer)
- Society for Experimental Stress Analysis (Experimental Mechanics)
- Society of Fire Protection Engineers (SFPB Bulletin)
- Society of Manufacturing Engineers (Manufacturing Engineering)
- Society of Women Engineers (SWE Newsletter)

Note: The Presidential Questionnaire was submitted to Governor Carter and President Ford on August 6, 1976, by Earle C. Miller, President of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME), on behalf of the 23 organizations listed above. Governor Carter's response was submitted to ASME, and its publication Mechanical Engineering, on August 30, 1976, with final revisions completed on September 1. Mechanical Engineering in turn is distributing the response in edited camera-ready form to the publications of the other 22 organizations.

Noel - As far as I know, each of the publications listed above printed all or part of our response to the questionnaire. Some printed our entire response (e.g., Mechanical Engineering) while others printed only excerpts (e.g., Professional Engineer and Aeronautics & Astronautics). In general, the engineering publications were very cooperative.
Fred Wood

Attachment B

Science & Technology articles, etc.

As the next step, the following organizations/publications have been contacted with respect to their interest in printing our response to the Presidential Questionnaire and/or related materials or articles in the science and technology area.

- yes ? * American Chemical Society (Chemical and Engineering News) Special Qnaire response
- + American Chemical Society (Environmental Science and Technology)
- ~~+ American Institute of Planners (Newsletter)~~
- ~~+ Association for Educational Communications and Technology (AV Communication Review)~~
- ~~+ Broadcasting~~
- ~~+ World Future Society (The Futurist, WFS Bulletin)~~
- + American Industrial Arts Association (Man/Society/Technology)
- yes ? + Mass Transit Wrote own article based on position papers
- yes ? * American Society for Public Administration ! (PA News and Views)
- yes ? * American Association for the Advancement of Science (Science)
- yes ? * Science News Wrote own article based on position papers
- + National Science Teachers Association (Science Teacher)
- ~~+ Society for General Systems Research (General Systems Bulletin)~~
- yes ? * International Society for Technology Assessment (TA Update) Special Qnaire response
- ~~+ American Astronomical Society (Journal of Astronomical Sciences)~~
- + American Institute of Biological Sciences (BioScience)
- ~~+ American Consulting Engineers Council (Newsletter)~~
- + American Society of Certified Engineering Technicians (Newsletter)
- ? + American Society for Information Science (Newsletter)
- ~~+ American Society of Naval Engineers (Naval Engineers)~~
- ~~+ Zero Population Growth (National Reporter)~~
- ~~+ Institute of Traffic Engineers (Traffic Engineer) see page 1~~
- ~~+ Federation of American Scientists (Public Interest Report)~~

Key: + = positive or possible interest; questionnaire response sent
 - = negative or no interest; questionnaire not sent.
 * = potential interest; additional Qs needed prior to formal contact.

- yes ✓ American Physical Society (Physics Today) article based on position papers
- yes American Institute of Industrial Engineers (Industrial Engineering) based on engineering Qnaire response
- yes American Society of Safety Engineers (Professional Safety) special Qnaire response
- yes ? New Engineers based on enrgy Qnaire response
Inside REP and Utility Spotlight

To Noel Sterrett, Atlanta Issues

3 of 3

Attachment C

Science & Technology articles etc

The following additional organizations/publications have been contacted with respect to their interest in printing our response to the Presidential Questionnaire.

- + American Institute of Architects (AIA Journal)
- ~~+ American Institute of Industrial Engineers (Industrial Engineering) see p 2~~
- ~~+ American Institute of Physics (Physics Today) see p 2~~
- + American Society for Microbiology (ASM News)
- + American Society for Testing and Materials (Standardization News)
- ~~+ American Society of Safety Engineers (Professional Safety) see p 2~~
- + Communication Theory in the Cause of Man
- ~~+ Inside ESB (copy from ASME)~~
- + National Association of Power Engineers (National Engineer)
- ~~+ Next Engineer (copy from ASME)~~
- + Science for the People
- + Society of Automotive Engineers (Automotive Engineering)
- + Society of Fire Protection Engineers (Technology Reports)
- + Society of Motion Picture and Television Engineers (Journal)
- + Society of Naval Architects and Marine Engineers (Journal)
- + Society of Plastics Engineers (Plastics Engineering)
- ~~+ Utility Spotlight (copy from ASME)~~

- American Congress on Surveying and Mapping (Bulletin)
- American Institute of Plant Engineers (Newsletter)
- American Society of Lubrication Engineers (Lubrication Engineering)
- American Society for Metals (Metals Progress)
- Association for Computing Machinery (Communications of the ACM)
- Association for Systems Management (Journal of Systems Management)
- Association of Iron and Steel Engineers (Iron and Steel Engineers)
- Instrument Society of America (Instrumentation Technology)
- Operations Research Society of America (OR/MS Today)

Key: + = positive or possible interest; questionnaire response sent.
- = negative or no interest; questionnaire response not sent.
* = potential interest; additional Q&As needed.

Noel - I do not know if the publications listed above printed anything or not. They all expressed interest in the engineering questionnaire.
There may well be many other pubs which used all or part of the engrg questionnaire response. Over 600 pubs requested copies.
Jeff Werner of the Organizational Liaison Office (1800 M St NW, DC 20036, 202-857-1600) may know of other science & technology articles... Call me if I can help further.

MEMORANDUM

TO: JIMMY CARTER
FROM: STU EIZENSTAT
DATE: APRIL 6, 1976

RE: PROPOSED ANSWERS TO QUESTIONNAIRE TO BE SUMMARIZED ON THE
ROBERT MACNEIL REPORT ON HIS APRIL 12 PROGRAM

1. If you were elected in November, what do you expect would be the level of inflation at the end of your four year term?

ANSWER

My goal is to substantially reduce both the rate of inflation, currently running at approximately 6%, and likewise to markedly reduce the intolerably high levels of unemployment, now running at 7.5% nationally, ~~more than~~ twice that level in our central cities and at rates over 40% among certain segments of our population, such as black teenagers.

While no candidate can or should guarantee a particular level of ~~unemployment~~ ^{unemployment}, it will be the policy of my administration to steadily reduce inflation to as close to zero as possible while still keeping levels of unemployment low and without sacrificing what must be a ~~front~~ ^{front} attack on unemployment.

From the post-Korea period up to the build-up in Vietnam our nation ~~had generally~~ ^{had} 1 1/2 to 2 percent inflation on the average.

By the end of my first four year term, my goal would be to reduce inflation to these levels, without at the same time creating

a sluggish economy. I believe that inflation can be kept at substantially lower rates than exist today while high levels of employment can likewise be achieved.

2. To achieve that rate of inflation, would you propose to reduce the federal deficit, or at least keep it from rising?

If so, would you reduce or maintain the level of federal spending? If you would reduce it, where would you cut?

If you propose to reduce the deficit, would you raise or maintain taxes? If you would raise them, which ones would you raise?

ANSWER

I believe that it is not only possible, but necessary to maintain a high level of government activity in important areas, while at the same time moving toward a balanced budget.

The programs which I have recommended in my urban policy position paper and throughout my campaign will help create the high levels of employment sufficient to generate billions of dollars of additional revenue. It is generally agreed that each 1% reduction in unemployment will generate from 13 to 16 billion dollars in additional revenues. Moreover, by achieving the type of marked decline in unemployment which I expect to obtain, we will be able to reduce unemployment compensation payments, since unemployment itself will be reduced (which payments now run from 17 to 20 billion dollars a year) and will likewise save an additional 2 to 3 billion dollars which now go to extra food stamps simply due to unemployment.

Therefore, with the additional revenues which will be generated by a reduction in the ~~the~~ employment rate and by cuts in recession oriented federal expenditures which will come about by an end to the recession under my administration, we can maintain a strong level of necessary government spending and yet achieve a balanced or substantially balanced budget.

Thus, over the next 4 to 5 years we should aim toward a level of government spending which would be in substantial equilibrium with the growth of our economy.

Under my administration our real economic growth will increase by at least 5% per year, thereby generating the tax revenue and avoiding the need for certain recessionary expenditures, which can insure both budget stability and yet an adequate level of public spending.

The deficit therefore will be reduced under my administration by the combination of additional tax revenues purely from economic growth and certain reductions (~~in~~ⁱⁿ) expenditures now caused solely by the recession, all without any tax increase. ~~Tax reform will also be of assistance in this regard.~~ There will be no need to raise taxes in order to accomplish the results I have outlined.

At the current time, a precipitous reduction in government spending ~~will~~^{would} be harmful to the continued improvement of ^{the} economy.

3. Would you relax regulatory pressure in such areas as pollution control and job safety, or resist the introduction of tougher regulation, in order to reduce corporate costs? If so, please give some examples illustrating how far and how fast you would go.

ANSWER

It is important that government regulations be equitable and fair and that they be reviewed to insure that these ends are being achieved. However, I will not relax necessary regulations in ~~the~~ areas such as pollution control and job safety, where these regulations are necessary to protect our environment and to guarantee a safe working place for the American worker. I believe that government regulations should be made more effective and more efficient and that this can often be achieved without increasing corporate costs beyond current levels.

4. What effect do you anticipate your anti-inflation policy would have on the level of unemployment? What level of unemployment would you expect at the end of your four year term?

ANSWER

Except for periods of war, this country has not experienced 3% unemployment for some 25 years.

I want to make it clear that reducing the intolerably high level of unemployment will be my first economic priority.

I believe that a much more vigorous effort can be made to reduce unemployment well below current levels without generating inflationary pressures and I support efforts toward a more vigorous economic policy.

Economists note that once unemployment is reduced to the ^{4 1/2%} or 5% level that the right economic mix is necessary to reduce unemployment down to 3% ^(adult) with the correct mixture of fiscal and monetary policy, for it is at this stage that structural unemployment

faces us.

We cannot be satisfied when any person who wishes to have a job remains unemployed and thus to target a specific figure is really to commit certain persons to permanent unemployment.

Therefore, my expectation is to continue to reduce ~~inflation~~ ^{unemployment} even below the 4 to 5 percent level, with the objective of reaching the 3 ~~to 4 percent level of~~ ^{adult} unemployment at the end of my first term and even lower levels thereafter.

My policy to reduce inflation will not generate further unemployment.

5. What policies would you like the Federal Reserve Board to pursue? What, if any, control might you have in their policies?

ANSWER

The Federal Reserve set as a target this year a 5 to 7 1/2 percent increase in the money supply but until last month they were well behind in this figure.

At current levels of unemployment and for the next year there should be an increase in the money supply without any increase in interest rates.

While the independence of the Federal Reserve Board must be protected at this time, I think the President should use his persuasive powers to insure that the Federal Reserve's monetary policies ~~were~~ ^{are} coordinated with executive branch's fiscal policies. We need increased consultations between the Chairman of the Federal Reserve and the President of the United States and ^{the Secretary of the Treasury.}

I also think that we should explore the possibility of making the term of the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board coterminus with the term of the President of the United States so that the President is not faced with a holdover from a previous President. I am currently exploring a wide range of economic views by various of my economic advisors to determine whether such a policy would be sound.

6. Do you feel that federal restrictions of wages and/or prices are a useful complementary tool in controlling inflation? If so, what form might such restrictions take?

ANSWER

I oppose the use of ^{permanent} mandatory across-the-board wage and price controls for all industries. Experience has indicated that such controls are difficult to maintain on a permanent basis and ~~have~~ ^{have} not been particularly effective as a long-term solution.

I think that it is necessary to explore strong voluntary approaches. The President of the United States should have stand-by authority to temporarily impose restrictions on prices and wages under carefully prescribed situations and when voluntary efforts have failed, which controls ~~sh~~ should be maintained for only a limited period of time. Such stand-by controls should not be lightly used and I hope that I would never be in a position of having to use them.

~~[I would appreciate your comments on these proposed answers so that we can forthwith forward our answers for this program. I have drawn substantially for these answers on Charles Schultz~~

of Brookings and ~~we will run these~~^{and} by Larry Klein, who I have been
~~unable to reach but who I will reach before this statement is~~
~~released. I would like the authorization to make certain changes~~
~~if Professor Klein feels they are necessary,~~^{the answers subsequently} although I believe
~~Mr. Schultz' and Mr. Klein's views will be quite similar on these~~
~~points. Indeed, some of these answers reflect Professor Klein's~~
~~thinking as expressed in our recent Atlanta meeting with him.]~~

ASSOCIATION FOR COOPERATION IN ENGINEERING

UNITED ENGINEERING CENTER — 10th FLOOR
345 East 47th St., New York, N.Y. 10017
TELEPHONE: (212) 752-6800 EXTENSION 321

Donald G. Fink
Operations Director

August 6, 1976

Governor James Carter
1625 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20016

Dear Governor Carter:

In these times when technology is needed for the solution of pressing social problems, yet the growth of that technology itself is being questioned in some quarters, the engineers of the United States are concerning themselves more actively in the policies of our Federal government which impact on the application of their skills. They are deeply interested in the positions to be taken by President Ford or Governor Reagan and yourself on issues which express their concern and request the cooperation of each of you by providing answers to sixteen questions which are attached.

This request is made in the name of the following organizations which represent over one million of the Nation's engineering community:

American Nuclear Society
Air Pollution Control Association
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
American Institute of Chemical Engineers
American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers
American Society for Engineering Education
American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air-Conditioning Engineers
American Society for Quality Control
American Society of Agricultural Engineers
American Society of Civil Engineers
American Society of Mechanical Engineers
Engineers Joint Council
Federation of Materials Societies
Illuminating Engineering Society
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
Institute of Transportation Engineers
National Institute of Ceramic Engineers

Air Pollution Control Association
American Consulting Engineers Council
American Institute of Aeronautics and Astronautics
American Institute of Chemical Engineers
American Institute of Industrial Engineers
American Institute of Mining, Metallurgical and Petroleum Engineers
American Society for Engineering Education
American Society of Heating, Refrigerating and Air Conditioning Engineers
American Society for Quality Control
American Society of Agricultural Engineers
American Society of Civil Engineers
American Society of Mechanical Engineers
American Society of Safety Engineers
Engineers' Council for Professional Development
Engineers Joint Council
Federation of Materials Societies
Illuminating Engineering Society
Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers
Institute of Traffic Engineers
National Council of Engineering Examiners
National Institute of Ceramic Engineers
National Society of Professional Engineers
Society of American Military Engineers
Society of Automotive Engineers
Society of Fire Protection Engineers
Society of Manufacturing Engineers
Society of Women Engineers

National Society of Professional Engineers
Society of American Military Engineers
Society for Experimental Stress Analysis
Society of Fire Protection Engineers
Society of Manufacturing Engineers
Society of Women Engineers

These societies and other which will be invited to join with us intend to distribute the questions and answers to their memberships early in the month of October.

In order to meet this schedule, we would appreciate your written reply by August 20. To package this material in a practical form for such wide distribution, it is imperative that replies be concise. For example, we would hope that it would be contained in a four page newsletter type of publication, two pages for each candidate.

Representatives of six of these societies are located in Washington, and will be available to you or your staff to clarify any points with regard to the intent of the questions or form of your response. These men are:

Johan Benson, Director
American Institute of Aeronautics and
Astronautics - Washington Office
1625 Eye Street - Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 785-0293

Theodore J. Hamilton
Washington Representative
American Institute of Chemical Engineers
2000 L. Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 296-2606

James Hughes
National Society of Professional Engineers
2029 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 331-7020

John M. Kinn
Institute of Electrical & Electronics Engineers, Inc.
Washington Office
1625 Eye Street - Suite 601
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 785-0017

Louis L. Meier, Jr.
Washington Counsel
American Society of Civil Engineers
2029 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 785-4454

William P. Miller, Jr.
Washington Representative
The American Society of Mechanical Engineers
2029 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006 Phone (202) 785-3756

PRESIDENTIAL QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you see as the role of our various energy sources and of conservation methods in meeting U.S. energy demand? How would you allocate research, development, and demonstration funds in these areas?
2. With regard to nuclear power, what is your view on full development of the breeder reactor? Would you allow U.S. companies to sell nuclear fuels, components, or facilities to foreign countries?
3. Do you favor divestiture of the oil companies? And if so, how?
4. Do you see your administration proposing a national policy on the development and use of mineral and material resources? If so, what will it be?
5. What is your position on national economic planning? How would you cope with the capital shortage problem? What is your position regarding increased public works spending to cut unemployment?
6. Do you favor increased control over, or a decrease in the power of, federal regulatory agencies? If so, how would you implement such a change?
7. What is your position on developing and also on procuring advanced weapons systems?
8. What do you see as the future role, priorities, and funding for NASA? Within NASA's budget what importance do you place upon aeronautical R&D, space science and space applications.
9. What are your priorities in financing and carrying out a national transportation plan? What do you see as the financial trade-offs between highways, mass transit and other surface modes of transportation?
10. How do you intend to use the Office of Science and Technology in your administration?
11. In the implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act: Would you encourage on-site consultation by OSHA inspectors to discuss compliance? Would you favor deputizing existing safety engineers, who are employed by insurance companies and the like, to act as official OSHA inspectors? Should firms with 100 or fewer employees be exempt from OSHA regulations?
12. Do you believe in regulating the voluntary standards and certification activities in the United States? What is your stand on Senate bill S. 3555, which would establish regulation of such activities by the Federal Trade Commission?
13. With regard to the Clean Air Act of 1970, do you feel that the specific reductions in auto emissions mandated by the Act are just and achievable? Do you agree with Act provisions for control measures and air quality standards which were intended to prevent the "degradation" and/or "substantial deterioration" of air quality?
14. What change if any do you recommend in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and in its regulations and implementation?
15. What forms of technological aid do you recommend that the U.S. offer to developing countries?
16. Institutions of higher education are faced with new responsibilities and with continually increasing costs. What measures will your administration support to provide the financial resources required to maintain the excellence of engineering education in the United States?

EDITED VERSION OF QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSE TO APPEAR
IN THE PUBLICATIONS OF 23 ENGINEERING ORGANIZATIONS

Q 1. What do you see as the role of our various energy sources and of conservation methods in meeting U.S. energy demand? How would you allocate research, development, and demonstration funds in these areas?

A. One of the greatest failures of national leadership is the failure to convince the American people of the urgency of our energy problems. Our national policy for energy must include a combination of energy conservation and energy development, together with price protection for the consumer.

Energy conservation

We need:

- Strict fuel efficiency standards and ratings for motor vehicles;
- Rigid enforcement of energy-saving speed limits;
- Efficiency standards and better labeling for electrical appliances;
- Mandatory improvements in building insulation;
- Revisions in electric utility rate structures to discourage total consumption and peak power demand;
- Development of integrated mass transit systems to alleviate somewhat our dependence on the automobile;
- And similar conservation measures.

Energy development

A major immediate need is to derive maximum energy from coal, while preserving environmental quality.

Power companies and industries must shift to this source of energy, but without destroying the surface of our lands through uncontrolled strip mining. We must invest in improved mining efficiency, cleaner combustion technology, and a better transportation system for moving coal to its end users.

Q 1 -- continued

With respect to nuclear energy, we should apply much stronger safety standards as we regulate its use. A strengthened safety program should require that:

- Nuclear reactors be located below ground level;
- Power plants be housed in sealed buildings;
- Plants be situated in sparsely populated areas;
- Plant designs be standardized;
- Radioactive wastes be effectively isolated from the biosphere; and
- A federal safety officer always be present, with full authority to shut down the plant in case of any operational abnormality.

At the same time, we need a major thrust to greatly increase the development and use of solar and other renewable sources of energy.

RD&D allocation

Allocation of research, development, and demonstration funds should be based on a comprehensive, long-range, understandable energy policy. With proper planning and determined execution of long-range goals, federally funded RD&D can help increase substantially both energy conservation and energy development in ways which are consistent with environmental quality and economic well-being.

Q 2. With regard to nuclear power, what is your view on full development of the breeder reactor?

A. Breeder reactor

We must not close the door on any long-range energy sources, including nuclear power. However, our allocation of limited research and development funds must reflect a balanced assessment of advantages and disadvantages for each alternative.

During the past few years, two-thirds of all federal R&D funds went for atomic power, primarily for the liquid metal fast breeder reactor (LMFBR). Since this potential source of energy will not be economically feasible until the price of natural uranium increases several times over, since England, France and the U.S.S.R. have design experience with the LMFBR, and because of the mounting costs and safety and environmental problems, I believe our emphasis on this project should be substantially reduced and converted to a long-term, possible multinational effort.

In the short run, our R&D emphasis should shift from the LMFBR to energy conservation and cleaner coal technologies, as well as to the rapid development of renewable sources of energy. We should also take steps to reduce our dependence on enriched uranium.

Atomic plants in the United States use light water with enriched uranium. Some countries, such as Canada, use heavy water with more plentiful natural uranium. At present, the U.S. government's fuel enrichment plants are expected to be able to produce adequate enriched uranium for the next decade. A shift away from sustained production of atomic weapons or toward heavy water reactors can extend this time of adequate supply, and minimize the need for either breeder reactors or the private commercial production of enriched nuclear fuel.

Q 3. Do you favor divestiture of the oil companies? And if so, how?

A. I see clearly the value of a strong system of free enterprise. I believe that competition is preferable to regulation and intend to combine strong safeguards for consumers with minimal intrusion of government in our free economic system.

If and when competition within the petroleum industry is inadequate to insure free markets and maximum benefit to America's consumers, I would support selective divestiture of the oil companies. At the present time, I consider these circumstances to exist or to be a threat at the wholesale and retail levels within the vertically integrated oil companies, and within the coal and uranium industries because of excessive ownership and control by the oil companies.

I do not feel it is necessarily in the consumer's interest to limit a vertically integrated company to one single phase of activity, such as exploration, production, or transportation.

I do support legal prohibitions against ownership of competing types of energy, such as oil and coal. There may be some limited instances in which there should be joint responsibility for any phase of production of competing energy sources.

To insure maximum protection of the American consumer, I will insist that we have reliable information available on which to determine the adequacy of competition in the oil industry, and will be very strict in assessing whether a lack of competition is having an adverse impact on consumer prices and availability of oil supplies. Our anti-trust laws must be effectively enforced, and disclosure of data on reserve supplies and production should be required.

Q 4. Do you see your administration proposing a national policy on the development and use of mineral and material resources? If so, what will it be?

A.

I believe we must undertake a comprehensive long-range assessment of our mineral reserves and the demand for them in order that development proceed in an orderly, predictable way which assures wise use of these resources. We must assess the full range of natural resources used in the production process--from metals, fuels, and minerals, to such organic substances as lumber and fibers. And we must evaluate materials supply and utilization through all stages of the materials cycle--from acquisition of raw materials through processing and manufacture to eventual disposal, re-use, or recycling.

The results of this assessment can then form the basis for a national policy on the development and use of mineral and material resources, including any changes in the institutional and policy-making machinery which may be necessary.

Q 5.

What is your position regarding increased public works spending to cut unemployment?

A. Capital shortage

Many simultaneous actions should be taken to reduce unemployment, of which public works spending is only one. To reach full employment we must assure:

- An expansionary fiscal and monetary policy, at least for the next year, to stimulate private sector demand, production, and jobs;
- Incentives for the private sector to hire the unemployed even during periods of economic downturn;
- On-the-job training by business;
- More efficient employment services to match people to jobs; and
- Improved manpower training programs.

As a supplement to the private sector, I favor federally created jobs for areas and groups afflicted by acute unemployment. According to a recent M.I.T. study, the cost would be only slightly higher than existing relief programs. The benefits in additional national productivity, taxes paid, and human dignity would be enormous.

I also favor accelerated public works programs as another means to cut unemployment where such spending is consistent with national priorities and efficient use of public funds. For example, in the area of transportation, it must be recognized that the task of rebuilding the existing transportation system is so massive, so important, and so urgent that private investment will have to be supplemented with substantial direct public investment. However, while some additional costs would be involved in providing jobs for repairing the railroads and completing our mass transit systems, most of the cost would be within present budget allocations for transportation and would instead reflect a reordering of current program priorities.

Q 6. Do you favor increased control over, or a decrease in the power of, federal regulatory agencies? If so, how would you implement such a change?

A. The reform of our regulatory agencies would be one of the highest priorities of a Carter Administration. Rather than discuss the functions of regulatory agencies in terms of increase or decrease in power, I feel it is important to examine the manner in which the regulatory agencies exercise their authority.

Throughout this campaign, I have emphasized the need for a "code of ethics" for federal regulators. Such a code includes:

- Government in the "sunshine" which is open and accessible to all members of the public, not just special interests;
- Strong implementation and enforcement of our freedom of information laws;
- Disclosure and control of the activities of lobbyists through enactment and enforcement of a strong lobbying disclosure law;
- Breaking up the sweetheart arrangements between regulatory agencies and the regulated industries and closing the revolving door of employment which exists between them;
- Annual disclosure of all financial involvements of major federal officials should be required by law; and
- No gifts of any value should be permitted to a public official.

Finally, I will not permit our regulatory agencies to become dumping-grounds for unsuccessful candidates, faithful political partisans, out-of-favor White House aides, and representatives of narrow special interests. Insistence on high-qualifications of regulatory officials, coupled with openness in government can go a long way toward making our regulatory agencies truly responsive and responsible to the public interest they are designed to serve.

Q 7. What is your position on developing and also on procuring advanced weapons systems?

A. The prime responsibility of any President is to guarantee the security of our nation with a well-organized and effective fighting force. We must have the ability to avoid the threat of successful attack or blackmail, and we must always be strong enough to carry out our legitimate foreign policy. This is a prerequisite to peace.

Without endangering the defense of our nation or our commitments to our allies, we can reduce present defense expenditures by about \$5 to \$7 billion annually. We must be hard-headed in the development of new weapons systems to insure that they will comport with our foreign policy objectives. Exotic weapons which serve no real function do not contribute to the defense of this country.

The defense procurement system should be reformed to require, wherever possible and consistent with efforts to encourage full participation by small and minority businesses, advertised competitive bids and other improvements in procurement procedure so as to encourage full and fair competition among potential contractors and to cut the current waste in defense procurement. A more equitable formula should be considered for distribution of defense contracts and other federal procurement on a state or regional basis.

Finally, we must get about the business of arms control. The Vladivostok Agreement set too high a ceiling on strategic nuclear weapon systems. The SALT talks must get off of dead center. The core of our dealings with the Soviet Union must be the mutual reduction in arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings in offensive weapons before both sides start a new arms race to reach the current maximums and before new missile systems are tested or committed for production.

Q 7 -- continued

Our nuclear deterrent remains an essential element of world order in this era. But by asking other nations to forego nuclear weapons, through the Non-Proliferation Treaty, we are asking for a form of self-denial that we have not been able to accept ourselves. I believe we have little right to ask others to deny themselves such weapons for the indefinite future unless we demonstrate meaningful progress toward the goal of control, then reduction, and ultimately the elimination of nuclear arsenals.

The United States and other nations share a common interest in reducing military expenditures and transferring the savings into activities which raise living standards. In order to smooth the path for such changes, we should encourage long-range planning by defense-dependent communities and managements of defense firms and unions.

Q 8. What do you see as the future role, priorities, and funding for NASA? Within NASA's budget what importance do you place upon aeronautical R&D, space science and space applications?

A.

Perhaps the greatest potential area of application for space research and technology is in telecommunications.

One important part of a comprehensive energy conservation program is the effective use of telecommunications technology--including the telephone, mobile radio, television, satellites, and computers. In a time of widespread inflation and high unemployment, telecommunications is one of the few sectors of the economy which has consistently provided more jobs with increased productivity. New applications of telecommunications can do much more to improve our quality of life and conserve our scarce resources.

I am pleased to note the efforts at NASA and a number of universities and research institutes to evaluate the potential of telecommunications for increasing the efficiency of energy-intensive activities such as travel. New ways of using telecommunications--such as telephones linked to computers or video conferencing via satellite--bring the promise of substantial time, money, and energy savings in the use of transportation. In other areas, we can, for example, make better use of mobile radio or satellites and computers for on-the-spot diagnosis of heart attacks and delivery of emergency medical services. The technology is here today. What we need--but do not yet have--are the institutional mechanisms and commitment in both the public and private sectors to make best use of our technological assets.

The federal government can play a constructive role in encouraging more effective use of telecommunications, in part through agencies such as NASA. I believe that the federal research and development emphasis should be on innovative uses of telecommunications and information services--particularly for improving productivity in the delivery of public services by federal, state, and local government agencies.

Q 9. What are your priorities in financing and carrying out a national transportation plan? What do you see as the financial trade-offs between highways, mass transit and other surface modes of transportation?

A.

As a consequence, America has, with the notable exception of urban mass transit, (where substantial new construction needs remain), an essentially mature total transportation system. Priority now needs to be given not to developing massive new national transportation systems, except in the case of public transportation, but rather to achieving more effective utilization of the existing rail, highway, and airport networks.

The federal government often has encouraged one mode of transportation to the disadvantage of another. No coordinated transportation policy exists. While the Nation has an extremely well-developed rail, highway, and aviation system, substantial parts of that system have deteriorated to the point where the efficiency and effectiveness of the total system is being compromised. Arresting this deterioration and completing needed work on new urban transit systems must become the Nation's first transportation priority.

The Highway Trust Fund has served as an outstanding and successful mechanism for constructing an extensive and effective highway network in the United States. In doing so, the Fund has also supported a major section of the U.S. economy, providing jobs, advancing technology, and changing the face

Q 9 -- continued

of the American landscape. But we are now in an era in which the nation's transportation needs are changing. Such problems as energy costs, material shortages, and environmental considerations will continue to have a great and increasing bearing upon future needs and programs.

We must substantially increase the amount of money available from the Highway Trust Fund for public mass transportation, study the feasibility of creating a total transportation fund for all modes of transportation, and change the current restrictive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities so that greater amounts can be used as operating subsidies.

What we need most today is a balanced multi-modal approach to maintaining and improving the nation's transportation system. The concept of a total transportation trust fund is especially appealing in that it would support and facilitate this balanced approach. At the same time, we need to review and change the complex regulatory system with which our transport industries must contend.

Q 10. How do you intend to use the Office of Science and Technology in your administration?

A. It is crucial that the advice of the scientific and engineering community of this nation be actively and permanently sought by elected officials in the evolution of national policy dealing with the complicated, unpredictable, and rapidly changing technological problems of this modern world.

The day when political leaders could make effective policy decisions independently and turn to the scientific community only for assistance in implementation has long passed. The Office of Science Advisor to the President should be upgraded immediately to provide a permanent and high level relationship between the White House decision-making process and the scientific community.

When Governor of Georgia, I appointed a Science Advisor and supported activities in technology transfer, technology assessment, and the effective use of science and technology within the various state agencies.

Q 11. In the implementation of the Occupational Safety and Health Act: Would you encourage on-site consultation by OSHA inspectors to discuss compliance? Would you favor deputizing existing safety engineers, who are employed by insurance companies and the like, to act as official OSHA inspectors? Should firms with 100 or fewer employees be exempt from OSHA regulations?

A. We must do more to guarantee each and every American the right to a safe and healthy place of work. Over 600 toxic chemicals are introduced into our workplaces annually. There are currently over 13,000 already listed. Nearly 100,000 working people die each year due to occupational illnesses and accidents. Over 17,000 disabling injuries occurred in our nation's mines. This terrible toll cannot be tolerated.

I believe the basic concept behind OSHA is excellent. We should continue to clarify and expand the state role in the implementation of Health and Safety. OSHA must be strengthened to ensure that those who earn their living by personal labor can work in safe and healthy environments.

The Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 should cover all employees and be enforced as intended when the law was enacted. However, early and periodic review of the Act's provisions should be made to insure that they are reasonable and workable.

The control of occupational hazards can save many workers each year who die prematurely because they are exposed to toxic chemicals, dust, pesticides, unsafe machinery, and other dangerous conditions. Nationwide efforts in this area should continue until our working citizens are safe in their jobs.

I would look favorably on developing means to provide technical assistance and information to employers to encourage compliance with the Act.

Q 12. Do you believe in regulating the voluntary standards and certification activities in the United States? What is your stand on Senate bill S. 3555, which would establish regulation of such activities by the Federal Trade Commission?

A. I understand that this question is important to the engineering profession. Clearly, many engineering organizations have made valuable contributions to the development of technical standards which are in wide use today. As a general rule, however, I do not feel that it is appropriate for me during the campaign to endorse or oppose specific legislation which is now pending before Congress. The issues raised by S. B. 3555 are ones which, if I'm elected, I would want to review in greater detail before making legislative recommendations.

Q 13. With regard to the Clean Air Act of 1970, do you feel that the specific reductions in auto emissions mandated by the Act are just and achievable? Do you agree with Act provisions for control measures and air quality standards which were intended to prevent the "degradation" and/or "substantial deterioration" of air quality?

A. My strong commitment to environmental quality is based on the conviction that environmental protection is not simply an aesthetic goal, but is necessary to achieve a more just society. Cleaning up air and water supplies and controlling the proliferation of dangerous chemicals is a necessary part of a successful national health program. Moreover, environmental protection creates jobs. Environmental legislation enacted since 1970 already has produced more than one million jobs.

It is time that this country had a coherent, clear national policy dedicated to the protection of our environment. I do not believe that there is an incompatibility between economic progress and environmental quality. We should not be diverted from our cause by false claims that the protection of our ecology and wildlife means an end to growth and a decline in jobs. This is not the case.

With respect to air pollution, given the findings of technical feasibility by the Environmental Protection Agency, The National Academy of Sciences and organizations such as the Jet Propulsion Laboratory, I feel that we should require our automobiles to meet the emission standards of the Clean Air Act just as quickly as lead times allow, taking into account such important technical factors as the necessary re-tooling and capital investment. I also support enforcement of the non-degradation clause of the Clean Air Act.

Q 14. What change if any do you recommend in the Federal Water Pollution Control Act and in its regulations and implementation?

A. If elected, I will insist on strict enforcement of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to protect our oceans, lakes, rivers, and streams from unneeded and harmful commercial pollution. I would oppose efforts to weaken the mandate embodied in that statute. I will, however, give full consideration to recommendations which will make our efforts to achieve water quality more effective and efficient, which recognize basic regional differences in ecological and economic conditions, and which help ensure that states and localities are not penalized by pursuing environmental programs.

Environmental research and development within the public and private sectors should be increased substantially. For the immediate future, we must learn how to correct the damage we have already done, but more importantly, we need research on how to build a society in which renewable and non-renewable resources are used wisely and efficiently.

The technological community should be encouraged to produce better air and water pollution-control equipment, and more importantly, to produce technology which produces less pollution.

Q 15. What forms of technological aid do you recommend that the U.S. offer to developing countries?

A. The people of developing nations need our aid, technology and knowledge. Our program of international aid to developing nations should be redirected so that it meets the minimum human needs of the greatest number of people. This means an emphasis on food, jobs, education, and public health--including access to family planning. The emphasis in aid should be on those countries with a proven ability to help themselves, instead of those that continue to allow enormous discrepancies in living standards among their people. I believe the time has come to stop taxing poor people in rich countries for the benefit of rich people in poor countries.

We should undertake a systematic political and economic cost-benefit analysis of existing international institutions in the United Nations' systems and outside, with a view to determining the appropriate level of United States support. We should end the current diplomatic isolation of the United States in international forums by working more closely with our allies and with moderate elements in the developing world on a basis of mutual understanding consistent with our respective national interests.

Q 16. Institutions of higher education are faced with new responsibilities and with continually increasing costs. What measures will your administration support to provide the financial resources required to maintain the excellence of engineering education in the United States?

A.

I feel we need imaginative reforms to strengthen our colleges and universities in times of financial difficulty. For example, parents whose children attend private colleges understandably complain that they must support public colleges and universities through taxation as well as pay high tuition fees. During my years as governor of Georgia, voters authorized annual grants for each student attending private colleges, at a smaller cost to taxpayers than if these students enrolled in public institutions. Such legislation should be encouraged elsewhere. Also, basic tax reform proposals should give proper consideration to private philanthropy in education.

We must remember that, in our search for peace in the world and a better quality of life at home, we depend on and must call upon the best talent we can find in the business world, labor, the professions, and most certainly, in the universities and the scientific and engineering community.