Carter's Briefings and Statements

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter ; Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Carter's Briefings and Statements; Container 69

To See Complete Finding Aid:
http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf

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

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.

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 ot 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 foriegn 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 furtherence 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 missle. 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 cam 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 occured -- 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 compatability with me and so forth, and that would be one of the mechanisms that I would use to decide ultimately whom I might chose 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

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, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

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.

TRANSCRIPTION

August 3, 1976 - Manchester, New Hampshire

I predict to you, that as soon as the Republican Convention is over, there is going to be almost an unprecedented, vicious, personal attack on me, on Senator Mondale, on other Democratic candidates. The Republicans are going to be desperate because of the success that the voters have had in the last year in learning about the absence of leadership, the suffering that we have experienced from the mistakes in ~~forming~~ foreign policy, in the management of the White House, in dealing with our problems, and because of their very low showing in the polls -- the division ~~of~~ their party -- they are going to be desperate. And in desperation, they are going to turn to personal attacks -- mark my words.

We need to make sure that we can withstand those attacks by one means only -- not by hiding, not even by lashing back. But by being immune to successful attacks because we're wrong, or because we're dishonest, or because we lack courage, or because we're divided, or because we're timid. In other words, in order for democratic candidates to be successful in the fall, we have got to deserve in every possible aspect of our presentation as candidates, our promise to the people, any legitimate criticism.

The Democratic party is my party. I have never voted for a Republican in my life. I believe in our party. But we're not perfect. We've made some serious mistakes. In the last 24 years, you know how long Democrats have been in the White House? Eight years. Eight years. And there's a reason. Because the people

of this country on election day felt that they could trust Richard Nixon better than our candidates. And because they felt that the Democrats that we put up against Eisenhower were inferior in some way. So we've got to deserve support. We ought to remember how deeply hurt the American people have been in the last few years. Our basic confidence, our basic trust, our basic faith, in our own country, has been shaken. I think, more than any other time in the last hundred we feel that something precious has slipped out of our hands. And I feel only a tremendous responsibility not to betray the trust of people like you all over the country who have confidence in me. I want to be a little better, a little cleaner, a little more honest, a little harder working, a little closer to you, than I would under ordinary circumstances. Because we are in a time of testing. When the people say, I'll give my government one more chance. I'll give my system of government one more chance. I'll give my candidate one more chance. I don't want to lose that chance. To recement relationships between us as people and our government. I want to tear down the wall that's been built around Washington. I want to tear down the wall that's been built between the White House and Congress. I want to tear down the wall that's been built between one kind of person in this country and those who might be different. I want to tear down the wall that's been built between us and the ideals and standards that have made us a great country.

At noon, I spoke about the family. Every decision that I make as a candidate, Every decision that I make as a future president, is going to be based on strengthening the family, and interrelationship one to the other. But we've got to earn that support.

And the last thing I want to say is this. We've got to retain our

unity. If we get divided in New Hampshire, if each candidate after your September primary has a tendency to go alone, if there is a breakdown in communications or exchange of ideas between myself and your own candidates locally in New Hampshire, it will be a serious mistake. The unity of our party can be preserved through the campaign. It ought to lay a basis for success in the future. I believe in my country, I know you do too. I have deep feelings of patriotism. I know they are mirrored in New Hampshire. I believe in the right of people to be free, independent, self-reliant. I believe in the work ethic. I believe that the best government is the one closest to our people. I believe in stripping the secrecy away from the processes of government. I believe in basic human rights, civil rights. And investment in people, not buildings. So do all of you. But those things have got to be preserved. And if they can be preserved by us and the future of our country I believe is in the hands of those like us all over the country. I beleive we can win in November. Restore the things we've lost and prove to the rest of the world and to our own nation, as I've said many times in the primary, that we still live in the greatest country on earth.

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, knowning 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.

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 embarassment, 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 advertisments 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.

# # #

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.

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.

# # #

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

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 picutre 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 inadequte 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 togehter. 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 responsibiilty 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 becasue 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, adn 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.

# # #

EDUCATION AND DOMESTIC POLICIES PRESS BRIEFING

PLAINS, GEORGIA -- AUGUST 16, 1976

GOVERNOR CARTER: This press conference will be devoted to the subject of our briefing this afternoon in order to save time and let these experts on different subjects stay on their schedule. We had a four-and-a-half hour discussion of subjects generally related to social or human resource issues. They related to income security -- social security, federal employee retirement, unemployment compensation, aid for families with dependent children, SSI, foodstamps, child nutrition, housing, Medicaid, Medicare. We also discussed subjects concerning education, manpower training, and social services.

We did several things today that might be of interest to you. First of all, I think there was general agreement that the best way to approach this broad subject is to consider it as an entity and to lay down during the campaign this fall as best we can for the American people to consider, long-range purposes or goals: what we can hope to achieve at the end of a four-year or five-year period, and which aspects of that achievement we hope to accomplish at the end of each succeeding year. What will be the net cost to the people of this country as we give better services.

There was also, I think, an almost unanimous agreement that any improvement in the quality of services or level of services had to be combined with the reorganization of the structure of government; that the present bureaucratic mess almost was an insuperable obstacle to the achievement of those better service delivery systems. So reorganization of the structure of government must be done as rapidly as possible.

Another thing that we discussed was that we would try to maintain my own goal of a balanced budget by the end of the first four years, assuming I am elected President, and at the same time hold down the percentage of our gross national product that's spent by the federal government to its present level -- roughly 20-21% -- and to use those as parameters for the future. There is also a general agreement that we ought to think about those federal programs in human terms. One example given, of course, was the impact of federal programs on the family structure which I have already pursued in one speech and I've emphasized again and again. A second concern was the impact of federal programs on the quality and the maintenance of the standards within communities -- particularly the urban communities that have been damaged already and are threatened with further damage in the future.

The last point I want to make is this. No matter whether we're talking about young people or aid for families with dependent children or any other aspect of our societal life, there was a general feeling thatpeople are better off if they have fruitful employment for themselves -- work. As was the case with the discussion on inflation and employment, everyone agreed that we ought to emphasize the right of people to have a job. It's a good investment for the future, it cuts down on all the ancillary costs of government -- welfare, unemployment insurance, and other aspects that are very costly at this time. And we agreed

that the first effort should be within the present limits of our federal budget, to make that expenditure much more efficient as a first priority. Between now and the election itself, we will try to present these programs to the people, and if I am elected President, we should be ready with some concrete proposals early in November, so that we can move aggressively on Inauguration Day if I am elected. These are some broad principles. I think I might ask now for some specific questions on these subjects and let those who have given me information this afternoon and who are experts in their fields help me in answering these questions. So if you have a question on these subjects, I'll be glad to take them now.

QUESTION: Governor, did you discuss busing at all?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, we did, as a matter of fact. We had quite a spirited debate, coincidentally between two of our black representatives here. Most of the white participants just stayed out of it. We didn't resolve the issues raised and they say they're going to finish their debate on the bus going back to Atlanta. We're going to have to put some people between them.

There was a general feeling that our society ought not to back off from our commitment to the integration of our educational system, that this is a very beneficial thing for the students, both black and white and those that represent other minority groups. The laws needs to be applied uniformly throughout the country. The next administration needs to spell out a strong position on the issue of busing and on the issue of transporting students. The first priority ought to be ensuring a quality education for every child, and that arbitrary rules or forumla perhaps are an improper way to approach the subject. But we did discuss busing, and education. Commissioner Riles from California has had some special experiences with that subject and I would be glad to have you address specific questions to him on this if you'd like.

QUESTION: Governor, what specific proposals do you have now on welfare reform?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would have to limit my specific proposals on welfare reform to what I have already discussed. One is to remove those people who are able to work from the welfare system all together and to provide them with employment assistance rather than the dole. These persons need to be given manpower opportunities, educational opportunities, training opportunities, matched with a job, offered a job, and be treated outside the so-called welfare system itself.

Secondly, we need to deal with the working poor -- those who presently work fulltime but whose incomes fall far below the poverty level should also be outside the welfare system itself, and helped perhaps through the tax structure.

Third, those who cannot work fulltime ought to be treated with respect, with compassion, with understanding, given encouragement to work part-time if they are able. Any program to help these people should always insure that it is never more attractive for someone who can work to stay on the welfare rolls instead of working either part-time or full-time.

One last point that I have made often, and I haven't changed my mind at all, is to try to place an emphasis on strengthening the family structure -- not to ever make it advantageous or mandatory that a father leave the home in order for his own family to have an adequate income for sustaining life.

We agree, too, that the welfare laws which are now multitudinous and sometimes

overlapping and wasteful and very confusing ought to be greatly simplified. There ought to be one basic payment to meet the necessities of life, varying in amount only enough to accommodate cost of living changes from one community to another. Over a period of time there ought to be a shifting of responsibilities for financing welfare away from the local governments to the federal government. Later on a shifting away from state governments toward the federal government. Those are some of the principles of welfare reform that I think there is a general agreement on but I'm not sure that we're unanimous.

QUESTION: Isn't it awfully difficult to take people off the welfare rolls when unemployment is at 7 or 8 percent?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think it's interesting to point out that in manpower training, in placement, counseling and other employment assistance, CETA, and in other social services that now fall within the framework of education that we spend $13.6 billion right now to put people to work. Under the subject of AFDC and SSI, we have four billion dollars less spent, so we already have a combination of major expenditures to put people to work on the one hand, and to support them on the welfare rolls on the other. I think we need to combine these two thrusts. We need to take those who can work out of the welfare system. Then we need to give them job training, job placement, education, if they need it, using the services of public and private job placement agencies, match them with a job, offer them a job. But sometimes we lose sight of the fact that the number of people in the so-called welfare categories is relatively small compared to the number of people in other categories. But that's where a lot of the dissatisfaction falls. I believe the emphasis on work opportunities, as contrasted with full-time dependence on the welfare system for those who are able to work, either part-time or full-time, is one of the roots of our problem.

QUESTION: The statement that you made, Governor, that you want to hold the percentage of gross product spent on these kinds of programs to the present level -- is that a commitment on your part or a statement of desire?

GOVERNOR CARTER: It's a statement of a goal. There is some difference of opinion on this. The goal that we have set for ourselves is roughly 20%. I think the present level is about 21%. That's all programs put together in the whole federal government. That's total federal expenditures as a percentage of the gross national product. I would like to keep that same level intact. Now there is one possible major program that might cause a deviation from that. If we take large amounts of presently private expenditure that goes into the health system and administer the health program through federal expenditures, that might cause an increase of maybe one or two percentage points.

But that would be the only exception and we are still looking into that question. I think this one element of increased federal spending that would be completely acceptable to the American people. This is derived from polls by Pat Caddell and many other polls that have been conducted. The American people are willing to see more money spent through the federal government to have a comprehensive health care system. I might point out that the total amount of money that might be spent on a comprehensive health care system would increase very slightly but there might be a shift away from private financing to the federal government that might increase the figure above the 20% or 21% level. That would be the only exception that I might be willing to accommodate and I still would like to hold down by the end of my term the percentage of the GNP that goes through the federal government to the 20% or 21% level.

QUESTION: Governor, if there were an increase, such as the one you are speaking of, how would it be financed? Where would the money come from?

GOVERNOR CARTER: There are several ways it could be paid for: employer-employee contributions, for example, or an increase in the general tax level. Of course, the question that still has to be addressed is how much of the program would still be financed or administered by the private insurance sector. These questions will have to be answered later on. But that is the way it could be financed if we made that decision.

QUESTION: (Almost inaudible. Concerning where the money for expansion of federal health insurance programs and other efforts can be obtained.)

GOVERNOR CARTER: You have to remember this. The GNP of our country goes up year by year, either in actual dollars or in inflated dollars. So the total amount of federal government expenditures can rise while government as a percentage of GNP remains the same. Are you with me so far? So, we would have an amount that could be spent between the 1977 budget and the 1981 budget of about $60 billion. This figure takes into account the growth through inflation, the extension of presently existing programs, and the increase in new programs. That's the framework within which we all are making our plans. What I intend to do before the election is over this fall is to spell out a rough allocation of these increasing funds within a four-year period so that the American people will know general parameters within which we will work financially. It will also give a good indication of the priorities that I think ought to be established for our country. I think this is important for several reasons: one is to get a national commitment or mandate from the people with a successful campaign so that there will be a unanimity of purpose with everybody having to yield somewhat on special or sometimes selfish aspirations. And secondly, it would tie me much more closely with Congressional candidates and with Congressional leaders if we spell out ahead of time what we hope to do. People like Senator Russell Long or Congressman Al Ullman, for instance, to the extent they agree with the purposes that I have expressed can help me work to achieve these common purposes. So I think to the degree that I can understand these programs, and present them to the American people as part of a four-year program laying out our priorities and the funds that will be allocated to them -- to that extent we can achieve these goals with a minimum of disharmony if I am elected.

QUESTION: Governor, I would like to ask one more thing. The matter of attitude surrounding welfare reform and welfare payments, etc., is probably much more serious a grievance problem than the economics of welfare reform.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, it is.

QUESTION: What is your feeling about the attitudes in the country, the volatility of the attitudes about welfare payments, etc., and how would you deal with these attidues before the election?

GOVERNOR CARTER: It is hard for me to express to you all the attitudes that cause me concern. I would say that the most prevalent attitude that hurts the welfare system is the belief on the part of the taxpayers that their money is wasted. A belief among welfare recipients that they are not treated fairly. The complexity of the present systems that have accumulated over a long period of time -- one program at a time, and the insensitivity of the programs to those that honestly need help. All these factors cumulatively create a great distrust of the fairness or the compassion of the welfare system itself. And, I think, one of the key

points is to remove those from the welfare system who are generally acknowledged to be able to work and to treat them under some other category, either as those who are partially employed or those who are under training looking for a job, or those who are actually given jobs in the private or public sector. So, those are some of the adverse attitudes I think could be changed.

QUESTION: Governor, could you give us any examples of how you might reorganize social programs?

GOVERNOR CARTER: One of the examples that I have used in a speech that I made on health is to spell out the multiplicity of programs. There are about 72 different agencies, large and small, that deal with physical health care. There are ten major agencies that deal with health -- Medicaid is in one agency, Medicare is in a different agency. Neither one of those agencies deal with health care directly but they serve the same people and I think this fragmentation of responsibility for adequate health care in our country is one of the problems with which I will have to deal. But exactly which one of those agencies will survive, what the exact placement of those agencies might be in the major departments is somthing that I'm not yet prepared to spell out. But that's an example of the problem, and I would anticipate cutting down those agencies to a very small number, consolidating responsibility for health care within one major agency or maybe two at the most, and having the number of agencies drastically reduced.

I think you all have a list of those who are here and if you have a question that you would like to address to some of the people behind me I would certainly welcome the opportunity to defer to them.

QUESTION: What are the top priorities you see for your administration?

GOVERNOR CARTER: There are two major projects that will take some time to study. One is the comprehensive reform of the income tax structure to which I'm committed and which I will do. That will take a great deal of study. It's now 40,000 pages and I don't want to make a serious mistake that would have an adverse impact on any major portion of our economy or some components of our society. The other one is the comprehensive government reorganization. Now that can be implemented piecemeal. For example, I could change by executive order any item in the government organizational structure that was established by executive order. Another factor would be this. If we pass, say a comprehensive bill that relates to welfare reform, then the multitude of individual little agencies that have been established to administer the different welfare programs might be consolidated in that legislation. Another thing is this. I hope to have very early authorization from the Congress, possibly even before I become President, to reorganize the structure of the executive branch of government in a comprehensive way subject only to subsequent veto by the Congress. This is similar to legislation that has been on the books in the past. It has recently been terminated because it expired and this is something that I hope to achieve. So, I'll move as expeditiously as I can.

In the State of Georgia I did our reorganization effort this way and it was successful, in my opinion. It took us about a year to have the comprehensive reform, but we started piecemeal reform long before that by the arbitrary elimination and consolidation of agencies under my control. And, as you possibly know, the reason we waited a full year in Georgia is that the legislature only meets once a year beginning in January for 45 days, so I had to wait until the legislature convened. In the Congress it would be done much more incrementally. But I'll have to have in my own mind a picture to present to the American people

of what the comprehensive organizational structure will be before I think I can be successful.

QUESTION: Governor, the Republicans are trying, or are beginning to try to paint you as a big spender, saying that your programs such as those you described today would cost $200 billion or more. How do you respond to that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: It's not true. We have people behind me here who, I would say, in general, might be liberal, moderate, conservative, would take a very aggressive attitude toward providing better services for our people. That's their life's work and they have special knowledge in these fields. But I think there was a general agreement today that we can meet the commitments that I have made to the American people. And there was general agreement that under normal economic circumstances, which I think I can anticipate, we can also meet the parameters that I have described to you earlier. That is we can provide these services while maintaining roughly the same percentage of the GNP being expended by the federal government, and with the prospect of a balanced budget by the end of my term in 1981 fiscal year budget.

QUESTION: This is the first briefing we've had an opportunity to get anything from the people who participated. I wonder, Mr. Riles, whether you or someone else speaking for your group can tell us a little about your impressions of Governor Carter.

MR. RILES: The Governor, of course, invited us down here to discuss specific issues that he had interest in, and, or course, that we had some expertise in. Mine, of course, being education. I can say that he listened very carefully throughout the discussion of several hours, asked questions, asked for clarification, encouraged debate, differences, and even on some said that they were the kinds of things he would like to implement. It was a very worthwhile session as far as I am concerned and I got the impression that the Governor is sincere in his effort to understand the problems from our viewpoint, and that he will make up his own mind in due time.

QUESTION: Mr. Riles, what recommendations has the group made to the Governor on the role of the federal government in education and any changes that should be in that role?

MR. RILES: Dr. Friday and Dr. Halperin spoke on that principally. I spoke on elementary and secondary education. I think both of us emphasized that the role of the federal government needs to be clarified, that it has grown up in a slipshod way. There are a multiplicity of categorical programs that need to be looked at, goals set, and then we need to proceed to deal with them. The whole issue of state versus federal commitments in this area need to be clarified. And it's in that way we discussed the problem. We laid out some of the concerns but we think we ought to leave it up to the Governor to determine what that role should be.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Let me introduce you to a few other people, and I hesitate to get involved in this because I don't want anybody to be left out. The person on my left is Robert Ball, he is a former commissioner of the Social Security Administration and now senior scholar in the National Academy of Sciences. Bob, you might want to just make a brief remark. He is, I would say, one of the foremost experts in this country on social security for the past, present, and future and how it relates with other social programs.

ROBERT BALL: The discussion this afternoon was really very impressive to me. I've known the Governor briefly in earlier times, but today his sharp questioning and his ability to get facts and ideas out of us was, I thought, really very remarkable. In my own special field of social security, the Governor has taken the position of making a high priority of the restoration of financial integrity to that system which is so important to all the people in the country.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would like to introduce now, Marion Wright. Marion, would you step up here. She is the director of the Children's Defense Fund and is a very strong spokesman for the needs of children in the family as it relates to social programs, educational programs, transportation, housing programs, and almost any aspect of life. She is one of those who will be helping me as we tie together all decisions made in the future with the family itself and how the government programs can be sensitive to strengthening and not weakening the family.

MARION WRIGHT: I think it was a good meeting. I am very pleased that somebody has invited us to talk on behalf of families and children and that we now have a voice that is going to be an advocate for families and children who are, in fact, our children -- tomorrow's Americans. I think he is sensitive. I think he is committed. And from the conversation today I think that the kinds of themes that he struck in New Hampshire will continue. So, we are delighted to have his attention on this issue.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Ruth, come over here. Ruth Hanft is an expert on the health care system and this will be one of the major problems in the future. She is also now a professor at Dartmouth College and a member of the National Academy of Sciences in the Institute of Medicine. Ruth, the rest of you don't say anything good about me, just say a word about your own program.

RUTH HANFT: We discussed briefly the problems of the class of medical care and some of the methods being used in some of the states to control the costs. We talked about different ways of phasing in a national health program. The role of different parties -- the federal government, private insurance -- and we plan to do a lot more work on issues papers and concepts for the Governor.

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.

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 compotent 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 consier 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, extration, 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 liquifaction 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, artifically 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.

# # #

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 modificaitons 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 quiessence 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 disucss 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 acorss 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 multinational 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 inadequte, 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.

# # #

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT TOWN HALL FORUM

Los Angeles, California, August 23, 1976

During the past week, when the attention of the political world was focused on the events in Kansas City, I spent most of my time at my home in Plains, Georgia, reading, studying national issues, talking with friends and advisers, and trying to sort out my thoughts as I look ahead to the Presidential campaign.

I want to share some of those thoughts with you today, and I want to say at the outset that my mood is one of confidence and optimism. Not simply optimism over my own immediate political prospects, but optimism about the future of this country.

I think, and I believe the American people agree, that this is one of our most important elections, that this is one of those elections, as in 1932 and 1960, when we have a chance to break with the past and make a fresh start in our national affairs.

Every election is unique, of course. In 1932 our nation faced an economic disaster, and our people correctly judged that Franklin Roosevelt was the candidate whose personal character and political courage made him best qualified to lead us through that crisis.

In 1960 we faced not an economic crisis but a state of spiritual malaise, a sense of national drift, and the people correctly judged that John Kennedy, with all his youth and vigor, could keep his promise to get the country movin g again, as in fact he did.

Today, as we face the election of 1976, I think there is a feeling in the land, much like those of 1932 and 1960, that we face an economic crisis, and that we are drifting and need to get moving again. But there is something more than that. After all we have been through in recent years, we need to have our faith in our government restored. We want to believe once again that our national leaders are honorable and competent and deserving of our trust. For if we cannot believe that, little else matters.

I have thought for some time that this year's campaign was taking place on two distinct levels. At one level, and quite properly, there is policy, and the economy. In many hundreds of public forums I have discussed all these issues with our people for 20 months, and later this month I will make statements on defense and veterans' affairs, agriculture and economics. But today I would like to discuss with you the other level of this year's campaign, the less tangible issue, which is simply the desire of the American people to have faith again in our own government.

We have been through too much in too short a time. Our national nightmare began with the assassination of John Kennedy, and went on to include the assassination of Robert Kennedy, and of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the wounding of George Wallace. We watched the widespread opposition to the war in Vietnam, and the division and bitterness that war caused, and the violence in Chicago in 1968, and the invasion of Cambodia, and the shootings at Kent State, and revelations of official lying and spying and bugging, the resignations in disgrace of both a disclosure that our top security and law enforcement agencies were deliberately and routinely violating the law.

No other generation in American History has ever been subjected to such a battering as this. Small wonder, then, that the politics of 1976 have turned out to be significantly different from years past. I doubt that four years ago or eight years ago a former Southern governor with no national reputation and no Washington experience would have been able to win the Democratic nomination for President. But this year many voters were looking for new leaders, leaders who were not associated with the mistakes of the past.

This is suggested not only by my own campaign, but by the success that Governor Jerry Brown achieved in several of the Democratic primaries. For, however else we may differ, Governors Brown and Reagan and I have in common the fact that we are all outsiders as far as Washington is concerned, and committed to major changes in our nation's government if elected President.

To want a change, to want a fresh start, to want government that is honest and competent again, is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, all share those fundamental concerns.

In the last analysis, good government is not a matter of being liberal or conservative. Good government is the art of doing what is right, and that is far more difficult. To be liberal or conservative requires only ideology; to do what is right requires sensitivity and wisdom.

I think that most Americans are not very ideological. Most Americans share a deepseated desire for two goals that might, to an ideological person, seem contradictory. We want both progress and preservation.

We want progress because progress is the very essence of our American dream--the belief that each generation, through hard work, can give a better life to its children. And increasingly in this century we have realized that it is a proper function of government to help make that dream come true.

But we do not want reckless change. We want to preserve what is best in our past--our political traditions, our cultural heritage, our physical resources--as guideposts to our future.

To walk the line between progress and preservation, between too much change and too little, is no easy task. It cannot be achieved by the extremists of

either side, by those who scorn the past or those who fear the future. It can only be accomplished by leaders who are independent and imaginative and flexible in their thinking, and are guided not by closed minds but by common sense.

That is the kind of leadership the American people are looking for this year, and that is the kind of leadership that, if elected, I intend to provide.

As I have observed the political world in recent years, it has seemed to me that there is a process at work, in both political parties and probably in all nations, by which over a period of time the political leadership becomes isolated from, and different from, the people they are supposed to serve.

It seems almost inevitable that if political leaders stay in power too long, and ride in limousines too long, and eat expensive meals in private clubs too long, they are going to become cut off from the lives and concerns of ordinary Americans. It is almost like a law of nature-- as Lord Acton said, power tends to corrupt.

I think this process reached a peak a few years ago, when we had a President who surrounded himself with people who knew everything in the world about merchandising and manipulation and winning elections, and nothing at all about the hopes and fears and dreams of average people.

When government becomes cut off from its people, when its leaders are talking only to themselves instead of addressing reality, then it is time for a process of national self-renewal, time to look outside the existing governing class for new leaders with new ideas. I think that is what happened in the Democratic party this year. I think our party was ready for renewal, for new faces, for a changing of the guard. If the candidate had not been myself, I think we would have chosen someone else who was not part of the old order of things.

My sense is that millions of Americans feel that this is the year in which they will give the system one last chance. They do not want to be disillusioned again. They are going to study the candidates, examine our political records and our personal ability and character, and make a judgment as to which candidate can best restore competence and vision and honesty to our government.

I welcome their scrutiny, and have confidence in their judgment.

Obviously there are some outstanding political leaders in Washington-- one of the most outstanding, Senator Mondale, is my running mate--and yet I think our people are correct in seeking leadership from outside Washington, new leadership which can approach the executive branch of government with fresh eyes and an open mind.

As a governor, I have been on the receiving end of our federal programs. Members of Congress may see the new programs on the drawing board, or hear about their theories, but governors and local and state officials deal with the realities. I have wrestled with the unnecessary regulations, and the paperwork and red tape and the overlapping jurisdictions. I know what it is to try to start a state drug-treatment program and have to negotiate with almost a dozen different federal agencies that have separate legal responsibility for the drug problem.

Let me say that, on the basis of my experience, I have never been more serious or more determined in my life than when I promise to carry out a complete reorganization of the executive branch of government.

Let me say also, in case there is any question in anyone's mind, that I am not anti-government. I am anti-waste in government. I don't believe in give-away programs. I don't believe in wasting money. I do believe in tough, competent management, and I have tried to practice it as a naval officer, as a farmer, as a businessman, and as a governor. I also believe in delivering services to those people who need those services in an efficient, economical, and sensitive way. That is not liberal or conservative. It's just good government, and that's what the American people want, and what I intend to provide.

I think the basic issue in this campaign is going to be whether we want government that looks confidently to the future, or government that clings fearfully to the past.

There's a song in the musical "Oklahoma" called "Everything's Up to Date in Kansas City". But I didn't think everything was up to date in Kansas City last week. We kept hearing the same old tired rhetoric about socialism and reckless spending that we've been hearing every four years since the Roosevelt years. I don't think the American people are much impressed by that kind of rhetoric. The American people don't believe that Social Security and Medicare were reckless spending, or that TVA and the minimum wage were socialism. The American people consider the source of those charges, and look at the record, and aren't decieved by the nay-sayers.

One of the real issues in this campaign is going to President Ford's record of vetoes. It is a record that I cite more in sorrow than in anger, for it is a record of political insensitivity, of missed opportunities, of constant conflict with the Congress, and of national neglect.

In six years as President, Mr. Ford's predecessor vetoed 41 bills that had been passed by Congress. In only two years, Ford has already vetoed 53 bills, about four times as many bills per year as his predecessor-- and to be four times as negative as Mr. Ford's predecessor is a remarkable achievement.

What did these vetoes accomplish? Did they save us from wasteful, reckless spending, as the Administration would like us to believe. I think not.

One of the bills President Ford vetoed was the Emergency Employment Act, which would have created nearly two million full and part-time jobs, to help those millions of Americans who have been rendered jobless by Republican economic policies. I think our government has a responsibility to help those people get back to work. When people can't find jobs, we pay the price over and over in increased costs of welfare and unemployment compensation and lost tax revenues.

Congress also passed a bill that would have granted those unemployed home-owners temporary help in meeting their mortgage payments. I think that was a

responsible action for Congress to take. But Mr. Ford vetoed the bill.

When people are out of work, they and their children still have to eat, and Congress passed the School Lunch Act, to increase the number of families whose children were eligible for school lunch subsidies. But Mr. Ford vetoed that bill.

I had occasion, very close to home, to see what that kind of veto could mean to the real people who were on the receiving end of it. I know a young teacher who taught a remedial class for first-graders in the Plains Elementary School. Most of the students in this special class happened to be black, and were having a hard time getting started in school because of the devastating poverty in which they had been raised.

Free milk was provided twice a day, in the morning and at lunch, for needy students, but then there was a cutback and the morning milk was eliminated. So the young teacher began using her own money to see that all her students had milk. And when she ran out of money she went to her father and he saw to it that her students had milk every morning.

That is the sort of thing that happens when our leaders ignore the human factor in government, when they think in terms of statistics and economic theories instead of in terms of real human needs.

These leaders are so short-sighted. Doesn't it make more sense to spend money on milk and education today, to help children get a fair start in life, than to spend money on police and courts and jails ten years from now, when those children have grown up untrained for a productive life and turned against a society that treated their needs with indifference?

It has been my experience in government that the most profitable investment is in people, and that is the rule I will follow if I become your President.

There were many other vetoes. Mr. Ford vetoed a bill to provide loans and grants to train nurses. He vetoed a bill to send more doctors to rural areas and inner-city slums where there are far too few doctors. He vetoed a bill to provide job training and college educations for Vietnam veterans, the most unappreciated heroes in our nation's history.

These vetoes haven't helped our economy. They haven't balanced the budget -- far from it. They have only contributed to needless human suffering.

An occasional veto may be justified, if legislation is poorly drafted or ill-considered, but 53 vetoes in two years demonstrates a negativism, a dormancy, and a fear of action that can only be harmful to this country. There is something seriously wrong when the members of Congress, all of whom were elected by the people, repeatedly pass legislation the country needs, only to have it vetoed by an appointed President. I believe those men and women in Congress are a great deal closer to the national mood than Mr. Ford has shown himself to be.

We have had enough of government by veto. It is time we had a President who will lead our nation, and who will work in harmony with Congress for a change, with mutual respect for a change, out in the open for a change, so the working families of this country can be represented as well as the rich and the powerful and the special interest groups.

Another major issue this fall is going to be the state of our nation's economy. Republicans have a long tradition of mishandling the economy, one that goes back to Herbert Hoover. Except in election years, when they sometimes manage to make the economy pick up by temporarily adopting Democratic economic programs.

During the Eisenhower, Nixon and Ford Administrations, we had five recessions. Under Kennedy and Johnson we had none. And we all know that recessions are hardest on those people who are weakest, who are poor and uneducated and isolated, who are confused and inarticulate, who are often unemployed and chronically dependent -- in short, those members of society whom a good government would be trying hardest to help.

Do you know what the basic Republican anti-inflation policy has been? To put people out of work. Cooling down the economy, they call it, because that sounds nicer. I say to you that any economic policy that sees virtue in unemployment is morally and politically and intellectually bankrupt.

What's more, those policies have been dismal failures. In 1968, the last year of a Democratic administration, the unemployment rate was 3.6%. Today it's more than twice that -- about 7.8% and rising. Under Kennedy and Johnson the average annual rate of inflation was 2%. During the Nixon and Ford administrations it has been almost 7%.

With all this human suffering, has the Republican administration balanced the budget? In the last three years, the accumulated deficits are about $160 billion, more than the previous 30 years combined. Under Kennedy and Johnson, the average deficit was less than $4 billion. Under Nixon and Ford the average deficit has been more than $24 billion a year.

In short, the Republican economic policies have not worked, and I believe they have failed to work because they were the creations of people who put economic theories and special interests ahead of the realities of human need in this country.

There are many other problems and many other issues in this campaign. I have been speaking about the breakdown of the American family, and I mentioned that among young people the second most prevalent cause of death is suicide and that in the past ten years the gonorrhea rate has tripled among children 14 years of age or younger.

I sensed that some people thought I shouldn't use those words, suicide and gonorrhea, because they are ugly words describing unpleasant facts. But there are many unpleasant problems in our society -- children who need food, overcrowded jails and mental institutions, inadequate treatment for the young men who were maimed in Vietnam, and the heartbreak and family disintegration that unemployment can bring.

All these are ugly problems and it is a natural human instinct for us to want to tune them out. But we cannot tune them out. We can only succeed in tuning out our own humanity, including those qualities of compassion and concern without which no society, however, rich or powerful, can be truly great.

"No man is an island," John Donne wrote many years ago; we are all part of the mainland of humanity. That is still true today, and as American citizens, most of us blessed with a good education and influence in society, we cannot ignore the needs and suffering of our less fortunate fellow citizens -- not if we want this nation to remain great.

"Ask not for whom the bell tolls," Donne went on to say; "it tolls for thee."

I think there is a bell tolling for all of us this year.

It is asking us what kind of America we want.

It is asking whether once again an American President can inspire patriotism and price in all of our people.

It is asking if we can tear down the walls that have divided different races and different religions and different regions in America, and once more be a united nation.

It is asking if we are indeed a tired, worn out, cynical nation, or if we can once more be moved by optimism and hope and love for our fellow human beings.

It is asking if through our democratic system we can once again give this nation a government as competent and as good as our people.

I believe we can. We have lived through a time of torment, and now we are ready for a time of healing. I believe we are ready for new leadership, leaders who come from the people and who speak to the people and who care about the people. I believe we have reached a turning point in our national history, a time of cleansing and rededication, and I promise you I will do all in my power to bring this nation back to the greatness we deserve and that the world expects of us.

Thank you.

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.

Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

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 responsibilites 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 leadershp 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.

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

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.

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 accomodating 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 be co-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 persued 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 if 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 -Hwakins 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-Hwakins 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 idel 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 reinstitution 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 authori 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.

# # #

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 where 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.

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 magaton 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 missles, 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 missles 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 weaponery. 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 ther 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 missle capacity, and it hleps 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 weaponery, 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 reducations 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 automony 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 missles, the possible inclusion of Backfire, the Russian bomber in the SALT II talks with the cruise missle. 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 missles. I have not discussed with the SALT negotiaters 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.

# # #

Remarks by Jimmy Carter to the AFL-CIO General Board meeting - August 31, 1976

EMBARGOED UNTIL DELIVERY - 11:30 AM EDT, August 31, 1976

As I come to discuss with you the economic life of our nation, I remember the great contribution of Nat Goldfinger. His public statements and written analyses meant a lot to all of us in public life. He had a wonderful ability to express complicated economic facts and theories in a human and understandable way. He was a tough fighter for working families, and he had common sense. As Lane Kirkland said, Nat Goldfinger was the chief economist of the people.

I am proud to meet here with President George Meany and the other great leaders of the labor movement who have fought so many years for a decent life for working Americans and for a government which is fair and sensitive to the legitimate needs of our people. You were always in the forefront in battles for minimum wage, health care, social security, public education, fairer tax laws, strong national defense, job opportunities, housing and the quiet dignity of free human beings.

Ours is a vision of an America which is strong, united and confident, but this vision has been dimmed in recent years.

Our factories have been idle, our workers unemployed.

We have a government limited in ability, timid in leadership, afraid of the future.

We have an administration which uses the evil of unemployment to fight the evil of inflation--and succeeds only in having the highest unemployment, and the highest inflation, in the 20th century.

We have an administration which talks about fiscal responsibility--and succeeds only in having the slowest economic growth in 30 years, and the most unbalanced budgets in our 200 year history.

In Kansas City we heard that the Republicans are proud of their economic record.

I have to agree that they have set some records that will live in our economic history books.

The unemployment rate today at 7.8% is higher than any time between the Great Depression and the inauguration of Gerald Ford. Neither Presidents Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson or even Nixon ever gave us a 7.8% unemployment rate. That's a record.

And unemployment has not been going down in the past few months, it's been going up. There are over half a million more workers unemployed today than there were two months ago.

Our 6% inflation rate today is higher than any rate under Eisenhower, Kennedy or Johnson. So the last two presidents can share this entry in the record book.

The economy is producing $150 billion less than in normal prosperity. That loss of production and income amounts to $2,500 a year for every American family. That's another record.

Under Mr. Ford's budget, the public debt will rise $210 billion. That exceeds the increases under his five predecessors and amounts to more than 1/3 of the public debt amassed during the entire history of our country. That's also a record.

Starting with a 5.5% rate of unemployment in August 1974, the unemployment rate jumped

up to 8.9% in just nine months. That's a record.

In the last eight years, our rate of economic growth has been half as high as our historical average.

Economic stagnation has brought layoffs affecting 1/3 of the families in our country.

It has brought a tripling in the rate of inflation for food, housing and fuel.

It has thrown the federal budget out of balance because stagnation is expensive. For each one percent rise in the unemployment rate, the government loses $14 billion in taxes that would otherwise have been collected, and at least $2 billion in unemployment and welfare checks to support the unemployed.

Economic stagnation has made the average paycheck worth less today than in 1968.

This administration has indeed set many devastating new economic records.

But it has done something even worse. Our eight years of economic stagnation have changed the spirit and direction of America.

For eight years, this administration has told us what we cannot do. It is time for our leaders to affirm what we, as a united nation, can and must do.

I believe we can grow and prosper again as a country. I believe it is time for national unity, rather than national division. I believe the president and Congress can work together, for a change. Different regions of the country can work together, for a change. Business and labor can work together, for a change.

We reject the Republican dogma that events are entirely beyond our control, that the government can play no creative role, and that the best policy is to do nothing. We also reject the dogma that the federal government can solve all of our problems, or that the government always knows best.

We will look toward a philosophy that guides us toward new ideas--and to govern not by confusion and crisis, but with imagination and common sense, for a change.

We will replace stagnation with steady progress.

There are four ingredients necessary for a decent healthy economy. They are balanced, sustainable growth; full employment; stable prices; and a competent federal government working toward a balanced budget.

Ours is a troubled land today because the economic stagnation of the last eight years has diminished economic opportunities and reduced the American worker's standard of living.

We cannot bring health to our economy and society until we move from stagnation to growth and productivity. To achieve this goal will require the forceful leadership of a president and a Congress, working together, who share the belief that stagnation and high unemployment will never cure inflation.

The president should have the authority to appoint the chairman of the Federal Reserve Board, the chairman's term to run for the same four years as the president's. While maintaining the Board's independence, the chairman would consult more closely with the president, other executive leaders, and the members of Congress in developing a consistent economic policy.

It is essential that we have fully coordinated credit and budget policy, prudent and wary of inflation, but firmly directed toward restoring job opportunities. a fair tax system, and steady economic growth.

Today, the economic policies of the federal government are too often without purpose, coordination and efficiency. Carefully coordinated and sensible budget and credit policies, that will permit lower interest rates, will enable us to build the homes, schools, and plant that are part of a good life that we seek.

Our economic policies will also be more consistent and purposeful if we begin to look and plan ahead, instead of staggering from crisis to crisis. A more coherent set of long-term economic goals can help us eliminate the wild roller-coaster dips of the last eight years.

Our goals of balanced growth and full employment cannot be separated.

Our people are our most precious asset. We cannot afford to waste the talents and abilities of any person. We cannot afford the waste, especially, of our women and young people, and minority group members, who have been made to feel unwelcome in this stagnant economy. Half of the people who are now unemployed are less than 25 years old. The unemployment rate among teenagers is 18 percent. Among some minority groups, it is 34 percent.

We have seen the demoralizing impact on a family whose breadwinner cannot find a job. We understand the frustration of young people whose first encounter with the economic system consists of closed doors and dead ends. We are aware of the special impact on minority families who find that although the law is on their side, the economy is not.

It comes down to this: Will we as a nation force one group of our people to pay the price for the incompetence of their leaders? The Republicans say yes. I say no. I say that any economic philosophy which relies on keeping people out of work is morally, economically, and politicially bankrupt.

To end this waste, we must rededicate ourselves to providing jobs at decent wages for all those who are able to work. My commitment during the next administration, and I know you share it, is to concentrate on putting our people back to work.

To do this, I will propose a comprehensive set of policies carefully targeted to meet this broad national need, and also carefully targeted to reduce unemployment among those groups and in those geographical areas where it is highest. By targeting our efforts to pockets of high unemployment, we will be able to reduce unemployment much lower without accelerating inflation.

I believe in the work ethic. This administration once talked about the work ethic instead of welfare. The work ethic is very simple. It means people at their jobs. In its economic mismanagement, this administration has done more harm to the work ethic than any other in the last 40 years.

If I am elected, I intend to run an efficient government, and efficiency requires investment as well as savings. When the Republicans say that it costs too much to put people back to work, I say it costs too much not to. This year, the government is paying $17 billion in additional welfare payments and unemployment benefits because of the recession. I believe we can make a better investment.

It is wiser to invest in our youth than to let them run aimlessly over the streets of every community in this nation.

It is wiser to invest most of our new incentives to encourage the private sector to hire the unemployed. Private enterprise is the major supplier of jobs and skills in our economy, and we will need the full participation of American business management if we are to achieve full employment.

It is also wise to provide productive public jobs for those who are unable to find work in the private sector.

Our people want work, not welfare.

For eight years, the Republicans have given us the worst economic mismanagement since the days of Herbert Hoover.

We've heard a lot of tough talk from the administration on inflation, and we're going to hear a lot more during the campaign. But tough talk cannot cover up their disastrous record. Campaign talk cannot cover up the 70 percent jump since 1968 in every family's food bill.

Campaign talk cannot disguise the 60 percent jump in health costs.

Tough campaign talk cannot disguise the 70 percent rise in the cost of owning a home, or the 30 percent increase in mortgage interest rates. High inflation and high interest rates have put the housing industry, which provides the jobs and the housing we need, into a depression. The unemployment rate among construction workers is now 17%.

Since 1968, when Nixon was elected, the average cost of the same new house has leaped by $16,000, which puts the dream of a new home out of the reach of many American families. This helps to explain the recent 9% drop in new housing starts last month.

Campaign talk cannot hide the fact that prices rose three times as fast during the past eight years as they did under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson.

That's what all this tough talk about inflation really comes down to--the worst inflation in over half a century. And a 1968 dollar that's worth about 60 cents. No wonder the Treasury now issues $2 bills and no wonder the public doesn't seem to like them.

I pledge to you and to the American people that, if I am elected, we will never use unemployment and recession as a tool to fight inflation. We will never sacrifice someone's job, his livelihood for the sake of an ill-advised economic game plan.

After the record of the past eight years, we almost forget that inflation is not inevitable and we don't have to sit back and give up on it. We should remember that from 1961 through 1968 in a period of rising prosperity, inflation averaged about 2%. It was not a coincidence that those were the eight years out of the last 24 when Democratic presidents were in the White House.

If I am elected, we will establish a comprehensive program to fight the many causes of inflation. Our goal is to reduce inflation to 4% or less within four years. I will make sure that every person who serves in our administration will join with Congress and other leaders to reduce the impact of debilitating inflation.

We will fight inflation through increased productivity which will result from our policy of strong steady growth, at least twice the 2% rate maintained under this administration.

We will fight inflation by anticipating bottlenecks and capacity shortages and moving in advance to prevent them.

Whenever inflation reflects an imbalance between supply and demand, we will choose a strategy that first expands supply rather than restricting demand.

We will fight inflation by creating agricultural production policies which will both maintain the income of our farmers and ensure stable food prices for our consumers.

We will fight inflation through a vigorous antitrust policy which will help push efficiency up and non-competitive prices down.

We will fight inflation by eliminating governmental regulations which drive up prices and serve to protect only the industry being regulated. It takes more than talk and study in this area--it takes presidential leadership and a partnership between a president and a Congress that trust each other and can work together.

But above all, we will fight inflation by putting our people back to work.

Nowhere is unity and cooperation more important than in this fight against inflation. During the recent crisis years American labor has shown remarkable moderation in the face of inflationary pressures which were not of your making. I will not ask labor to do anything that would jeopardize the purchasing power of the average worker. But I will honestly ask you and business to cooperate with me, in a voluntary effort to get our people back to work, and inflation under control.

For my part, I will do everything I can to give the American people the kind of well managed, efficient, cost-conscious government they want and deserve.

Every year the average American taxpayer works at least three months for the government, but each year many rich Americans don't pay any taxes at all. Comprehensive tax reform is a necessity; and if I'm elected, we'll have it!

Steady growth, full employment, and stable prices will enable us to achieve our fourth goal--competent government with a balanced federal budget by 1980.

The Republicans are always calling themselves the party of fiscal responsibility. But we have to look at what they do, not what they say.

The deficit for the year just ended was $65 billion. That is the largest deficit in our entire history.

In fact, during the last eight years, this administration has piled up a total deficit and national debt--on which we all pay interest--almost as great as the total for all other administrations, in war as well as peace, in our 200 year history.

The interest charges alone on the $270 billion public debt created in the last eight years will amount to $19 billion per year. That is a perpetual charge of $350 a year, every year, for every family in the country.

The Republicans have never realized that the government cannot balance its budget by unbalancing the budgets of American families. A family out of work cannot pay taxes. A family out of work requires public support.

The American people know that there is a better answer. We know that in a well-managed and steadily growing economy we can create jobs, maintain stable prices, meet our people's needs, and achieve a balanced budget. And we can accomplish these goals while restricting the government to the same share ofour national output that it now has.

Living within our means will require discipline and efficiency. Working people follow those guidelines within their own budgets. Through a continuous, zero-based budgeting review of our expenditures, we can make the federal government follow those guidlines, too. New services will be phased in gradually and prudently and predictably, as we can afford them.

Unlike this administration, we see no conflict between a government which is responsive and compassionate and one which is efficient and careful in its use of the people's money.

Today, I have outlined some of the things we can do to end economic stagnation and meet our national economic problems. There is a lot more we can do, too.

But first we need a president to pull us together and give us a new sense of purpose. A sense of purpose that rests on the belief that, if we work hard together, with some imagination and common sense, we can do a better job. That is the promise of America--to grow, and improve, and to do better than what we have done in the past.

There is no greater obstacle to improving our economic performance than the thinking of this Republican administration that things can't change, that we can't solve our problems, and that we can't do better.

That's wrong. That's a denial of the promise on which this nation was founded.

It is a denial of our capacity--our spirit--to evolve and to grow, to develop new solutions to old problems.

And it is a denial of the spirit which flourished in another Republican administration--112 years ago.

"The dogmas of the quiet past," said President Lincoln, "are inadequate to the stormy present. The occasion is piled high with difficulty and we must rise with the occasion. As our cause is new, so we must think anew and act anew."

Act anew.

Act anew we must to solve the problems of inflation and unemployment, too. To restore economic prosperity that is justly shared among all of our people.

And solve these problems we will, with your guidance, your support, your spirit, and your faith.

Thank you.

Interview - Jimmy Carter/Congressional Quarterly

August 24, 1976

QUESTION: You were talking recently about a President being more attuned to Congress might possibly be able to get more out of Congress than one who is not, such as Gerald Ford. It might be more productive in a legislative way. Are you really talking about a Democratic President might get more out of a Democratic Congress?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes. I think a major portion of the problem has been that the attitude of the Presidents we've had has not been conducive to cooperation with the Congress. I think we could have had Republican Presidents who would have much more consistently cooperated with Congressional leaders. I believe that President Nixon and President Ford both have perhaps deliberately severed the normal relationships with Congress in the initial stages of preparation of major policies on domestic or foreign affairs. And this is something that I have found as a Governor to be very serious as a problem. My own inclination has always been when I had a major proposal to put forward, in the initial, embryonic stages of that proposal to work it out as best I could with the Congressional or legislative leaders.

QUESTION: Are you really saying though that the difference between yourself and Gerald Ford or Richard Nixon is that you are a Democrat and you'd be able to work better for that reason.

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think that's a part of the problem. But I remember when President Truman, for instance, was in office, on foreign affairs he had a very strong Secretary of State. But there was a general feeling around the country, that I think was

accurate, that there was strong bi-partisan support within the Congress. And as you know, this revolved around Senator Vandenberg on the Republican side, Senator George on the opposite side. So, I believe, obviously, that having a Democrat in the White House and a Democrat Congress is obviously a helpful circumstance, but it's not the only factor.

QUESTION: I'd like to come to that in just a moment. First of all, you yourself have said that the public holds Congress in a low esteem. How do you account for that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Individual members of Congress are held in very high esteem within their own districts, or their own states. Congress as a body suffers in public opinion polls, where I derived my opinion, because there is no clear voice to defend Congressional action. In recent months, with the total absence of leadership in the White House, there's been a constant disharmony or squabbling between the President and the Congress. The President can speak with one single voice. He can explain his position, whether it's right or wrong, and the American people hear it. There's not one person in the Congress of 535 members who can express a viewpoint on an argument clearly. So I think this makes Congress look inherently worse in the minds of the public when there is a disagreement or lack of cooperation between the White House and Congress.

Historically, when the Congress' reputation has been high in the public opinion polls, it's been during those eras when there's been a maximum amount of cooperation between the White House and Congress.

QUESTION: Would you also add that it's been during those eras when there's been strong leadership in Congress, assertive leadership?

GOVERNOR CARTER: That was the case, notably, when Eisenhower was in the White House, a relatively dormant President, and of course you had a remarkable and unprecedented cooperation between Lyndon Johnson in the Senate and Speaker Sam Rayburn in the House. They were compatible with one another. So I think that's a circumstance that'svery rare on the American political scene.
Our founding fathers had never thought that Congress would lead this nation. Congress is inherently incapable of unified leadership. That leadership has got to come from the White House. And in the absence of that leadership, the country drifts. That's what it's been doing lately. I think that when Congress has come up in recent months with proposals, sometimes faulty, sometimes fumbling, but sincere, to deal with pressures like unemployment or inflation, or housing or education, or jobs, or energy; with the total absence of leadership in the White House, they've done a very good job. But if they had cooperation from the White House, which we will have next year if I'm elected, then I think these problems can be resolved and that difficult questions can be answered.
QUESTION: Another reason that's been offered for the poor standing in the public opinion polls, is weak leadership on the part of the President and Ccongressional leaders. Do you agree with that and do you think the Congress needs stronger leadership?
GOVERNOR CARTER: No, I don't agree with that. The attitude of modern politicians, whether they're in Governors' offices or state legislatures, or in Congress, is that they don't want to be dominated by other political figures because of seniority or even because of position. And I think the innovative attitude of the new members of congress that have come along in recent years,

over several election periods, is going to continue. And I think that they never want to go back to a strong, dominant Speaker of the House or a strong dominant committee chairpersons, who wouldn't let the individual members have a major role. But I really believe, I believe this is objective and not just subjective, is that the Congress is looking for strong leadership in the White House to make major comprehensive proposals on welfare reform, tax reform, health care, government reorganization, and so forth, and then let the Congress in its legitimate constitutional authority dispose of those proposals as it sees fit, working harmoniously with the White House. But the leadership has got to come from the White House. That's historically been the situation in our country. I don't believe that the Congressional members want to go back to the kind of leadership in the Congress that can dominate them and subjugate individual members even though they might be relatively junior, as far as seniority goes.

QUESTION: How do you specifically answer President Ford's charge in his acceptance speech and elsewhere that the Democratic majority has been vote hungry, free spending, and that his 55 vetoes to that date have been of extravagant and unwarranted legislation and that saved the taxpayers billions and billions of dollars, as he said.

GOVERNOR CARTER: That's ridiculous. Under Nixon, who was a relatively strong President, the Congress cut back his budgets $20 billion. Ford has made no substantive proposals that I remember at all in dealing with acknowledged problems in the country. And in the absence of any leadership at all in the White House the Congress has tried to move. Under Nixon and Ford we've had an

average of more than $24 billion in deficits every year. Under Johnson and Kennedy, when we had a Democratic Congress there too, the average deficit was less than $4 billion a year. So with gross mismanagement based on an erroneous emphasis on tight constraint on the economy, let unemployment go where it will, we've cut down drastically the revenues for the federal government. I think that's a major origin of our very serious deficits under the Republican Administration. So they've had a combination of inadequate attention to problems, very high inflation, very high unemployment, extremely high deficits, and there's no way legitimately that Ford or Nixon can shift that responsibility to the Congress. Other than that, I think his statement was accurate.

QUESTON: I gather that you are aiming for a balanced budget at some point.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Exactly.

QUESTION: Do you have any idea how, when that might come about?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I've tried to be very conservative and assess different opinions that I get from my economic advisers, and I would say that before I finish my term, in the year 1980, we will have a balanced budget. And that's based on relatively careful projections of unemployment, inflation, and average increase in our gross national product per year. It also, by the way, meets every commitment that I have made to the American people on services to them.

QUESTION: What I was speaking of was, one of your first official contacts with Congress will be the fiscal '78 budget. How much impact do you expect to have on that, and what is your timetable

for developing that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: When I'm inaugurated, if I'm elected, I'll be prepared to make my recommendations to the Congress on modifications or proposals in the fiscal year '78 budget.

QUESTION: Do you have a specific time-table for developing that?

GOVERNOR CARTER: We are now working on that approach. My staff members have contacted budget leaders in the House and Senate and we're trying to assess the expected amount of revenue to be coming into the federal treasury over the entire four year period. To begin with a balanced budget, at the timetable that I have described to you, work back from that year by year, to establish priorities, to eliminate unnecessary programs, and this would be done very early after I'm inaugurated, if I'm elected.

QUESTION: Do you have any specific ideas of how large the fiscal '78 deficit might be?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Not yet.

QUESTION: Another of your first contacts with Congress would be your State of the Union message. Will the thrust of that message be toward enacting new programs, a newlegislative package, or enlarging the existing programs, or will it be to cut back or reform existing programs?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I can't say. I don't know yet. It will be quite awhile before I start working on my State of the Union message.

QUESTION: That's fair enough. You've indicated elsewhere that you thought you could do better, could have done better with your personal relationships with some of the Georgia State Legislature leaders. What did you learn from that experience with the legislature

that you believe you can transfer to Congress and how do you think your personal relationship will develop with the Congressonal leaders?

GOVERNOR CARTER: When I was elected Governor, I had very little support during the campaign from legislative leaders. I think we had over 250 total membership, and over 15 of them had endorsed my opponent. So I had to start from scratch. But I had a heavy mandate from the Georgia people. And I emphasized those commitments on government reorganization, tax reform, prison reform, mental health programs, judicial reform, and so forth to the Georgia people during the campaign. The legislative leaders accepted that mandate and although we did have a very innovate aggressive, and I think successful, administration, my relationships with the legislature were compatible. There were people who opposed everything I did all during the four year period, because of political reasons and otherwise. But there was nothing that I accomplished in the four year period that didn't have to be confirmed and supported by a joint, working relationship with the legislature. The fact that Lester Maddox was the Lieutenant Governor overly emphasized in the public's mind the disharmonies. In general, the major changes were made with complete cooperation between me and the legislature.

QUESTION: You also gained the reputation in Georgia as being a person who would carry through on your legislative proposals with complete vigor.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes. I would.

QUESTION: And friends and critics of yours both characterize you as a stubborn person in some ways. You seem certain to run into

some obstacles as you try to get some of the programs you've been talking about through Congress and all the conflicting interests that are in Congress. Just how tough are you prepared to be with Congress when you run into obstacles?

GOVERNOR CARTER: One of the things that I obviously learned while I was in the Governor's office, working with the legislature, it was a very, very independent legislature, by the way, was that the best way to avoid confrontations and showdown votes and the necessity for major compromises, is to work with the members of the legislative branch in the initial stages of the preparation of major proposals, as I said earlier. Also, to remind the members of the legislative branch that, to the extent that my election was successful, the American people join me in those commitments. Also, during the campaign period itself, which is approaching now, I'll be helping and being helped by many of the candidates for Congress. The other point that I should make is this. We must be sure that when a proposal is made for a change in our domestic or foreign governmental life, that that proposal can be justified in an open debate, and the stripping away of secrecy that in the past has concealed the selfish influence of special interest groups I consider to be a major factor in the passage of both substantive and advisable legislation. Now, if after all those emphasis are consummated and my voice to the American people is heard clearly, if we have a difference of opinion in the Congress that I consider to be important, I would never hesitate to go directly to the American people with my side of the debate, and through that mechanism hope to influence the Congress to accept my position. And I believe that if I'm right, if the position is

clear enough to be understood by the American people, that's the best approach to it. But that would only be a last resort after I've exhausted every other means to cooperate quietly and maturely with the members of Congress.

QUESTION: You apparently believe then Lyndon Johnson's advice that Congress should be in on the takeoff if they're going to be in on the landing...

GOVERNOR CARTER: Absolutely. And I believe we need to have one other factor implemented for a change. And that is to let the Congress members, leaders or otherwise, get maximum credit for any improvements that are brought into being. The President is naturally the focus of public attention. There's no way to take away the image of the President as a leader. And I believe it's very helpful to the President himself and to the country to let individual members of Congress be the ones to announce in their own districts and states as early as possible their support for programs that might be in the process of evolution. I would do this to the maximum degree possible.

QUESTION: Do you have any preference as to who will become the next leaders of the 95th Congress?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes.

QUESTION: Who are they?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would never let anyone know what my preferences are.

QUESTION: But you do have preferences?

GOVERNOR CARTER: To some degree. This is something that I will never become involved in. I have private thoughts about it but I'm perfectly willing to abide by the decisions of the members

of Congress. I'll never ask a member of Congress to vote for one person or another as the new Congressional leaders are chosen.

QUESTION: Could you characterize the kinds of persons you'd like to see?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No.

QUESTION: A lot of people on Capitol Hill are certain that you are going to be the next President, and I understand a lot of members are calling your staff offering help.

GOVERNOR CARTER: Yes, that's true.

QUESTION: Would you say your honeymoon with Congress has already begun?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I think so. I would like to hope that my so-called honeymoon with Congress could extend throughout my term. I know from experience that there will be heavy concentration toward the end of the term on the more controversial proposals. Because the ones where there is little controversy are naturally more likely to pass very early. But I would be tenacious, and I would be open in my evocations to the American people of my proposals, and I think that if I retain my respect for Congress, which is a natural part of my being, and express this respect and desire for mutual consultation, that the honeymoon period can be extended for quite a long time.

QUESTION: Who are you turning to during this period for your advice about Congress?

GOVERNOR CARTER: Well of course, the Georgia delegation would naturally be close to me. I've known them all my political life and the existing leaders of Congress, Senator Mansfield, of course, and Robert Byrd in the Senate, and the Speaker, and Tip O'Neil in

in the House. Some of the committee chairmen have offered their help to me and I have accepted it with gratitude. But I've not tried to go into the Congressional area and single out special persons. I've treid to accept advice from all of them. And if they have a committee staff member, for instance, who's particularly knowledgeable about welfare, or energy, or transportation, I've enmeshed their contribution with that of my own issues analysis staff as best I could. Whether I get elected or not, this is very helpful to me in putting forth to the American people for better understanding the stands on issues that are important to this country.

QUESTION: Do you feel that you have any effect on legislation at this point, already?

GOVERNOR CARTER: No, I haven't tried to. I think that to the extent that I have presented my views to the American people in recent months that there has been an effect, but I've never tried to call up individual members of the House or Senate to influence their vote on legislation. I don't think it's proper for me to act like I'm already President.

The one exception has been the voting registration bill. I personally favor universal voter registration without any obstacle at all to somebody becoming registered. But I know it's late and this is a subject on which I've spoken out quite at length, but with the one exception, there has been no involvement on how the legislation should be voted on.

QUESTION: You have, however, passed the word that you would prefer to see a delay in the building of the B-1 Bomber?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I haven't passed any word to members of Congress except through my own public statements.

QUESTION: Different Presidents have handled their contacts, their regular contacts with Congress in different ways. Woodrow Wilson used an emissary, the Post Master General Albert Burleson. Truman had a liaison staff, a fairly small staff, but he prefered to deal face to face with people. And I guess Eisenhower was the first one who established an extensive liaison office. How do you -- and then there was the Kennedy-Johnson highly organized, aggressive liaison staff under Lawrence O'Brien. How do you see your liaison?

GOVERNOR CARTER: I would like to have a combination of the Kennedy, Johnson and Eisenhower effort, plus much more personal participation of my own. I understand there's a room, for instance, in the National Capitol that's set aside as the President's room. And I would like to go there for the signing of major legislation which was the custom prior to Franklin Roosevelt's term. And my present thinking, which I have not firmed yet, would be for me to go to the Capitol every now and then to spend a day or half-day in that office, within the Capitol itself, and to make myself more accessible to individual members of Congress. So I don't want to try to dominate the Congress, or to have an undue influence, but I want them to know that we represent the same people. There's no one in any Congressional District in the nation that won't be my constituent if I become President. And I want that general sense of cooperation and mutual respect and mutual trust to prevade my whole attitude toward congress throughout the four years. So I think just a

personal moves on my part -- treating Congress, members as though they were Presidents themselves, returning their telephone calls, letting my staff members respect them thoroughly, dealing with the problems that they present to me, making my own presence felt in the Capitol building itself on occassion, would be contributions that might alleviate the present disharmony and total separation of the White House on the one hand and the Congress on the other.

QUESTION: I guess we're running out of time. One of the main things that the White House liaison staff does, or one of the major causes of their workload, and also the liaison agent in the agencies, each of the departments has a fairly sizeable legislative liaison office, must of their workload consists of doing favors for members of Congress. Do you see any reason to cut back on Congressional liaison staffs and any reason to cut back on the amount of, you'll pardon the expression, back-scratching that goes on?

GOVERNOR CARTER: The thing I would say in response to that is to repeat what I just said, that the constituents of the Congressman or Congresswoman will also be my constituents. And I want to do a good job for them. I also want to be sure that whenever any action is taken in that respect that the action be of such a nature that it can be made known to the public. I would prohibit any interference on the part of White House staff members in the deliberations of judicial affairs, or regulatory agency deliberations for any particular person. I think those kind of deliberations ought to be all open, they ought to be subject to scrutiny by the press and by the public. So with that one caveat, I would

certainly do everything I could to meet the needs of my constituents and the constituents of Congress' members.

# # #

SPEECH TO IOWA DEMOCRATIC PARTY - Van Ryswyk Farm - Des Moines, Iowa
August 24, 1976

There is no way for me to describe how I feel coming home to Iowa. As Neal was talking about change and opposition to change, and agriculture and farm land and historical developments, I though about two or three weeks ago I went down to our farm with one of the television network correspondents, and we were in the cemetery there where our ancestors are buried who were born in 1787. We haven't moved very far. And I thought about my own children's great grandfather who helped to clear that land and he went down into the swamp and he told me when I first came home from the Navy that it was so hot down there that he never wore trousers, he had long shirts that came down to about his knees.

And he used to plant corn before it was possible just to get a mule and a plow through the new fields, by poking a hole in the ground and dropping in a corn grain and then hoeing around the stalk as it came up. Mr. Captain(?) we called him. Never did like change either. And I asked Mr. Captain(?) what was the thing that bothered him most and he said, well, he thought the thing that bothered him most was women's styles. He said when he was a young man that women wore their dresses very carefully and that you couldn't even see their instep. Nowadays, the dresses don't even cover up their step-ins.

All of us are reluctant to make unnecessary changes, but there are some changes that I have to admit that I like and that happens to be one of them. This morning I was particularly aware of how many things have changed since the first time that I came to Iowa to campaign. This is where my whole effort started. And I'm grateful to be back with you.

I'll be speaking tomorrow at the State Fair. I'm sure with several thousand people there, about agriculture, farming. But I remember the first reception we had in Des Moines. We rented a very large hotel ballroom and we had enough food for several hundred people. And four people came. So I stood around embarrassed for a little while, some of the hosts are here with me this afternoon, I walked over to the courthouse as Tom Whitney suggested to shake hands. But my campaign improved from there. We started off with nothing.

I come from a little town -- 683 people. My wife and I and my children and a few volunteers began to go from one living room to another and from one labor hall to another, and from one shopping center to another, and from one farmer's market, livestock sales barn to another. And we made friends. Like many of you in this audience. And our campaign grew. And we got known. But it was hard, because in those early days when I would get into a factory shift line, as I was this morning, I got up at 5:15 in Seattle to go to a Boeing plant. But at the first of the campaign, as the workers came by, I would shake hands with them and I would say, I'm Jimmy Carter, I've been Governor of Georgia, I'd like to have your vote, I'm running for President, and by that time they would be almost out of sight. And they'd stop and they'd come back and they'd say -- President of what?

So by that time I'd lost fifty possible votes. But our campaign grew and the major contributing factor to my own success was the confidence and the friendship and support that I got in the State of Iowa, and I will never forget it as long as I live. And I thank you for it.

Dick Clark and John Carver, Neal Smith and in the future our new Congressman from the third district, we will have I believe the kind of change made in Washington that will benefit not just your own state but also benefit the country and perhaps the world. I think it's time to reassess where we are and face frankly some of our defects, some of our mistakes, some of our failures, some of the unanswered questions. We've had too long the absolute absence of leadership in the White House. We've seen walls built around Washington and we feel like we can't quite get through to guarantee

the people of this country a government that's sensitive to our needs that we can understand and control, that competent, well managed, efficient, economical, purposeful. And also a government of which we can be proud.

Now, a lot of people want to blame the Congress. I don't blame the Congress for it. Because time after time after time in the absence of leadership from the White House the Congress -- 535 different people remember -- has tried to come up, sometimes in a fumbling way, but always in a courageous way, with answers to questions about agriculture, education, housing, employment, inflation, energy, without success. Because everytime we've heard the word veto. President Ford has vetoed 53 bills in the last two years. Four times as many per year as Richard Nixon vetoed. And anybody that's four times as negative as RIchard Nixon, I think he's stayed there too long.

You've got a state in which I feel at home. Because I am a farmer, because I believe in the basic commitment of American human beings to preserving the family structure. Because I believe in communities that are stable and idealistic and self-governing. Because I believe that people ought to control their own government. And not the other way around. I believe that the government ought to be open, and that those locked doors ought to be broken down. These kinds of changes will accommodate your own inclinations I know.

And you have a Democratic Party here that over almost insurmountable obstacles has exerted your own strength, without controlling the state house, you've built from scratch. And you now have a superb delegation in Congress that 's waiting for a good Democratic President with whom they can work and you'll have that next

January too.

There's another thing that I think has changed. And that is the attitude of political analysts and perhaps newspaper and other news media representatives about our people's character. Too often the people of this country have been underestimated. I remember back in 1960 a lot of people said that the South, being conservative, being basically Protestant, would never support a young, liberal Catholic Senator from Boston. But when the returns came in in November, of 1960, John Kennedy got a bigger margin of victory in Georgia than he did in Massachusetts. I might add also that in 1928, we did not vote for Herbert Hoover, we voted for Al Smith in Georgia.

So we've had a demonstration I think in the South that the reputation for prejudice against someone from a region, or because of a religion, has been overestimated. The American people are better than politicians or leaders quite often recognize. And my own success this year has been a demonstration of that attitude, I believe.

Well, I don't want to talk about the past, What I want to talk about just very briefly is the future.

We've embarked already in the Democratic Party on a great crusade to register people to vote. This has been a problem throughout our history. To try to match together freedom and liberty on the one hand, and equality on the other. Almost invariably in other countries, down through the years, they were not compatible. When you had a lot of liberty and a lot of freedom, the powerful overran and overcame the rights of the weak. And then when you had equality guaranteed by the government, quite

often it was accomplished, as in the Communist nations, by the abolition of freedom.

Our country has struggled with this now for two hundred years. We've made a lot of progress. Our country was not perfect when it was formed. We look back on our early founders of our nation almost in a worshipful way. We think that Thomas Jefferson and George Washington and John Adams and others couldn't make mistakes. But that's not exactly true. But it's because our country, when it was originally founded was founded on the proposition that slavery was okay. It took us a hundred years almost to eliminate slavery. And women couldn't vote, young people couldn't vote. The people couldn't choose their own U.S. Senators. But we've changed those things as we've gone along. And now it's time to make a quantum jump into the future. And bind together as best we can liberty and independence and individuality for our people with equality of opportunity on a fair, open, sensitive, and well managed government.

When the President and the Congress cooperating with one another, and with the people being represented in every decision that's made, I believe we can do those things, and if I'm elected President I'll join with these leaders on this platform and others to bring that about.

I want to say a few specific things. We've been hurt lately in our country. And embarrassed. And sometimes ashamed at what we've seen happen in our own government. The Vietnamese war, the invasion of Cambodia, the Watergate tragedy, the CIA revelations, have been an embarrassment to us. ANd we've said, what could have happened to the United States of America to bring about this cir-

cumstance among our leaders? I don't claim to be better than anyone else. I've got a lot to learn. I'm just like you all. I worked almost all my life at manual labor. My folks have been in Georgia two hundred years. Nobody in my Daddy's family ever finished high school before me. I grew up on a farm during the depression years. We didn't have electricity or running water but I had a good life. ANd I learned that government can be effective. I'm not afraid of government. It's not effective now -- it's drifting. We don't have any long-range commitments or predictable policies in agriculture or energy or education or environmental quality, transportation, even foreign affairs. THat needs to be done. There's no way for government, industry, manufacturers, labor, agriculture, education, science, and other entities of our society to work together in harmony. We need to have a good agriculture policy. I'm going to talk about that tomorrow, I'll skip over it now.

We also need to have a Sunshine Law passed in Washington to strip away the secrecy that now surrounds government. And that's going to come. We're going to have a complete reorganization of the executive branch of government to make it efficient, economical purposeful, and manageable for a change. If I'm elected, it's going to be done. And you can depend on that.

We're going to have complete, comprehensive welfare reform. Now the American people are compassionate and we want to take care of those who are not able to work. But I believe that anybody that's able to work ought to work.

And this can only come about, in my opinion, to have a simple system. We now have two million welfare workers. We've only got

three million adult welfare recipients. That's right. We've got almost a hundred different federal welfare programs in all categories. That system needs to be simplified. I believe the American people, including myself, the Senators and Congressmen on this platform are intelligent enough to devise a fair, equitable, compassionate welfare system. To divide those who can work and the ones who can't, to educate and train those who are not employable now but can be, and to deal sensitively with those that are subject to being dependent on government.

One of the phrases that I always remember that I used in my announcement speech on December of 1974, is a quote from a Chinese philosopher called Kwan Su, who lived almost two thousand years before Christ. And Kwan Su said, "You give a man a fish, he has one meal. You teach a man how to fish, he can feed himself for life. That ought to be the attitude of government.

THere is one other specific thing I want to mention. And that is taxation. I think most Americans again don't mind their taxes if we feel that the system is fair, and our neighbors who have the same valued property and who have the same basic income pay the same amount of taxes. I know I don't mind. I don't beleive other people mind. But our present income tax system is a disgrace. It's got to be changed. Now the Congress has tried to struggle with this problem and with others. Without any beneficial or helpful assistance from the White House. So far the efforts have not been successful. Quite often when we hear about tax reform, I kind of shrink up a little bit, because tax reform has meant in the past --quite often -- that the special interest groups who are powerful, influential, have high paid lobbyists, good lawyers,

in a tax reform bill they benefit. But the average Americans get cheated. So we need a change in the whole basic structure of the income tax system. Not amendments, but a basic change.

Now, I recognize the difficulty of these things. And a lot of people say, well, I've heard it before. I've heard about government reorganization. I've heard about welfare reform. I've heard about tax reform. I don't intend to break my promises to you. I've had a chance to meet with the leaders in the House and Senate. THose who head the Democratic Caucuses and those who head the committees. ANd I believe they share with me an overwhelming hope that the next administration, working harmoniously with the Congress, can make these long delayed changes come to pass.

I believe that it's not only possible, but mandatory. And if I do have difficulty with special interest groups and others, I'm going to come to you for help. And present my case to you and I don't believe you'll let me down.

The last thing I want to say is this. We've got a long way to go in this country. And it's not going to be easy. And no President can do it alone. And no 535 members of Congress working with the President can do it alone. On election day, that's just the beginning of making these changes in our society. ANd if there are things that you don't like in your own government, if there are questions that you have not found yet the answer, if we've made mistakes that you don't want to see made again, or if there are hopes or dreams in your own lives or in the lives of your children that you'd like to see realized, or if there are things that you've learned in the small towns and farms and cities, Iowa and other places in the country, that you have admired and you'd like

to see repeated throughout this country, I hope that you'll join me in a personal commitment to change our government for the better. I see no reason why government should be confused and wasteful when the American people are not confused and don't waste. And I see no reason why government should not be honest when the American people are honest. And I see no reason why we should divide rural people from urban people, or young people from old people, or black people from white people, or different regions or races from one another, or religions. These divisions have sapped us of strength. And now is the time to correct it.

Every now and then there comes along a special time and this is it. We've suffered, yes. But we're celebrating our two hundredth birthday. It's a time for reassessment, to look back and see what we've done wrong, to encapsulate in our own minds the vision of our country, to bind ourselves together. The Democratic Party demonstrated, I believe, in Madison Square Garden, the most remarkable unity of purpose that I have ever seen in my life. It wasn't unity brought about by me as a candidate. Or by Bob Strauss as the Democratic National Chairman, but it was unity brought about by common concern, and a common interest, and a common willingness not to be personally selfish for awhile, but to make a small sacrifice for the common good of our nation. THe Democrats have a strong position now in the polls -- 25 points ahead. It would be a serious mistake for us to take a victory for granted. The only fatal mistake that I can see that I could make would be to take a state or a voter for granted. I know how hard it is for the average American citizen in this time to feel proud and self-reliant and worthy. I want to make sure that I as a political leader

never underestimate the worth of any human being. I'm not anybody's boss, I don't ever want to be. I want to be everybody's servant. And I want to learn from you individually what you think this country ought to be.

I'm going to run a hard campaign. And as I said to the suprise of many people on my first trip to Des Moines, I don't intend to lose the nomination. I believe I can win on the first ballot. A lot of people smiled, some laughed out loud. Well, I'm going to make another prediction to you now. I don't intend to lose in November. I intend to be your next President. If you'll help me I'll do it.

GOVERNOR JIMMY CARTER

May 31, 1976

5:00 P.M.

RAPID CITY, SOUTH DAKOTA

A RALLY AT

CANYON PARK, SOUTH DAKOTA

"A Standard Stump Speech"
Transcript

GOVERNOR CARTER: Thank you. That is a great introduction and I appreciate it. Thank you very much.

This is a beautiful crowd. And, I really appreciate your warm friendship and your hospitality on this Memorial Day.

As I drove here from the airport, I thought about your own terrible tragedy of four or five years ago, and the special day we have to honor the tragedies of the past, the times when men's and women's minds and hearts in different lands throughout the world were unable to find a common ground on which to settle differences and on which to base the preservation of human life.

We have a great country. We have made some serious mistakes in the past, and we don't want to make them again.

1976 is the time of celebration. It is also a time to look backwards. It is a time to look two hundred years ago, at the time that George Washington, and Benjamen Franklin and Thomas Jefferson, Thomas Paine and Patrick Henry. It is a time to look back at the time, at the years of Abraham Lincoln, when our nation was torn apart, and it is a time to look back on the great depression years when Franklin Roosevelt was President and then later for Harry Truman when the war was ended, and then John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson.

It is a time also to think about the recent years, times of Viet Nam and Cambodia, when our nation for the first time made a major commitment of lives and money, without the American people being a part of the process. We didn't decide as a people to start a war in Viet Nam or to bomb Cambodia, and see hundreds of thousands of women and children killed, and fifty thousand American lives lost, and a hundred and fifty billion dollars spent. But, it happened, It happened in our country. It happened with out government -- my government and your government.

And, later we didn't decide to wrap secrecy around the White House and to see the professional reputation of the F.B.I. destroyed, and the Attorney General's office prostituted, and the terrible shame of Watergate come on our country, and the President of our country caught lying. We didn't make those decisions as a people, but they happened, and they happened in my government and your government.

And, later we didn't decide to plot assissanations and murder against leaders of countries with whom we were not at war. I wouldn't plot murder, and neither would you. But, it happened in our government. In my government and in your government.

So, looking back two hundred years ago, or a hundred years ago, or fifty years ago, or two or three years ago, we see a nation that is growing. We are still a young

country. We have made a lot of mistakes. Not just recently, but long ago. And, we have corrected those mistakes as we progressed as a country. In spite of the fact that sometimes we have been ashamed, and we have been embarrassed, and we have had to apologize for our own government.

That doesn't mean to look into the future, we can't be proud once again, and inspired once again by our nation's government. That is what 1976 can mean. Fine things, proud things, clean and decent things, inspirational things, idealistic, compassionate things, loving things, compared to the mistakes of the past.

So, how do we make sure that in the future our country will not repeat its past mistakes? There is only one way to do it, and that is to be sure that to the degree that we are capable, that our government is what the people are. The American people are competent, good managers, good organizers, good salesmen. There is no reason why we should have a horrible, bloated, confused, overlapping, wasteful, inefficient, ineffective, insensitive, unmanageable, bureaucratic mess in Washington. This is not part of us, and it is not a necessary part of our government.

The American people are fair. There is no reason why we should have an unfair system of taxation. Our present income tax is a disgrace to the human race. The surest income to be taxed is the income earned from manuel labor.

There is not any hidden secret loopholes for someone who draws a paycheck every two weeks, or retirement check every two weeks. But, there are hidden secret loopholes for everyone else.

The average family in this country now that makes less than ten thousand dollars a year, pays a higher proportion of their income in taxes than does a family that makes more than a million dollars a year.

I know that we are smart enough and fair enough to develop a tax system that is fair.

I happen to be a farmer. My father was a farmer. My grandfather was a farmer. For two hundred and ten years in Georgia, all of my father's family who ever had a chance to finish high school. I know what it means to work for a living. I know what it means to sweat in the hot sun, to plow a mule, to pick cotton, to pull fodder, to pump water. Also, I know what it means to have a good chance in life, a better education, a better opportunity than my father and my ancestors didn't have.

That is what this government, this nation is also, a chance for us to give our children opportunities that we didn't have.

Our nation ought to have a system of education based on individualized instruction, where every child is considered to be unique, with special characteristics, talents, abilities, problems. I think this is the kind of educational system that we can have.

We need on our farms to realize the tremendous truth, that is what is best for the family farmer is exactly what is best in the long run.

For the consumers of this country, we need maximum production, an aggressive sale of American products overseas. Fifty percent of all the food or feed grains that cross any natural border come from the fields of the United States of America. A tremendous resource that would help us to insure favorable trade balances, beneficial influence on the world economy, prosperity for our farm families, better growth in industries depending on agriculture. We need predictable agricultural policy, where we can make decisions for the future, with some assurance of what our government policy is going to be on acreage, basic price supports, import quotas, an aggressive sales of our exported food items.

These kinds of things are part of a farmer's life. They have got to be part of the Federal government that deals with farmer's lives.

I was in the Navy foreleven years. I am a graduate of Annapolis -- that is how I got my education -- at public expense. I was in the Submarine Force. I worked under Admiral Hyman Rickover.

I recognize very clearly that the number one priority of any President has got to be to guarantee the security of our country, its freedom from successful attack or threat of attack or blackmail, and an ability to carry out a legitimate foreign policy.

But, I also recognize, being familiar with the defense establishment, that the most wasteful bureaucracy in Washington is in the Pentagon. We need to have, there again, tough management.

We have got too many military bases overseas, about two thousand of them. We have got too many troops overseas, too many support troops for combat troops, twice as many as the Soviet Union has.

We have got a lot of waste in other ways. For every instructor now in the military, we have got less than two students. We build too many weapon systems we don't need.

But, in making these changes, we could have a simpler, better organized, more muscular, more effective, fighting force. And, with that capability understood throughout the rest of the world, that is the best way to guarantee peace.

We have in our people a realization that government lacks competence. I don't want anyone in this group to vote for me tomorrow, nor next November, unless you want to see the Executive Branch of the government of our country completely reorganized, and made efficient, economical, purposeful and manageable for a change. And, I don't want anyone in this audience to vote for me, unless next January, you want to see a start, with a basic comprehensive tax reform program, to give us an income tax system that treats people fairly, and puts the burden where it ought to be,

on those with a higher level income. And, I don't want anybody to vote for me unless you want to see us have an aggressive foreign policy that accurately represents the character and interest of the American people.

I don't claim that I know all of the answers. Nobody could. I am just an average human being like you are.

I started campaigning for President last January, January 20th, 1975. Nobody knew who I was. I didn't have any built in campaign organization. I didn't hold public office. I lived in a little town, with 683 people population. I was not a lawyer, I was a farmer. I wasn't in Washington or New York, the center of the national news media.

But we started working one living room at a time, and going to factory shift lines and shopping centers and high school auditoriums, and union halls and bingo games, and trying to get people to know us.

I have a good family, an almost built-in campaign organization. There are eleven of us who campaign full time.

My wife and I have been married almost 30 years, 30 years in July. We have got three sons, the oldest son is almost 29 years old. He was born in Virginia. My second son is 26 years old. He was born in Hawaii. My third son is 23 years old. He was born in Conneticut. And, then, my wife and I had an argument for 14 years, and we have an 8 year old daughter who was born in Georgia.

And, all of my sons are married.

(Applause.)

And, my sister campaigns full time, and my mother's youngest sister campaigns full time, and my oldest son's mother-in-law campaigns full time. So, we have eleven of us. And, as we went through Iowa, and Oklahoma, and Maine, and New Hampshire, Vermont, Florida, Illinois, North Carolina, and other states, we accumulated a growing campaign family, people who shared with us a belief that this nation can represent the characteristics of the American people.

I haven't depended on endorsements of powerful political people to put me in office. When they have come, I have appreciated them. But, I have taken my case directly to the voters. And, I have tried to form a close relationship between myself as a candidate and the voters in individual states.

here are obviously some important political decisions to make. All of the other candidates, without exceptions, decided to enter just a few states, to hope to win a small group of delegates, to take those delegates to the National Convention in July in Madison Square Garden, to create a deadlock or broken convention, to get in the back room and horse trade, for the highest elective office in the world.

I decided to do it differently. We have got thirty primaries in this country where you can win delegates. I am in all thirty of them. I haven't skipped a State, I haven't avoided an opponent. I haven't evaded an issue. We have been very careful about this. We have now been through I think 23 or 24 States. I have won in 17 of them.

In the next seven days, you have got seven more primaries. The last ones are California, Ohio and New Jersey. In between, we have got Delaware. And, as you know, tomorrow, we have got three very important primaries. One of them is in Montana. One of them is in Rhode Island. And, one of them, of course, is in South Dakota.

(Applause)

I have come in this afternoon to get to know you and to let you know me, to ask you for your help. I have got mroe than a thousand delegates. But, I need to form a relationship with you that hopefully will be permanent.

There is no way that anyone could take a single voter for granted, or a single state for granted. It is very important to me what happens tomorrow in South Dakota. You have a great state. Independent, beautiful, agricultural, industry. You have had your tragedies, and you have over come them. You have demonstrated courage.

This state has also produced great leaders. And, I am proud that some of them are my friends. And, I look forward to the time when our party and our nation can overcome the divisions among us, and work towards common purposes.

The eyes of the country tomorrow are going to be focused on you. And, I would like to have your support.

As I said earlier, I don't know all of the answers. I am learning, as I campaign around the country.

I don't even claim to be the best qualified person in this country to be President. I am sure there are a lot of people in this nation, I am sure a lot of people in this audience, who are more intelligent than I am, who know more about management, who may be more sensative to our people's needs. I want to express my personal thanks to all of you for not running for President this year. I have got enough opponents.

(Applause.)

But, I want to close by saying this, and then answer some questions from you.

We have got a long way to go. And, although I do intend to be President, whith your help, it is just as much your country as it is mine. If there are things about our nation that you don't like, if we have made mistakes in the past that you never want to see made again, if there are divisions among our people that you would like to see healed, if there are injustices or discriminations or hatreds that you would like to alleviate, if there are hopes or dreams in your own lives that you would like to see realized during the life of your children, I hope that in this next 24 hours you will realize the tremendous responsibility on your own shoulders, and make an effort, even a sacrificial effort, for this brief period of time to help change what our country has been into what our country ought to be and can be.

I would like to answer some questions now. We will start with the local news media. I will repeat the questions so the audience can hear them, and I would like to have questions about the campaign, about foreign affairs, Korea, Detente, Middle East, Angola, or about domestic affairs, agriculture, welfare, health, transportation, education, tax reforms, environmental

quality, defense, amnesty, abortion, gun control, right-to-work, whatever issues you want to discuss, and I will try to answer all of your questions, and I will be as brief as I can.

Is there any questions from the local news media first of all?

The question is: That Congressman Udall is campaigning for the last week, and he considers South Dakota, according to his statement, to be an important part of the stop-Carter movement. Do I think that my visit here this afternoon can off set that?

Well, I can't answer that question very well. I don't consider South Dakota to be part of a stop anything movement. I consider South Dakota to be part of this country who is not trying to stop something, but trying to elect a President. And, as I said earlier, I have not run in one State and skipped the others. I am running simultaneously right now in seven different primaries. Last night I was in Georgia, this morning I was in Rhode Island, this afternoon I was in Ohio, tonight I will be in California. And, I have tried to make sure that I have covered this country as much as I possibly could. Last week I was in South Dakota again. But, that

is the point I was making earlier, with my family members, I don't have to be here all of the time. My wife has been here before, my son and his wife have been here before, my oldest son's mother-in-law has been here before, and we hope that in my absence that I can depend on all of you to join our campaign and to realize that the decision to be made tomorrow is just as much in your hands --

(End of Side A)

-- without working a lick all year, and that income, as you know, for a farmer comes not just from one person, it comes from the husband, a wife and all of the children who live on the farm. So, we need to do something to make sure that the farmers do get a fair part of the national income.

All right. The question was about the legalization of marijuana. I do not favor the legalization of marijuana. I do favor the decriminalization of it by States. We now have six States in this country who have decriminalized the possession of small quantities of marijuana. The first one was in Oregon. We moved towards that posture when I was Governor of Georgia. What it is is this, for those of you who are not familiar with it:

The possession of small quantities of marijuana is still a crime. It is punished, however, not by a felony sentence or imprisonment, it is punished by a heavy fine like two hundred dollars. It doesn't leave a permanent criminal record on the life of a young person or old person who is caught with that small amount. At the same time, you increase, if possible, the penalties for the sale or distribution of marijuana and other drugs, and put the pushers in jail. That is a good approach to it. I think -- I know that Oregon, Alaska, California and three other States now have this process. So, I would not favor legalization, I would favor the States decriminalizing marijuana, for small quantities of possession.

One more question is all I can take. Yes ma'am.

Oh, no. The question is, speaking of inefficient bureaucracies, what would I do about the Post Office.

(Applause.)

Let me say two or three preliminary things to avoid answering the question, which I can't answer.

First of all, my grandfather was a Postmaster in Richland, Georgia. And, he was a Third District

Campaign Manager for Tom Watson, who was a great Populist Congressman.

My grandfather was the one who had the original idea for the rural free delivery of mail. So, anyone who lives on a rural route can thank my grandfather for the idea. It was passed, introduced by Tom Watson, our Congressman, and eventually, twenty-five years later, the Republicans finally financed it, and the farmers started getting mail directly.

My mother also worked in the Post Office, and my wife's mother just retired from the Post Office this December 31st.

I don't know how to answer the question about what we should do about the Post Office.

If I could bring one political issue in, I think the only piece of legislation that my opponent in South Dakota has ever passed was setting up the present Post Office system. Senator -- I mean Congressman Udall is responsible for the present Post Office arrangement. That was his Bill, and I think it is the only one he ever passed that amounted to anything.

I was asking the other day about what we could do about the Post Office, and somebody said,

"well, you could at least have good mail delivery twice a month by sending all of the checks for Post Office employees through the mail", that they thought it would get delivered on time at least twice a month.

Somebody else said that the reason they raised the rates on post -- on mail, on letters from ten cents to thirteen cents, was that the extra three cents went for storage.

Well, I can't answer your question, I will have to admit that. But, I will say this. I am a good manager, I have run the government of Georgia well, I am a businessman, a farmer, a planner, an engineer. And, I would assume the responsibility for the Post Office Department as part of my Presidential duties. It wouldn't be taken on lightly.

First of all, I would choose people in whom I had complete confidence to assess how much of the mail could be delivered by electronic means. I would keep control of the delivery of first class mail in the Post Office to have some financing. I would not hesitate to subsidize the delivery of mail from general funds to make sure that our people do have that service.

I would very carefully analyze the Postal Service of other nations to see what we could learn from them, and let the American people know about all of these procedures as they went forward.

I can't answer your question any better than that, I am sorry.

Let me say this in closing. I have got to go. But, I have got an address that I would like for you to write -- you don't have to write it down -- but, I would like, if you have any questions about issues or my stands on those that I mentioned earlier in passing, write Box 1976, that is this year, Atlanta, Georgia, and we will send you back in written form comprehensive speeches that I have made on things like nuclear arms limitation, the disposal of atomic waste, reprocessing of plutonium, the testing of peaceful devices, nuclear devices, the Middle East, Angola, general foreign policy principles, Detente, all other things concerning domestic affairs, agricultural policies, defense policies, and so forth, these are written down in position papers of mine.

So, if you have an interest in any of those,

if you would write to my Headquarters, Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia, we will send you those position papers.

Let me say this in closing. I am glad I came to see you. It means an awful lot for me to have this large crowd come out and make me feel welcome. My wife said this was one of the most beautiful cities she had ever seen. And, not only was the city beautiful --

(Applause.)

-- not only was the city beautiful, but the people were very good to her. She -- this is an exact quote -- she said, "I have never found the people so enthusiastic in their friendship as the ones who welcomed me and helped me while I visited South Dakota". She was here weekend before last and the week before that. And she wanted me to express my personal thanks to you. I thank you also.

My family and I, and many hundred thousands of Americans like you, want to see our country change. We want to see people treated fairly. We want to see a Sunshine Law passed in Washington to force open the secret deliberations of Executive and Legislative Branches of government. We want to see the Sweetheart arrangement broken down between regulatory agencies and industries being regulated. We want to see a long range policy evolve on

agriculture, energy, environmental quality, transportation, education, welfare, health. We want to see the basic needs met in the field of unemployment, with the number one emphasis on the next administration's responsibility being jobs. Also repair the divisions that exist between black people and white people, between rural and urban, and young and old, in our country and other countries.

And, I want to see above all the same thing that you want, and this is something I say often, I mean it, I want to see us have a nation once again with a government that is good and honest and decent and truthful and fair and competent and idealistic, that is compassionate and is filled with love, as are the American people.

If we could just have a government as good as our people are, that will be a tremendous achievement. And, I believe that 1976 is the time when we might do it, and prove to the rest of the world, that is very important, but more importantly, prove to our own people who have been disappointed, disillusioned, sometimes embarrassed, that we still live in the greatest nation on earth.

Thank you very much. God bless all of you. Help me do well.

Thank you. God bless you.

(Applause.)

- - - - -

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT THE

Martin Luther King Hospital

LOS ANGELES

June 1, 1976

We are here today to honor a man with a dream.

We are here to honor a man who lived and died for the cause of human brotherhood.

Martin Luther King, Jr. was the conscience of his generation.

He was a doctor to a sick society.

He was a prophet of a new and better America.

He was a Southerner, a black man, who in his too-short life stood with Presidents and Kings, and was honored around the world, but who never forgot the poor people, the oppressed people, who were his brothers and sisters and from whom he drew his strength.

He was the man, more than any other of this generation, who gazed upon the great wall of segregation and saw that it could be destroyed by the power of love.

I sometimes think that a Southerner of my generation can most fully understand the meaning and the impact of Martin Luther King's life.

He and I grew up in the same South, he the son of a clergyman, I the son of a farmer. We both knew, from opposite sides, the invisible wall of racial segregation.

The official rule then was "separate but equal," but in truth we were neither—not separate, not equal.

When I was a boy, almost all my playmates were black. We worked in the fields together, and hunted and fished and swam together, but when it was time for church or for school, we went our separate ways, without really understanding why.

Our lives were dominated by unspoken, unwritten, but powerful rules, rules that were almost never challenged.

A few people challenged them, not in politics, but in the way they lived their lives. My mother was one of those people. She was a nurse. She would work twelve hours a day and then come home and care for her family and minister to the people of our little community, both black and white.

My mother knew no color line. Her black friends were just as welcome in her home as her white friends, a fact that shocked some people, sometimes even my father, who was very conventional in his views on race.

I left Georgia in 1943 and went off to the Navy and by the time I returned home ten years later, the South and the nation had begun to change.

The change was slow and painful. After the Supreme Court outlawed school segregation, the wrong kind of politicians stirred up angry resistance, and little towns like mine were torn apart by fear and resentment.

Yet the change was coming. Across the South, courageous young black students demanded service at segregated lunch counters. And in the end they prevailed.

In Montgomery, a woman named Rosa Parks refused to move to the back of the bus, a young clergyman named Martin Luther King joined the protest, and a movement had found its leader.

In 1961, we had a new president, John Kennedy, who responded to the demands of the civil rights movement, and who used the power of his office to enforce court orders at the University of Alabama and the University of Mississippi, and who by the last year of his life was giving moral leadership in the struggle for equal rights.

In August of 1963 Martin Luther King stood on the steps of the Lincoln Memorial in Washington and told a quarter of a million people of his dream for America.

"I have a dream," he said. "I have a dream that one day on the red hills of Georgia, sons of former slaves and sons of former slaveowners will be able to sit down together at the table of brotherhood."

"I have a dream," he said, "that my four little children will one day live in a nation where they will not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character. I have a dream."

And so the dream was born. The challenge was made. The rest was up to America.

Three months after Dr. King's speech, President Kennedy was dead, and we had a new president, a Texan, a man whom many black pepole distrusted. But soon Lyndon Johnson stood before the Congress of the United States and promised, "We shall overcome!"

Lyndon Johnson carried forward the dream of equality. He used his political genius to pass the Voting Rights Bill, a bill that was the best thing that happened to the

South in my lifetime. The Voting Rights Act did not just guarantee the vote for black people. It liberated the South, both black and white. It made it possible for the South to come out of the past and into the mainstream of American politics.

It made it possible for a Southerner to stand before you this evening as a serious candidate for President of the United States.

But war came, and destroyed Lyndon Johnson's great society. Martin Luther King spoke out against that war. There were those who told him to keep silent, who told him he would undercut his prestige if he opposed the war, but he followed his conscience and spoke his mind.

Then, in the spring of 1968, he went to Memphis to help the garbage workers get a decent wage, to help the men who did the dirtiest job for the lowest pay, and while he was there he was shot and killed.

But his dream lives on.

Perhaps some of you remember the night of Dr. King's death. Robert Kennedy was in Indianapolis, running for president, speaking before a black audience. At that point, on that awful night, Robert Kennedy was perhaps the only white politician in America who could have spoken to black people and been listened to.

Let me tell you what he said.

He said, "What we need in the United States is not division, what we need in the United States is not hatred, what we need in the United States is not violence and lawlessness, but love and wisdom and compassion toward one another, and a feeling of justice toward those who still suffer within our country, whether they be white or whether they be black."

Those words are still true today.

We lost Martin Luther King.

We lost Robert Kennedy.

We lost the election that year to men who governed without love or laughter, to men who promised law and order and gave us crime and oppression.

But the dream lived on.

It could be slowed, but never stopped.

In Atlanta, a young man named Andrew Young, who had been Martin Luther King's strong right hand, was elected to the Congress of the United States.

All over America, black men and women were carrying the dream forward into politics.

In Georgia, when I was governor, we appointed black people to jobs and judgeships they had never held before, and one day we hung a portrait of Martin Luther King, Jr., in our State Capitol.

There were protests, but they didn't matter. Inside our State Capitol, Coretta King and Daddy King and Andy Young and I and hundreds of others joined hands and sang "We Shall Overcome."

And we shall.

I stand before you, a candidate for President, a man whose life has been lifted, as yours have been, by the dream of Martin Luther King.

When I started to run for President, there were those who said I would fail, because I am from the South.

But I thought they were wrong. I thought the South was changing and America was changing, I thought the dream was taking hold.

And I ran for President throughout our nation.

We have won in the South, and we have won in the North, and now we come to the West and we ask your help.

For all our progress, we still live in a land held back by oppression and injustice.

The few who are rich and powerful still make the decisions, and the many who are poor and weak must suffer the consequences. If those in power make mistakes, it is not they or their families who lose their jobs or go on welfare or lack medical care or go to jail.

We still have poverty in the midst of plenty.

We still have far to go. We must give our government back to our people. The road will not be easy.

But we still have the dream, Martin Luther King's dream and your dream and my dream. The America we long for is still out there, somewhere ahead of us, waiting for us to find her.

I see an America poised not only at the brink of a new century, but at the dawn of a new era of honest, compassionate, responsive government.

I see an American government that has turned away from scandals and corruption and official cynicism and finally become as decent as our people.

I see an America with a tax system that does not steal from the poor and give to the rich.

I see an America with a job for every man and woman who can work, and a decent standard of living for those who cannot.

I see an America in which my child and your child and every child receives an education second to none in the world.

I see an American government that does not spy on its citizens or harass its citizens, but respects your dignity and your privacy and your right to be let alone.

I see an American foreign policy that is firm and consistent and generous, and that once again is a beacon for the hopes of the world.

I see an American President who does not govern by vetoes and negativism, but with vigor and vision and affirmative leadership, a President who is not isolated from our people, but feels their pain and shares their dreams and takes his strength from them.

I see an America in which Martin Luther King's dream is our national dream.

I see an America on the move again, united, its wounds healed, its head high, a diverse and vital nation, moving into its third century with confidence and competence and compassion, an America that lives up to the majesty of its constitution and the simple decency of its people.

This is the America that I see, and that I am committed to as I run for President.

I ask your help.

You will always have mine.

Thank you.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

PRESIDENTIAL CANDIDATE QUESTIONNAIRE ON
Education

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

February 6, 1976

The Honorable Jimmy Carter
Jimmy Carter for President
P.O. Box 1976
Atlanta, Georgia 30301

Dear Governor Carter:

Increasingly the 1.8 million teacher-members of the National Education Association are involved in political activities supporting candidates for local, state, and federal office. The NEA has a procedure whereby the delegates to our annual Representative Assembly, the Association's supreme policy-making body, may vote to endorse a candidate for President of the United States, thus throwing the Association's financial and personnel resources behind the candidate judged by teachers to be most supportive of education and other national issues in which teachers are vitally interested.

Our procedure calls for careful evaluation of candidates' views and positions on these issues. We want to provide to our members as much information as possible on each candidate's position on matters of concern to NEA.

Enclosed is a questionnaire raising several of those issues. We are most interested in your responses. I would appreciate it if you would give us your reactions by March 1. The answers you provide will be used to inform our members about your stands and help us to assess your commitment to education.

Another aspect of our evaluation of candidates is a personal interview. We will be contacting you to set up an interview sometime in late spring. A small screening committee and I will want to talk with you about the issues and your positions and give you an opportunity to clarify any matter you wish. These interviews will be videotaped for use by the National Education Association Political Action Committee (NEA-PAC), the group which has the responsibility for recommending an endorsement. Bob Harman of our NEA Government Relations office will be in touch with your staff to arrange this interview.

I look forward to receiving your response to the questionnaire and to interviewing you later this year.

Sincerely,

John Ryor

John Ryor, President
National Education Association

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

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.

1. *If elected President, what steps would you take and/or what measures would you initiate to improve the quality of American public education?*

A major overhaul of the revenue sharing concept is needed. Funds for local governments should be greatly increased, and the prohibition against using these funds for education should be eliminated.

The regressive and haphazard method of financing education across the nation produces severe disparities among states and within a single state. As Governor, I successfully sponsored major reform for education financing in Georgia, based on the relative wealth of the area in which a child lives, to help eliminate such disparities.

The federal share of public education costs was 10% in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, the portion must be increased.

The return from federal expenditures can be greatly enhanced by simplification of laws and regulations to substitute education for paper-shuffling grantsmanship.

As President, I will initiate as a major and early priority a comprehensive attack upon the basic problems of education in America with particular emphasis on the obviously inadequate system of financing. This program will include specific and substantive proposals for implementation by the President, the Congress, and the states. I will not be hesitant to propose and support basic changes.

In addition to the items already mentioned, such a program would assure the following:

—The proper relationship between private and public education.

—Expanded vocational and career opportunities. (By 1980, 80% of all jobs are expected to require education beyond high school but less than a four-year degree.)

—The educational rights of the handicapped.

—The proper consideration of private philanthropy in education as decisions on basic tax reform proposals are made.

A piecemeal approach will not solve the problem. A comprehensive program and the political courage to see it implemented are required.

2. *In developing your Administration's education policies with whom would you consult? What role do you see NEA teacher-leaders playing in your Administration?*

I will consult with NEA on matters of policy and before making educational appointments. I will seek out experts in every field of education, including NEA teacher-leaders.

3. *What specific qualifications would you look for in your appointments of the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare; the Commissioner of Education; the HEW Assistant Secretary for Education; and Director of the National Institute of Education? What is your position on establishing a separate Cabinet level Department of Education?*

I will make all appointments on a strict basis of merit. I am in favor of creating a separate Cabinet level Department of Education. Generally, I am opposed to the proliferation of federal agencies, now numbering some 1900, which I believe should be reduced to 200. But the Department of Education would consolidate the grant programs, job training, early childhood education, literacy training, and many other functions currently scattered throughout the government. The result would be a stronger voice for education at the federal level.

4. *What budgetary priority do you place on public education in relation to the many other concerns of the federal government?*

I believe public education is a top budgetary priority.

5. *What measures would your Administration take to insure that state and local governments can provide educational equity and a comprehensive education for all Americans? Would your Administration take steps to see that the federal government's share of public education expenses increases, say up to one-third of all funds needed? What do you see as an appropriate level of funding at the end of your four-year term as President?*

I have discussed these questions in number one; I also stated that the level of federal funding should be raised.

6. *What is your position on the use of public funds to support church-related or other nonpublic schools? Would you support legislation to provide tax credits for tuition to nonpublic schools? What is the responsibility of the federal government in providing financial support for post-secondary education institutions? What form(s) should such assistance take?*

I will uphold the rulings of the Supreme Court on the use of public funds to support church-related schools.

I believe the federal government has a creative role to play in higher education. For example, parents whose children go to private colleges understandably complain of unfair treatment. 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 grants of $400 per year for each student attending private college, still a smaller cost to taxpayers than if these students en-

rolled in public institutions. Such legislation should be encouraged elsewhere. Also basic tax reform proposals should give proper consideration of private philanthropy in education.

7. *Do you support a federal statute to grant teachers and other public employees collective bargaining rights? Do you support the right of public employees to strike? If you don't favor the right to strike or place a limitation on that right, what alternative do you propose?*

I support the right of public employees to organize and bargain collectively. I would prefer binding arbitration for public safety employees. Under normal circumstances, I would not consider teachers in this category and would not interfere with their right to strike.

8. *Would you support a federal-state program to guarantee the right of teachers during their working years to substantially carry their retirement benefits with them from state to state?*

Yes, I would recommend and sign into law a measure which would allow teachers to transfer earned retirement benefits from one retirement system to another.

9. *Do you believe that teachers and university researchers should have a limited exemption under the copyright laws?*

I understand the intricacies of this question. I am studying this situation and will formulate legislation that is fair to both teachers and publishers.

10. *What is your position regarding the enactment of a universal, comprehensive national health security program that is supported through the tax system and is not based on the ability to pay?*

I support the concept of national health insurance. I favor a system of comprehensive national health insurance which guarantees every person as a right as much care as he or she needs, with minimum or no deductibles or coinsurance, and with cost and quality controls.

11. *What initiatives would your Administration take to maintain the guarantees of the Civil Rights Act, the Voting Rights Act, and amendments to them, despite attempts to water down these statutes? Would you insist upon strict enforcement of all civil rights laws and court mandates?*

The best thing that ever happened to the South in my lifetime was the Civil Rights Act and other related court decisions.

Guarantees of equal participation in the political process similar to those provided in the Voting Rights Act should be extended to all parts of the nation where minority representation and participation are clearly inadequate. We as a nation must act affirmatively and aggressively to compensate for decades of racial discrimination. This includes a commitment to increase minority representation in public jobs and policy-making positions, a principle upon which I acted as Governor. I have been an enthusiastic supporter of the ERA and affirmative action efforts to end discrimination against women.

I support postcard registration for voting. To make registration more available to young people, I, while Governor, filed and succeeded in having passed a bill to designate all high school principals as deputy voting registrars. This program significantly increased registration among the young, particularly in minority groups.

12. *What initiatives would you and your Administration take to eliminate sex discrimination, specifically to eradicate inequality in the world of work, leadership in our institutions and participation in politics and our educational system?*

As President, I would ensure that 1) laws prohibiting sex discrimination in employment, advancement, education, training, credit, and housing be strictly enforced; 2) strong efforts be made to create federal legislation and guidelines to eliminate sex discrimination in health and disability insurance plans; 3) Social Security laws be revised so that women would no longer be penalized; 4) women have equal access to health care systems and voluntary family planning programs; 5) adequate child care be made available to all parents who need such care for their children.

EEOC has been justly criticized at times for not properly emphasizing the enforcement of sex discrimination laws. I would support legislation to increase the number of employees at EEOC, specifically assigned to enforce our laws to eliminate sex discrimination.

13. *What are your major aims and objectives as President?*

I have many goals and objectives for our government. The two questions I hear again and again across this country are, "Can our government be competent? Can our government be decent and honest and open?" I have to tell you that a majority of our people would say no. But we don't have to be pessimists. I want to restore faith in the efficiency, effectiveness, competence and honesty of our federal government.

I have run the Georgia government in a tough, businesslike way. As a scientist, as a businessman, as a planner, as a farmer, I've managed it tightly and

brought about some dramatic changes in its costs, in its long-range planning and budgeting techniques, and in its organizational structure. We cut administrative costs by more than fifty percent in Georgia. We abolished 278 of 300 agencies and departments. So I know it is possible to run an efficient government.

We ought not lower our standards in government. Our government in Washington ought to be an inspiration to us all and not a source of shame.

These are the two major goals I have as a candidate for President. I will work to make our government efficient and competent; and I will make our government one that all our people can be proud of.

14. If you are chosen your party's nominee, why should teachers support you for President?

My personal commitment to education is reflected in my career as a public official. My first position was the chairmanship of a local school board. I ran for the State Senate because of my concern for public education in Georgia and successfully sponsored there our first overhaul of education financing. Ten years later, during my term as Governor, a second even broader reform was successfully completed after two years of hard work. As President, my priorities will not change; I will remain committed to quality education for all our citizens.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER

To the National Governors' Conference

July 6, 1976

I.

Since 1945, when President Roosevelt died, no former Governor served in the White House.

In the thirty years following President Roosevelt's death, we have seen a steady expansion of the role of the federal government. It has been an era of some good beginnings, and of some great national triumphs —in education, health care and social services for the indigent and elderly, and civil rights. It was an era in which the federal government broadened the opportunities for millions of Americans. We can be proud of those achievements, although a great deal remains to be done.

But it was not a great era for federal-state relations, nor was it a great period for the states themselves. As the federal government assumed important new responsibilities, too often programs were enacted which denied the diversity of American life, which created a growing bureaucracy, and which robbed state and local governments of flexibility in responding to local problems.

Too often, the states were caught in a financial squeeze as the federal government cut back on funds for vital programs which the federal government itself had created.

We will never know whether a gubernatorial viewpoint would have alerted a President to the erosion in the role of the states. But there is a new humility today about the federal government's ability to legislate problems away. There is a new understanding that often the machinery of government impedes our common objectives.

The states need a compassionate partner in Washington—a partner that will provide predictable, adequate assistance to enable states to meet their legitimate needs. But they also need an efficient partner in Washington—a partner that understands the virtues of forebearance, a partner that knows what the states **can** do as well as what they cannot.

No assembly of men and women in America understands more clearly than you do the defects of the present relationship, and nobody wants more than you to forge a new balanced partnership.

I know, because I have shared your experiences and your frustrations—but, most importantly, I have also shared your dreams.

I promise you that, if I am fortunate enough to be nominated and elected as President, I will not preside over an administration which ignores the lessons of my own personal experience. Last week I made a similar pledge to the mayors and today, as part of that same programmatic approach to government reform, I pledge to you, if elected, a sensitive ally in the White House, and I pledge to work with you to bring about a restoration of true federalism.

Historically, the states have been the laboratories of public policy. They have pioneered management, economic, labor and social programs which have been models for later federal programs. The states should serve as fifty independent experiments, each with its distinctive qualities and conditions, each providing a unique experience upon which federal and other state officials can draw. Instead, they are trapped between the federal bureaucracy and the state and local bureaucracies which you have been forced to create to cope with all the federal programs.

For too long, Woodrow Wilson's prescription that the states be "laboratories for experimentation" has failed to be a consistent objective of federal policy. For too long, federal programs have put the states in a straitjacket which has hampered local initiative. Yet, states in recent years have been the most creative segment of government.

The national government might have seen earlier the virtues of regional compacts, sunshine and sunset laws, zero-base budgeting and other reforms recently initiated by many of you at the state level, and only now being considered in Washington.

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.

For too long, the maze of restrictive federal programs has denied the diversity of life in this nation. Instead of rejoicing in pluralism, the federal bureaucracy in effect negated it with programs which were written as if the entire United States were less diverse than the State of Pennsylvania.

I see state governments not as impediments, but as effective instruments in achieving the objectives we share.

After eighteen months of campaigning, the instincts with which I began this campaign have been reinforced, and I have no intention of rejecting my own experience now. The most important commitment I can make to you is a simple one. If I am elected President, I will review every appointment, examine every program, to build an attitude of respect for the role of state government into the highest levels of the federal bureaucracy.

We will have a government structure that encourages rather than stifles local flexibility. I believe it is time that the federal government recognized that states and localities retain a special knowledge of local problems, and that responsive and flexible state and local leadership is essential to representative government in this nation.

II.

The first requirement is to improve the coordination of federal activities as they relate to each state.

The structure and missions of the various federal agencies and programs are often overlapping and uncoordinated, making it difficult for private citizens and public officials alike to resolve an individual or a community's problems.

If elected President, I intend first to upgrade the role of regional councils representing the federal government to assist state and local officials, as well as private citizens, in dealing with federal agencies on any matter involving a federal question that might arise. Those offices will be empowered to review conflicts among the various federal agencies and will have speedy access to the highest levels of the federal government.

Second, I will establish a system in the Executive Office of the President which enables the President to keep abreast of local initiatives, and which permits state and local officials to consult with the highest levels of the federal government on the full range of their concerns. I seek your assistance and advice in designing a machinery to meet that need, and to insure that consultations occur regularly.

Third, to the extent possible, we have to begin centralizing federal activities within each city in one location. The outposts of the federal government should be accessible to ordinary citizens when they need assistance, so that "one stop" federal service is available.

III.

Not only will we try to improve the relationship of the separate states to the federal government, but the federal government needs to make it easier for states to develop cooperative mechanisms to deal with regional problems.

The states have already begun to look beyond their borders to solve common regional problems. They have done this around the country in the Midwest, in the Great Lakes Commission which has recently emphasized the cleanup of that great natural resource; in the western states the Interstate Nuclear Board has been working on the problems of the development of nuclear power for the region; in the South there is the Southern Growth Policies Board working for regional economic growth. These are only a few examples. Most recently there is the coalition of northeastern governors trying to meet the problems of revitalizing the economy of that region.

But there is still more that might be done. The use of the natural resources of one region for the benefit of the nation can leave that region with the permanent negative impacts of that exploitation. The federal government and the affected region must find ways to see that those consequences are avoided, and that the hidden costs of seeing to it are equitably shared. If the coal beds of the country are used, the results of that process should return the land for other uses—for future generations. And the costs should not be only a local problem.

The place to start with these solutions is the administrative reform which we must accomplish in Washington.

A balanced national partnership must, to the greatest degree possible, grant to the local governments the administrative freedom needed for innovative, creative programming.

Between the mid-1950's and this year, the number of categorical grant programs grew from 150 to more than 1600, each with its own administrative bureaucracy, its own restrictive conditions, individual application procedures, review conditions and funding priorities.

These categorical grants can often serve important functions. On a program of national dimensions, such grants can maximize local involvement in confronting national problems.

In practice, however, the proliferation of grants has built an irrational structure, which has often limited local initiative and fragmented local efforts toward sound fiscal planning.

It is important to attach conditions to programs which ensure that funds are directed toward the beneficiaries intended by Congress and the President. But too often programs designed for the ghetto families have been shifted to further benefit affluent families whose political influence can prevail.

To achieve a balanced national partnership, I intend to undertake a review, beginning this year and involving full consultation with you as governors and with local officials and congressional leaders, to determine in which instances consolidation of categorical grants would be desirable.

That process of consolidation will insure that the federal structure is organized to allow localities maximum flexibility in delivering services within the framework of national standards. Consolidation must not and will not be an excuse to reduce needed federal assistance, or to change the distribution of benefits so as to discriminate against those individuals with the greatest need.

If a balanced partnership is to prevail, it is necessary that governors and mayors be involved, not only in the review of categorical grants, but in the formulation of legislation and the promulgation of regulations as well. Usually, state officials receive their first notice of proposed rules when they are printed in the Federal Register. It is time that we recognized that we have become a government of regulations rather than laws; reform will be empty unless it is accompanied by a comprehensive review of existing regulations and the implementation of procedures to assure future state and local involvement in the early drafting of rules and regulations.

I do not underestimate the difficulties we will face in achieving regulatory reform, but we must persevere. The cost of excessive regulation goes beyond higher consumer price. Federal regulatory requirements have bureaucratized the private sector itself. Only large businesses can afford the cost of the internal bureaucracies that they must maintain to meet complex federal standards. The federal regulatory environment must be comprehensively reviewed to assure that it does not stimulate increased concentration of private economic power in a few hands.

Finally, federal budget policy must become more predictable. Predicting state revenues with accuracy is difficult under any circumstances, but the federal government can at least carry its burden by assuring that it meets commitments that it has previously made. Three-year federal budgeting will permit more effective planning by the states. A lawsuit has just successfully challenged the arbitrary food stamp cutbacks proposed by the Ford Administration. With an administration committed to predictable and compassionate policy-making, three-year budgeting and long-term planning, such litigation should not be necessary.

There is no simple rule to follow in determining the proper role of the federal government in addressing a problem. In some areas, such as welfare reform, the federal government must assume increased responsibility. In establishing regional alliances, federal, state and local government should serve as equal partners. In other areas, such as transportation, where some of the categorical grant programs are too restrictive, state and local discretion must be increased. What we are seeking is not a wholesale cutback of federal programs but a judicious consolidation and reorganization which allows states to meet their needs without undermining legitimate national objectives.

IV.

A major item on your agenda is welfare reform. Throughout my campaign, I have stressed the urgent need for a complete overhaul of our nation's welfare system.

Our present system is a failure deplored alike by those who pay for it, those who administer it, and those who supposedly benefit from it.

We all know of the need to remove from our welfare rolls those individuals who are ineligible for, or are not in need of, assistance. We have all read about the deplorable inefficiency which permeates our welfare systems. We know of the inequities which characterize many of our welfare programs; we know, for example, that where one lives is often more important than what one needs in getting assistance. We also know that working for a living and staying with one's family can sometimes deprive that person's family of benefits otherwise available.

You here also understand, perhaps better than most, how the present system is bankrupting both our cities and our states. As your welfare reform task force report points out, in fiscal year 1977, combined federal, state and local costs of public assistance are projected to be about $25 billion. Medical assistance costs and food stamps raise this figure to almost double—$47 billion. Because of existing federal laws and standards, this burden is not equally distributed among states. In some counties, more than 50% of county revenue goes toward welfare purposes.

Continuing increases in costs are denying states and local areas the flexibility they need to meet the needs of our people.

This must be changed.

I am particularly pleased by the work of the National Governors' Conference in this area and of your interest in joining with other governmental units, the Conference of Mayors, the National Association of Counties, the Conference of State Legislators, to develop a common position on welfare reform. I hope to work closely

with you in this effort and to begin discussions with you and other groups as part of a development of a specific welfare reform proposal. What I want to share with you today are the basic principles which I believe should form the framework for welfare reform.

About 10% of those on welfare are able to work full time and they should be offered job training and jobs. Any such person who refuses training or employment should not receive further welfare benefits.

The other 90% of the people on welfare are children, persons with dependent children, old people, handicapped people, or persons otherwise unable to work full time. They should be treated with compassion and respect.

We should have a simpler national welfare program, with one fairly uniform standard of payment, adjusted to the extent feasible for cost of living differences by areas and with strong work incentives built in. In no case should the level of benefits make not working more attractive than working. And we should have welfare rules that strengthen families rather than divide families. Local governments should not be burdened with the cost of welfare and my goal would also include the phased reduction of the states' share as soon as that is financially feasible.

Simultaneously with welfare reform, there needs to be a major restructuring of state employment offices, existing job training and job creation programs in order to insure that all those who want to work can work. The federal welfare reform proposal should be developed in the context of reform of other related programs.

I believe we are competent enough to create a welfare program that is both efficient and compassionate.

These goals, programs and reforms are not impossible. Indeed, with your help, we can realize them all. I ask your cooperation. You shall have mine.

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

National Health Policy

BEFORE THE

STUDENT NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 16, 1976

I have chosen this occasion to discuss national health policy with you who have crossed a sometimes impassable border of discrimination and financial barriers to achieve your dream.

Over two-thirds of black medical students come from families with incomes of less than $10,000 a year. In 1975 there was a drop in the number of minority students who entered medical school for the first time in five years.

This has made it more difficult for you to become doctors—but it has also given you a clearer sight of critical illnesses which no x-ray can show. They are the illnesses not of one patient, but of an entire system. The causes and cures will not be found in medicine alone; the diseases have begun and spread from politics and society itself.

Advances

Some of our medical advances have been remarkable: we have researched and developed new wonders of science and technology. We have made history by our near-conquering of communicable diseases. New technology extends the lives of thousands of patients, as for example with cardiac surgery. Some advances have been matters of basic social justice: we have passed Medicare and Medicaid to provide care for the poor, the disabled, and the aged. We have more hospitals, more equipment, and more clinics, community health and mental health centers.

Present Problems

But the point of any health care system is its end result—not for bureaus, or hospitals, or universities, or budgets—but for human beings.

There is a difference between the *capacity* of our health care system and the state of our health. This nation, first in the genius of its technology and the wealth of its resources, ranks 15th in infant mortality. Our life expectancy is lower than the average lifespan in several western countries. We lead the developed world in areas where we would prefer to be last, in the diseases of highly industrialized nations—the rate of heart disease and cancer.

Such statistics measure social injustice as much as medical inadequacy. Every shortfall in the health of Americans shortchanges poor and minority Americans the most. Life expectancy for all of us is too short, but it is six years shorter for black people.

In 1965, Americans spent $39 billion, or less than 6 percent of GNP, for health services. By 1975, that expenditure had multiplied three times—to about $550 per year for every man, woman and child in our nation—more than 8.2 percent of GNP. Experts now estimate that, if these trends continue, the costs of continuing the present system will double over the next five years and could triple over the next ten.

Cost and access barriers are the normally accepted reasons for our problems and the expected focus of political concern. But the deeper causes of ill health, at least equal in their effects, are living conditions which breed half lives of sickness and early death. The problem with lead paint is not so much the price of a doctor to detoxify, but life within the poison-painted tenements. The health problem among urban slums and rural shacks is not just a lack of nearby doctors to treat the preventable diseases which fester there, but the environment in which people live.

What are some of the tragic inadequacies of health care?

We have failed so completely to control medical costs that only 38 percent of Medicare expenses are now being met, and the elderly have increasingly limited access to needed services.

Medicaid has become a national scandal. It is being bilked of millions of dollars by charlatans.

For the first time in our history, we are in the midst of a medical malpractice crisis. Some of the blame for this surely rests on a record of poor quality controls in monitoring health care.

Overhospitalization, another cause of major national concern, results all too frequently from insurance policy payments limited to inpatient care.

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.

The Nixon-Ford Administrations have slashed one essential health program after another in the fields of maternal and child health, community mental treatment centers, health manpower, health maintenance organizations, and biomedical research, among many others.

We have built a haphazard, unsound, undirected, inefficient nonsystem which has left us unhealthy and unwealthy at the same time.

The complex reality is that health care is one strand of a seamless social web. Our nation's health problems must be attacked from many approaches, one of which is national health insurance. We must begin by considering how best we can spend the health dollar. But first we must ask:

Where Has All the Money Gone?

Sophisticated and costly medical technology has improved our health. But its duplication and misutilization waste our wealth—and the scarcity of resources then restrains the budget for other social needs.

Hospital beds often seem to be occupied longer than patients need them because we do not have alternatives or agreed-upon standards.

The structure of our health insurance encourages in-hospital care. A patient with the same illness would be kept in the hospital an average of four days in Santa Rosa, California, and thirteen days in Brooklyn, New York. We have no adequate explanation for the difference.

Similarly, the likelihood of surgery is related to the state where a person resides as much as the state of his or her health. A patient in a New York City hospital is twice as likely to be wheeled to the operating room as a patient on the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Whether it is the practice pattern or the availability of surgeons is unclear.

Insurance has helped many Americans meet health care bills. Unfortunately, it may also be an incentive for inefficiency in delivery. Typical public and private insurance plans reimburse hospitals on the basis of costs incurred, frequently with limits on patient benefits, with no real control on the level of hospital costs and physician charges.

We have not until now controlled costs with incentives for efficiency. For the first time, legislation which is pending in the U.S. Senate makes a serious effort to place controls on hospital costs and physician charges under Medicare and Medicaid.

Federal policy is equally a problem. Federal programs are fragmented among at least fifteen departments—and the health responsibilities of H.E.W. are subdivided further among ten parts of that one cabinet-level agency. This bureaucratic sprawl of agencies cannot provide effective direction and coordination. Instead, it is a "disorganization" of overlapping jurisdictions and redundant programs, each of them with separate grant and reporting requirements. The result is more loss of money and time, and the wasted talents of administrators.

The administration of Medicare and Medicaid presents a perfect example of the need for government reorganization. The two programs often serve the same people. Each program is in a different agency of H.E.W. Neither agency is a health agency. Neither relates to programs to provide more professional and allied health manpower, or to research programs. Both Medicare and Medicaid have experienced massive cost increases that were not planned or anticipated. Our government now tries to shift part of the inflation back to the poorest of our citizens in the form of increased deductibles, co-insurance, and consequently reduced benefits.

What Are the Solutions?

First, our emphasis must be on prevention of the killers and cripplers of our people. Our purpose must be to promote health, not just to provide health care as such, and this includes initiative in insuring adequate family incomes and a clean environment as well as reforming the financing of health care. Reform of the welfare morass may prevent more sickness and disease during the next generation than could be achieved by placing $600,000 body-scanning x-rays in every hospital.

The control of occupational hazards can save many workers each year who die prematurely because they are exposed to toxic chemicals, dust and pesticides. These are usually low-income workers. Occupational health and safety can reduce cancer, accidents, and respiratory disease.

The abatement of air and water pollution would protect millions from breathing and drinking poisons which will lead to long, costly illness and disability ten or twenty years from now.

Continuing education and information about proper nutrition and self-care could reduce the $30 billion annual cost of the sicknesses that afflict Americans who eat or drink or smoke too much. Yet, the Federal Government spends less for this purpose than is planned for a single B-1 bomber, and medical schools don't teach enough about nutrition or preventive health care.

Reorganization of our government is one of the most important steps we can take. A random system tends to perpetuate every effort of the past, no matter what its record may be, because each agency defends its own fragment of the policy. A consolidated system and coherent planning can weigh competing alternatives, judge comparative results, and budget resources for the best returns in terms of health.

It would be both cost-efficient and health-effective to use less expensive treatment methods where possible and to improve outpatient services instead of overbuilding and overusing hospitals. And it should be normal rather than exceptional to balance benefits and costs before deciding how and where to dis-

tribute the new developments of medical technology.

Medical care costs must be controlled. We must find incentives for productivity and efficiency.

Improved Health Care and Delivery

Any comprehensive health policy must bring care within the reach as well as the means of all our people.

The most generous insurance program cannot pay doctors or hospitals that are not there.

In the county where I farm, there is not a doctor, dentist, pharmacist or a hospital bed. The National Health Services Corps has designated almost three hundred areas of similar shortage across the country. (Even nearby hospital services are remote for indigent people without transportation.) The ratio of physicians to population is three times higher in New York City than in South Dakota. Yet in the New York City ghettoes, physicians are scarce. Metropolitan centers generally have twice as many doctors for each thousand citizens as rural America.

The changing nature of medical practice compounds the numerical shortage of health personnel. There has been a substantial increase in specialists and a decline in family practitioners and primary care physicians.

The maldistribution of medical resources is neither inadvertent nor inevitable. It is partly the consequence of government action and the advance of technology. And therefore government can help redirect the trends of the past.

Medical education is an essential part of the reorientation of our national health care. The way medical schools teach, and the type of physicians they graduate, should reflect national projections of health needs and the rational planning of health services. The medical establishment has not responded to the shortage of primary care services and practitioners. But because of the strong federal and state support of undergraduate medical schools and graduate training, there is an obligation to the taxpayers to direct those funds in the public interest. Our national needs require redirecting medical education toward primary care as one means to correct the geographical and professional maldistribution of services and personnel.

We must insure more medical education for students from minority and low-income families, and for women, so they may take their rightful place in medicine. A major barrier to medical schools for minorities is financial. Most of your families had more hope than money to contribute to your dream. The government should assure scholarships and low-interest loans to make it financially possible to reach this goal.

To improve the availability of services, especially preventive services, the work of nurse practitioners and physicians' assistants is crucial. In addition to these new clinicians, we need more paraprofessionals and allied health personnel who can free doctors and nurses for the work that only they can do. A project in Portsmouth, Virginia, and others that we started in Georgia have demonstrated that many of the poor can fill paraprofessional roles, instead of being forced onto welfare rolls. The preventive work they do in their own neighborhoods reduces sickness and the expense of treatment.

Health care is so complex that it requires specialists, generalists and professionals of all levels to analyze problems and offer health services. A cooperative approach maximizes the use of professional time. That is why I support organized approaches to delivery of services.

Availability is linked to quality in other vital respects. Availability of different kinds of care is one example. Many of the aged live out their lives in nursing homes or hospitals that violate minimal safety, sanitation, and even fire standards. Many of the elderly end their years in impersonal, high-cost institutions when lower-cost residential and supporting services would permit them to continue living with dignity in their homes and communities.

Adequate enforcement of hospital and nursing home standards or the expansion of services like meals-on-wheels for the homebound elderly can certainly help. Other needs may be met by development of community-based counsellors, themselves older citizens, to act as facilitators for services.

Quality of care must be a matter of concern for the nation. The public should be protected by explicit standards of competence. The Professional Standards Review system is potentially an important initiative to monitor the quality of medical care. This system needs to correct its internal deficiencies and improve implementation nationally.

An efficient, cost-effective health care system will deliver and not just promise national health care. We must follow the basic principle that the amount of personal wealth should not limit the state of a person's health.

National Health Insurance

National health insurance alone cannot redistribute doctors or raise the quality of care. So we must plan, and decisively phase in, simultaneous reform of services and refinancing of costs. Reform will enable us to set and secure the following principles of a national health insurance program:

- Coverage must be universal and mandatory. Every citizen must be entitled to the same level of comprehensive benefits.
- We must reduce barriers to early and preventive care in order to lower the need for hospitalization.
- Benefits should be insured by a combination of resources: employer and employee shared payroll taxes, and general tax revenues. As President, I would want to give our people the most rapid improvement in individual health care the nation can

afford, accommodating first those who need it most, with the understanding that it will be a comprehensive program in the end.

- Uniform standards and levels of quality and payment must be approved for the nation as part of rational health planning. Incentives for reforms in the health care delivery system and for increased productivity must be developed.
- We must have strong and clear built-in cost and quality controls. Necessary machinery for monitoring the quality of care must be established.
- Rates for institutional care and physician services should be set in advance, prospectively.
- Maximum personal interrelationships between patients and their physicians should be preserved; freedom of choice in the selection of a physician and treatment center will always be maintained.
- Consumer representation in the development and administration of the health program should be assured.
- National priorities of need and feasibility should determine the stages of the system's implementation. While public officials have continued to dispute whether coverage should be catastrophic at first or comprehensive immediately, the system has become a comprehensive catastrophe. We must achieve all that is practical while we strive for what is ideal, taking intelligent steps to make adequate health services a right for all our people.
- A basic concern shall be for the dignity of the person, not for the individual's wealth or income.
- Incentives for the reorganization of the delivery of health care must be built into the payment mechanism.
- We must have resources set aside to encourage development of alternative approaches and to spur new distribution of health personnel.

Conclusion

The accomplishment of comprehensive national health insurance will not be quick or easy. It requires a willingness to seek new solutions, to keep an open mind. The problems are obvious, the solutions less so.

Reinhold Niebuhr said, "The sad duty of politics is to establish justice in a sinful world."

Our nation is still a place of many injustices. There are bars of hunger as well as iron. There are manacles of disease as well as metal. There is the solitary confinement of neglected old age; there are high walls of prejudice and repression. There is the capital punishment of war.

These prisons will not be unlocked by mere good intentions or political promises in dubious faith. If they could be, humanity would have wished them away long ago.

There are many doors to be opened—to sounder health, a cleaner environment, racial equality and economic fairness—to all those things to which we pledge our allegiance in a single phrase—"with liberty and justice for all."

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

Jimmy Carter

Governor Jimmy Carter of Georgia officially became a candidate for the Democratic presidential nomination on December 12, 1974, with announcement day speeches in Washington and Atlanta.

As a farmer, engineer, scientist, planner, businessman and former governor of Georgia he has the experience and the background to meet the challenges of presidential responsibility.

Born October 1, 1924, Jimmy Carter grew up in the small southwestern farming town of Plains, Georgia.. His father, James Earl Carter, Sr. was a farmer. His mother, Lillian, a nurse.

He graduated from the U.S. Naval Academy in 1946, did graduate work in nuclear physics, and worked under Admiral Hyman Rickover in the development of the atomic submarine program.

During his naval career he lived in many parts of the United States and served around the world, including the Far East. When his father died in 1953 he resigned his commission, returned to Plains to take care of his family and became a farmer. In addition to working his own farm, he also started a small business selling fertilizer and seed to other farmers. He did the manual labor while his wife Rosalynn kept the books. The business grew into a profitable general purpose seed and farm supply operation.

Soon after his return to Plains, Jimmy Carter became involved in the affairs of his community -- deacon and Sunday School teacher in his small church, chairman of the school board, and first president of the Georgia Planning Association. In 1962 he was elected to the Georgia Senate.

In 1970 Jimmy Carter became Georgia's 76th Governor after an uphill campaign that found him in opposition to the established political interests of the state.

In his inaugural address, Jimmy Carter stated that no Georgian should "ever again be deprived of the opportunity for a job, an education, or simple justice because he is poor, rural, black, or not influential."

When he became governor, Jimmy Carter took immediate steps to make that goal a reality.

He successfully sponsored legislation to equalize education funds between the richer and poorer counties, to raise the salaries of school teachers, to increase the number of special education teachers, and to establish a statewide testing program for students and schools. In 1974 the General Assembly approved his total revision of the state's educational funding program.

He completely reorganized the government of the state to make it more efficient and more effective in the delivery of services to its citizens, reducing some 300 agencies to 22. The financial benefit to the state from this move was estimated to be over $50 million dollars per year.

He opened up closed meetings of state agencies and boards to the public and the press, and set an example for the nation in citizen participation.

He eased individuals' tax burdens by equalizing property assessments and increased homestead exemptions to help the elderly and poor.

He reorganized and upgraded the Georgia Bureau of Investigation; established civil disorder and undercover narcotics units; improved salaries and training programs for police officers; and integrated the law enforcement agencies of Georgia.

He initiated and completed a thorough reform of the judicial system in Georgia which had been attempted in Georgia without success since the turn of the century.

In the four legislative sessions of his administration, almost all administration bills were passed, despite the opposition of many entrenched state officials.

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301. Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

In addition to those mentioned above, these bills include: a complete overhaul of the ad valorem tax system; environmental protection laws considered among the strongest in the nation; age of majority legislation to provide full citizenship for 18-year-olds; a comprehensive package of prison reform legislation; full funding for a testing and research program to eradicate sickle cell anemia; a statewide network of almost 150 community centers for retarded children; and a statewide narcotics treatment program and comprehensive laws which remove alcoholism as a crime and provide greater flexibility in dealing with drug offenders and stricter penalties for pushers.

Governor Carter also initiated a pioneering zero-base budgeting system which required annual justification for all programs, both new and old, and priority ranking of programs by department heads; a Goals for Georgia program featuring citizen involvement in the setting of long-term goals for the state; a bi-racial Human Relations Council to prevent discrimination because of age, sex, race, or income; and a Heritage Trust program to assess and acquire valuable natural and historic sites for the state.

Carter's reorganization plan and new budgeting system have become models for similar efforts acorss the nation.

As governor, Carter has visited several countries in Latin America, conferring with political and business leaders. His rough but serviceable command of Spanish enabled him to confer with government officials, deliver speeches and conduct news conferences as his own spokesman. He has paid similar visits to countries in Western Europe and the Middle East.

He was selected by his fellow governors to serve as chairman of the Southern Regional Education Board, the Appalachian Regional Commission, the Coastal Plains Regional Commission, and the Southern Growth Policies Board.

In 1973 the Democratic National Committee asked Jimmy Carter to become the Party's National Chairman for the 1974 elections. A comprehensive program of assistance to Democratic candidates was begun immediately featuring background papers on over 30 important issues, individual manuals on campaign techniques, regular targeting sessions to keep Party leaders abreast of the latest developments in close races, and a highly effective campaign consultation program.

The consultation program took Jimmy Carter and staff members into several hundred Senate, House and Gubernatorial races across the country.

The 1974 Campaign Committee effort became the most effective and extensive of any in Democratic Party history.

Jimmy and Rosalynn have four children: Jack, 29; Chip, 26; Jeff, 24; and Amy, 9.

# # #

"A New Beginning"

PRESENTATION BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

June 16, 1976

GOALS: OPENNESS, COMPASSION, EFFICIENCY

Let me again express my regret that I was not able to meet with you personally. As I indicated in my telegram to the Democratic National Committee, the need to campaign in a large number of states over a short period of time left me with no reasonable alternative.

You have an historically important opportunity. It is time for a New Beginning in our Bicentennial Year — a new beginning so that as a nation we can rededicate ourselves to the ideals upon which our country was founded and reinvigorate the basic principles that made our country great, principles which have been honored in the breach in the last few years. What is at stake in 1976 is whether we are going to begin the process of restoring the precious things we have lost in this country. You can begin that process of restoring the precious things we have lost in this country. You can begin that process with a platform which reaffirms the Democratic Party's traditional values, presents clear policy initiatives and commits this Party to three basic propositions.

Our Party and the platform should emphasize three themes — (1) The need for an *open, responsive, honest government,* at home and abroad. (2) The need to restore a *compassionate government* in Washington, which cares about people and deals with their problems, after eight long years of conscious indifference by two Republican Administrations. (3) The need for a *streamlined, efficient* government, without the incredible red tape, duplication, and overlapping of functions which has hamstrung the effectiveness of government and deprived the American people of the benefits of many of its programs. This government must become *efficient again.* Our first duty is to create a decent living environment and opportunities for those unable to help themselves. Government must become open. If we intend to rebuild confidence in the government process itself, policy must be shaped through the participation of Congress and the American people.

Yours is a serious responsibility that extends beyond fashioning a document we can win with in November. I believe you have an obligation to write a platform that will be a binding contract with the American people. The American people are tired of inflated promises which cannot be kept, of programs which do not work, of old answers to new problems. Our platform should not mislead the American people. Our platform should not signal a retreat. Rather it should set forth realistic goals and achievable, affordable policies which can and should be attained.

If our Party intends to have the trust of the American people in 1977, then we ought to trust them.

If our platform is drafted with integrity and care, it will give a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress a mandate that will shape our national agenda for the next four years.

The Republican Party cannot seek that mandate because it lacks a coherent set of ideals. The Republicans are trapped, not only by their own recent past, but by the American people's understanding that the Republican Party has no vision of this country's future.

The Democratic Party has an identity and a sense of itself. Individual policies may have failed, but our basic beliefs never changed.

We Democrats still agree with Woodrow Wilson that, "Democracy is not so much a form of government as a set of principles."

We Democrats still agree with Franklin Rooselvelt that, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

We Democrats still agree with Harry Truman that full employment is, and ought to be, a national policy and a national goal — and we ought to be pursuing that goal with all the determination and imagination we can muster.

We Democrats still agree with Adlai Stevenson that, "A hungry man is not a free man."

We Democrats still agree with John Kennedy that our nation must inspire the unique contributions of all its people, and that we must have leadership that can again say, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

We Democrats still agree with Lyndon Johnson that if our Constitution "doesn't apply to every race, to every religion, it applies to no one."

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.

The Democratic Party has never shied away from adopting new approaches to achieve traditional objectives. Over the past eighteen months, I have suggested new directions in a number of substantive areas. As a candidate, I have taken positions, which are publicly available, on virtually every conceivable issue. In the sections that follow, I have summarized for your consideration some of the major policy recommendations I have made during the campaign. I would be happy to forward more detailed supporting material if you desire.

1. *An Open and Honest Government: Code of Ethics for the Federal Government*

The Democratic Party must commit itself to steps to prevent many of the abuses of recent years.

– *The Attorney General of this nation must be removed from politics* and given the full prerogatives, independence and authority of his or her own office, plus those allotted temporarily to the Special Prosecutor during the Watergate scandals. The Attorney General should be appointed without respect to political considerations and should be *removed from office only for cause.* The Attorney General and all his or her assistants should be *barred from all political activity.*

– All *federal judges and prosecutors should be appointed strictly on the basis of merit* without any consideration of political aspects or influence. Independent blue ribbon judicial selection committees should be utilized to provide recommendations to the President when vacancies occur from which the President must make a selection.

– An *(all-inclusive 'Sunshine Law,'* similar to those passed in several states, should be implemented in Washington. With narrowly defined exceptions, meetings of federal boards, commissions and regulatory agencies must be opened to the public, along with those of congressional committees.

– *Broad public access, consonant with the right of personal privacy, should be provided to government files. Maximum security declassification must be implemented.*

– *The activities of lobbyists must be much more thoroughly revealed and controlled,* both with respect to Congress and the Executive Departments and agencies. Quarterly reports of expenditures by all lobbyists who spend more than $250 in lobbying in any three-month period should be required.

– The sweetheart arrangement between regulatory agencies *and the regulated industries must be broken up* and the revolving door between them should be closed. Federal legislation should restrict the employment of any member of a regulatory agency by the industry being regulated for a set period of time.

– *Annual disclosure of all financial involvements* of all major federal officials should be required by statute. Involvements creating conflicts should be discountinued.

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

– *Fines for illegal campaign contributions* have often been minimal. They should be *at least equal to the amount of the illegal donation.*

– *Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official.* A report of all minor personal gifts should be made public.

– *Requests to the IRS for income tax returns by anyone, from the President down, should be recorded.* Access to this essentially private information should be strictly circumscribed.

– *Maximum personal privacy for private citizens should be guaranteed.*

– *Errors or malfeasance* in the Executive Branch should be *immediatley revealed* by the President and an explanation given to the public, along with corrective action, where appropriate, to prevent any recurrence of such actions.

2. *A Compassionate and Effective Government Must Return to Washington*

A. THE ECONOMY

The next Administration must deal with both high unemployment and high inflation – the unprecedented twin legacy of the Nixon-Ford years.

For eight years, we have lived with on-again, off-again wage and price controls, two devaluations of our currency, a disastrous grain giveaway to the Soviet Union, a five-fold increase in fuel prices, restrictive monetary policies, and high interest rates.

The Democratic Party should be committed to a *sensible, predictable, steady, fair, humane and coordinated national economic policy.*

The first priority must be a rapid reduction of unemployment and the achievement of full employment with price stability. For the near future, *economic policy should be expansionary. By 1979, we can achieve a balanced budget within the context of full employment.*

(1) To reach full employment we must assure:

(a) Support for the *Full Employment Act* of 1976;

(b) *Countercyclical assistance* to cities with high unemployment;

(c) An *expansionary fiscal and monetary policy* for the coming fiscal year to stimulate demand, production and jobs;

(d) *Stimulation and incentives for the private sector* to hire the unemployed even during periods of economic downturn. To provide an additional incentive, the unemployment compensation tax paid by employers should be provided for businesses which hire persons previously unemployed.

(e) An increased commitment by the federal government to fund the cost of *on-the-job training* by business;

(f) *More efficient employment services* to match people to jobs;

(g) Improved *manpower training* programs;

(h) Creation of meaningful and productive *public needs* jobs as a supplement to the private sector, including jobs for unmet needs in areas such as housing, rehabilitation and repairing our railroad roadbeds;

(i) We should provide 800,000 summer youth jobs and *double the CETA program* from 300,000 to 600,000 jobs.

(2) There are more humane and economically sound solutions to inflation than the Republican program of forced recessions and high unemployment. We must battle inflation through:

(a) *Steady flow of jobs and output;*

(b) A better matching of *supply and demand;*

(c) *Reform of government regulations,* such as the backhaul rule, which unnecessarily add to consumer costs.

(d) *Strict anti-trust and consumer protection enforcement;*

(e) Increased emphasis on *productivity;*

(f) *Lower interest rates;*

(g) Effective *monitoring of inflationary trends and forces;*

(h) Standby wage and price controls, which the President could apply selectively. There is no present need for the use of such standby authority.

(3) Better coordination between fiscal and monetary policy should be assured by:

(a) Giving the President the power to *appoint the Chairman of the Federal Reserve for a term coterminous with the President's;*

(b) Requiring the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board to *state its objectives* more *clearly and publicly;*

(c) Requiring the Federal Reserve Board to submit a *credit market report* on past and expected monetary conditions to be included with the Economic Report of the President.

(d) Requiring the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to show in a consolidated report that their policies are *mutually consistent* or explain the reasons they are not consistent.

I believe the measures I have proposed can move us forward toward full employment, reasonable price stability, and budgets that are balanced over the economic cycle.

B. THE CITIES

Many of our major cities are caught in a crisis which cannot be fully resolved at a local level. On the one hand, businesses and the middle class tax base are flowing to the surrounding suburbs, and in many instances, out of the industrialized sector of the country entirely. On the other hand, the costs of urban government are inherently higher than in non-urban areas, and expenditures are accelerating rapidly.

There is no meaningful Republican policy that addresses the growing urban revenue-expenditure imbalance. There is no Republican policy to arrest the steady deterioration of the inner cities. In fact, the Republican policy has been nothing short of conscious, willful indifference to the plight of urban America. They promised general revenue sharing to supplement existing programs, and instead used the funds to supplant current programs and to lower the level of assistance to cities.

Our cities have needed help and the Republicans have turned their backs. Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Republican Administration cut $4.5 billion in urban programs and another $7 billion in programs to aid the poor, the untrained, the unemployed, and the medically indigent, all at a time when municipalities lost $3.3 billion in purchasing power.

Our country has no urban policy or defined policy or defined urban goals, and so we have floundered from one ineffective and uncoordinated program to another. Hopes have been raised only to be dashed on the rocks of despair when promise after promise has been forgotten.

We need a coordinated federal urban policy that recognizes that our urban problems stem from a variety of factors, each of which must be dealt with directly and forcefully – problems of urban decay, declining tax base, crime, unemployment, lack of urban parks and open spaces.

We must begin our urban policy by recognizing the *human needs* of the individuals who live in our cities. According to the United States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6%, as opposed to 8% for non-metropolitan areas and 5.3% for the suburbs. For the poverty areas of cities that figure is 13.8%, and for blacks in these areas it is 17.6%. Teenage black unemployment in some areas of America approaches the staggering figure of 40%.

Indeed, even these figures are deceptive, for they do not include the literally hundreds of thousands of people who have left the labor market entirely due to their frustrating inablilty to find work.

To make dramatic imporvement in the unacceptably high unemployment rate, I propose a creative, joint program of incentives to private employers and a public needs employment program funded by the federal government. Such programs will more than repay our investment, not simply in making taxpayers of those now on unemployment insurance or on welfare, and not simply in generating additional revenues to the federal, state and local governments – although each 1% decline in the unemployment rate will produce $13 to $16 billion in federal tax – but rather in restoring the pride and self-respect of those too long ignored and cast aside. In the section on "The Economy," I have set forth policies which would dramatically reduce unemployment in urban areas where it is most severe.

While we must concentrate on the human needs of those who live in our cities throughout the country, we cannot ignore the fiscal plight of the cities themselves.

To alleviate the suffering our cities are being put through by high inflation and continued recession, I propose the following:

– *Countercyclical assistance* to deal with the fiscal needs of cities particularly hard hit by recession. The $2 billion of countercyclical assistance recently vetoed by Mr. Ford is essential and affordable, and is with in the budget resolutions adopted by Congress.

– *Extension of the Revenue Sharing program for five years, with an increase in the annual funding level* to compensate for inflation, and with stricter enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill to guarantee against discriminatory use of the funds. We should explore whether the Revenue Sharing formula might be amended in the future to place greater emphasis on areas of high need. All

Revenue Sharing funds should go to the cities, and the priority areas for which funds can be expended should be broadened to include education.

The key to an effective urban policy is the understanding that an integrated approach addressing each of the separate facets of the urban malaise is necessary if deteriorating conditions are to be arrested. In other sections of this paper, specific programs relating to welfare reform, housing, and crime control are suggested. In the context of those programs, we can establish a creative partnership between the federal government and our urban areas.

C. TAX REFORM

Our national tax system is a disgrace. The income most certain to be taxed is that which is derived from manual labor. Carefully contrived loopholes have created a regressive system which lets the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average wage earner. Some of our largest corporations with extremely high profits pay virtually no tax at all. When a business executive can charge off a $50 luncheon on a tax return and a truck driver cannot deduct his $1.50 sandwich — when oil companies pay less than 5% on their earnings while employees of the company pay at least three times this rate — when many pay no taxes on incomes of more than $100,000 — then we need basic tax reform.

A piecemeal approach to change will not work. Basically, I favor a *simplified tax system which treats all income the same, taxes all income only once, and makes our system of taxation more progressive.*

D. WELFARE REFORM

Our welfare system is a crazy quilt of regulations administered by a bloated bureaucracy. It is wasteful to the taxpayers of America, demeaning to the recipients, discourages work, and encourages the breakup of families. The system lumps together dissimilar categories of poor people, and differs greatly in its benefits and regulations from state to state. It is time that we broke the welfare and poverty cycle of our poor people.

My recommendations are designed to satisfy the following goals: (a) we must recognize there are *three distinct categories of poor people* — the employable poor, the 1.3 million employable but jobless poor, and the working poor; (b) *no person on welfare should receive more than the working poor can earn at their jobs;* (c) *strong work incentives, job creation and job training* should be provided for those on welfare able to work; (d) *family stability should be encouraged* by assuring that no family's financial situation will be harmed by the bread-winner remaining with his dependents; (e) efforts should be made to have *fathers who abandon their family be forced to continue support;* (f) the welfare system should be streamlined and simplified, with less paperwork, fewer regualtions, improved coordination and reduced local disparities; (g) *persons who are legitimately on welfare should be treated with respect and dignity.*

To achieve these goals, I propose one fairly *uniform, nationwide payment,* varying according to cost of living differences between communities. It should be funded in substantial part by the federal government with *strong work and job incentives* for the poor who are employable and with earnings tied so as to *encourage employment,* so that it would never be more profitable to stay on welfare than to work.

We should repeal laws that encourage a father to leave the home.

No one able to work, except mothers with preschool children, should be continued on the welfare rolls unless job training and a meaningful job were accepted. The 1.3 million people drawing welfare who are able to work full-time should be taken out of the welfare system; they should be trained for a job and offered a job. If they decline the job, they should be ineligible for further benefits.

The welfare burden should be removed from cities, with all welfare costs being paid by the federal and state governments.

E. EDUCATION

The average cost per student in public schools has approximately doubled within the last 10 years, but unfortunately, must of the increased expenditure pays for inflation rather than qualitative improvements. Two-thirds of our institutions of higher education, according to the Carnegie Commission, are likely to be facing financial difficulties either now or in the near future. Private colleges which in the 1950's served 50% of all students have now shrunk to 25% of the market.

Meanwhile we are graduating teachers each year who will be unable to find jobs — in 1974, 290,000 teachers for less than 120,000 jobs; in 1976, 164,000 new teachers for 115,000 new positions.

The fiscal crisis is naturally affecting students too. Many face tuition increases at the very time that grants and loans are difficult to acquire. When they graduate, they confront a ceiling in job demand.

The federal share of public education costs was 10% in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, this *federal portion must be increased.*

The following steps are necessary:

— The creation of a *separate Department of Education.* A Department of Education would consolidate the grant programs, job training, early childhood education, literacy training, and many other functions currently scattered throughout the government. The result would be a stronger voice for education at the federal level.

— *Expanded vocational and career education opportunities.* Although the number of students enrolled in career education has more than doubled within the last six years, two-and-one-half million leave the educational system without adequate vocational training; it is estimated that 750,000 untrained youth enter the unemployment pool annually.

Community colleges and other existing programs must be strengthened and extended.

— *Expansion of educational rights of the handicapped* must be assured. Of our six million school-age children, only three million are now receiving the attention they need. Recent federal court decisions have guaranteed the handicapped their right to an education. Since such education costs five to six times that of nonhandicapped children, increased federal expenditure is necessary in this sphere.

— Imaginative reforms to strengthen colleges and universities in times of financial difficulties. Basic tax reform proposals should give proper consideration to the role of private philanthropy in education.

F. HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE

Our present health care system is in need of drastic reorganization. Despite per capita and absolute expenditures on health care that are largest in the world, our nation still lacks a workable, efficient and fair system of health care.

First, we need a *national health insurance program,* financed by general tax revenues and employer-employee shared payroll taxes, which is universal and mandatory. Such a program must reduce barriers to preventive care, provide for uniform standards and reforms in the health care delivery system, and assure freedom of choice in the selection of physicians and treatment centers.

We must shift our emphasis in both private and public health care away from hospitalization and acute-care services to *preventive medicine* and the *early detection* of the major cripplers and killers of the American people.

Our major cripplers and killers are cancer, heart disease, stroke, respiratory diseases, hypertension, and six others of decreasing incidence within the population. Almost every one of these afflictions can be prevented, to a degree, by regular physical examinations and routine medical care.

Another major problem is to *better utilize the health personnel avialable to us.* Registered nurses, physicians' assistants, and other highly skilled para-professionals should be utilized under the supervision of physicians to provide diagnostic and preventive service.

A third major thrust should be to *improve the delivery of health care and to bring care within the reach — as well as the means — of all our people.* In the county where I live, there is not a doctor, dentist, pharmacist or hospital bed. The National Health Service Corporation has designated almost three hundred areas of similar shortages across the country. Even yearly hospital services are unavailable to remote indigent people without transportation. Our national needs require redirecting medical education toward primary care as one means to correct the geographic and professional maldistribution of services and perosnnel. We must also insure more medical education for students from low-income and minority families so that they may take their rightful place in medicine.

We must also *reorganize the physical plant of our health care delivery system.* We need to initiate effective coordination between our physical facilities — building, expanding, modernizing, relocating and converting them as need in order to provide the best possible medical care at reasonable cost.

We must *restructure our priorities* in the kinds of health care we offer. If is ironic that although our advanced medical technology is unsurpassed, our ability to deliver primary and preventive medical care to all of our citizens is very poor. We must shift our emphasis away from limited-application, technology-intensive programs to broad-based delivery or primary care for every citizen.

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.* Nationwide efforts in this area must continue until our working citizens are safe in thier jobs.

We should seek strong and effective legislation to promote mine safety and to protect mine workers against the black lung disease so frequently associated with mine work.

G. CRIME CONTROL

While the prevention of crime is essentially a state and local responsibility, the federal government has a significant role to play in the reduction of crime. Federal efforts should proceed along several lines:

First, we should *reform our judicial* system to ensure that *swift, firm and predictable punishment follows a criminal conviction.* I believe that crime is best deterred by the certainty of swift justice.

Second, the federal government can provide a model for the states by *revising our system of sentencing, eliminating much of the discretion* given to judges and probation officers, insuring *greater certainty in sentencing and confinement,* and insuring a higher percentage of serious criminals being imprisoned.

Third, we should place reasonable restrictions on the purchase of handguns, including the prohibition of ownership by persons with certain criminal backgrounds.

Fourth, we should *upgrade the rehabilitation programs* available to criminals while in prison.

Fifth, there is a need for a *coordinated, concerted attack on drug traffic and organized criminal activity.*

Sixth, we should provide *federal assistance to the crime prevention programs of local governments with a minimum of federal regulations.*

Finally, we must *step-up the attack on unemployment,* the root cause of much of our urban crime, through the programs I have mentioned previously.

H. TRANSPORTATION

America has the world's most extensive transportation system. Since the beginning of our nation's history, the

Federal government has invested substantially in the development of that system, so that today there are more than 915,000 miles of Federal-aid highways, 325,000 miles of railroad tracks, 12,750 airports and 25, 000 miles of commerically navigable waters. Federally-supported mass transit systems are in place in many of the nation's major cities. 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 chief impediments to more effective utilization of the existing system are physical deterioration and outmoded regulations. Examples of both problems abound in all modes of transportation: Over the last seven years nine major Northeastern railroads have gone bankrupt.

Most of the Nation's basic highway and street system has been similarly permitted to deteriorate. Although the problem of deferred maintenance is less pervasive, disturbing parallels with railroads can be found and the long-term outlook is far from promising given current trends.

Although the deterioration of urban public transportation services has been slowed since the passage of the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and the subsequent amendments to it in 1970 and 1974, the gap between transit capital needs and available funding, as identified by the U. S. Department of Transportation, has grown to over $6 billion.

Moreover, the federal government often has encouraged one mode of transportation to the disadvantage of another. No coordinated transportation policy exists. While the National 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 Nations's first transportation priority.*

While the private sector should be encouraged to undertake this rehabilitation work directly with privately raised capital, 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. In certain program areas, such as highways, this will involve substantially reordering current program priorities to stress rehabilitation work. In yet other areas, such as public transportation, this will require reinforcing current program trends with increased investment levels.

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 restirctive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities so that greater amounts can be used as operating subsidies. We should oppose the Administration's efforts to reduce federal operating subsidies.

Priority attention should also be given to *restructuring the nation's antiquated system of regulating transportaion.* The present patch-work scheme of rail, truck, and airline regulation at the federal level needlessly costs consumers billions of dollars every year. However valid the original purpose of promoting a fledgling industry and protecting the public from the tyranny of monopoly or the chaos of predatory competition, the present system has, more often than not, tended to discourage desirable competition.

I. HOUSING

The following agenda on housing is aimed at putting to work hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and fulfilling our national commitment to build 2 million housing units per year:

(1) *direct federal subsidies and low interest loans* to encourage the construction of *low and middle class housing.*

(2) *expansion* of the highly successful *Section 202 housing program for the elderly,* which utilizes direct federal subsidies.

(3) greatly increased emphasis on the *rehabilitation* of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods; certain of our publicly created jobs could be used to assist such rehabilitation. It is time for urban conservation instead of urban destruction.

(4) greater attention to the role of local communities under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(5) greater effort to *direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing.*

(6) *prohibiting the practice of red-lining by federally sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA,* which has had the effect of depriving certain areas of the necessary mortgage funds to upgrade themselves.

(7) encouraging more loans for housing and rehabilitation to the poor.

(8) providing for a steady source of *credit at low interest* rates to stabilize the housing industry.

J. AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AMERICA

The Republican agriculture policy has whip-sawed the consumer with higher prices and the farmers with declining profits, with speculators and middlemen as the only beneficiaries. Presidents Nixon and Ford have brought about the anomalous situation of family farmers going bankrupt to produce food and fiber American consumers cannot afford to buy. As a farmer, I understand the difficulties which the American farmer has confronted with Secretary Butz and Republican agricultural policy.

It is time that we developed a *coherent, predictable, stable, coordinated food and fiber policy.* This policy should:

– insure *stable prices to the consumer* and a *fair profit for farmers;*

– *increase opportunities in the world market* for our agricultural commodities through an innovative, aggressive foreign sales program;

— guarantee an *abundant supply of agricultural goods* and *avoid periodic shortages;*
— reduce the tremendous increase in the price of farm goods from the farmer to the consumer (which is not passed along to the farmer in the form of profit) by studying ways to *avoid excessive profits made by middlemen and processors;*
— create a *predicatable, stable, reasonable small food reserve, with up to a two-month supply,* permitting farmers to retain control of one-half of these reserves, in order to prevent government dumping during times of moderate price increases;
— insure *coordination of the policies* of the many federal agencies and bureaus, in addition to the Department of Agriculture, which affect the farmer;
— *close the revolving door* that now exists *between the boards of the grain inspection companies and the processors* that supply them with their grain, since both the farmer and the consumer pay when regulatory agencies fail to do their job;
— guarantee *adequate price supports and a parity level* that *assures farmers a reasonable return* on their investments;
— farmers must be given the ability to transport their produce to market. In Illinois alone, 50 million bushels of corn rotted in the ground last year because of an inability to transport the crop to market.

K. ENERGY

It is time for strong leadership and planning in energy. Yet none exists in the Executive Branch. One of the greatest failures of national leadership is the failure to convince the American people of the urgency of our energy problems. In the White House it is business as usual.

Our national policy for energy must include a combination of *energy conservation and energy development, together with price protection for the consumer.*

The price of all domestic oil should be kept below that of O.P.E.C. oil. There is *no need to, and I oppose efforts to, deregulate the price of old oil.* For natural gas, we should deregulate the price of only that natural gas not currently under existing contract (less that 5%) for a period of five years. At the end of the period of time, we should evaluate this program to see if it increases production and keeps gas-related products at prices the American people can afford.

Imports of oil from foreign countries should be kept at manageable levels. Increasing amounts of oil from remaining domestic and foreign sources should be channeled into *permanent storage* facilities until we have accumulated at least an *additional 30-day reserve supply.* We should *place the importation of oil under government authority* to allow strict control of purchases and the auctioning of purchase orders.

To insure the maximum protection of the American consumer during the coming years of increasing energy shortages, our anti-trust laws must be effectively and rigidly enforced. Moreover, maximum disclosure of data on reserve supplies and production must be required.

I support restrictions on the right of a single company to own all phases of production and distribution of oil. However, it may not laways be in the consumer's interest to limit a company to one single phase of production. Such a restriction, for example, might make it illegal for the same company to explore for oil and then extract that oil from the ground once discovered.

I 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. For example, fuel oil and some propane are produced from crude oil. Their production clearly cannot be separated until after extraction and refining take place. It may not be beneficial to the consumer to separate control of these tow competing energy sources.

It is time that we had *a nationwide program of energy conservation.* The potential for dramatic energy conservation remains untapped. Our energy waste in transportation is 85%; in generating electricity it is 65%. Overall, 50% of our energy is wasted. The federal government itself must set an example for energy conservation and must insure that its own regulations do not encourage energy waste.

We need to *encourage mass transit* as a means of energy conservation; *strict fuel efficiency standards* and ratings must be established for motor vehicles; rigid enforcement of energy-saving *speed limits* is essential; *efficiency standards and better labeling* for electric appliances are a prerequisite. Moreover, *mandatory improvements in building insulation* must be established.

To help conserve our dwindling energy supplies, unnecessary electrical power plant construction should be stopped and advertising at the consumer's expense to encourage increased electric consumption should be restricted. *Rate structures,* which discourage total consumption, and peak power demand, *which give greater protection to the average consumer, should be established.*

We must *substantially shift our efforts to increase our production of coal,* of which we have a 200-year supply, *without* at the same time *destroying the surface of our lands through uncontrolled strip mining.* At the time, we must make a major research and development thrust to greatly increase the use of solar energy.

While it is unrealistic, given present Administration policies, to become energy independent by 1986, we should attempt to be free from possible blackmail or economic disaster which might be caused by another boycott. Our reserves should be developed imports set at manageable levels, standby rationing procedures evolved and authorized, and aggressive economic reprisals available to any boycotting oil supplier.

With proper national planning and determined execution of long -range goals, energy production and conservation can be increased.

(1) *Environmental Protection*

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.

As Governor, I was proud to be considered by conservation groups as the best friend of the conservationists to ever sit as Georgia's Governor.

The Democratic Party should:

— insure that the *Army Corps of Engineers stops building unnecessary dams and public works projects harmful to the environment* and that the Soil Conservation Service *ends uncalled for channelization* of our country's rivers and streams.

— *hold fast against efforts to lower clean air requirements of the Clean Air Act.* I support strict enforcement of the nondegradation clause of the Clean Air Act.

— *encourage the development of rapid transit systems* which will help alleviate somewhat our continued and increased dependence on the automobile.

— insist on *strict enforcement of anti-water pollution laws* to protect our oceans, lakes, rivers, and streams from unneeded and harmful commercial pollution, and oppose efforts to weaken the federal Water Pollution Control Act.

— *protect against the noise pollution* with which our advanced technology challenges us. I *opposed* development of the *SST* on this basis, and I also *opposed* granting *landing rights to the Concorde.*

— *assist coastal states which bear the economic and environmental impact associated with the development of the Outer Continental Shelf.* Federal officials should accept the states' recommendations regarding lease sales and development plans unless those recommendations seriously conflict with national security.

— *support the need for better land-use planning.* I favor giving planning assistance to the states if firm assurances are given by the states that these plans will be implemented and will protect critical environmental areas.

— support efforts to place *reasonable limits on strip mining.* We must require reclamation of land as a condition for strip mining.

— *encourage solid waste disposal.* We must reduce the volume of waste created, give grants to states to improve collection service, and expand research in the solid waste disposal area.

M. CIVIL RIGHTS AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

I have long advocated eliminating discrimination against blacks, other minorities, and women.

I believe that the various Civil Rights Acts, including the Voting Rights Act, have had a tremendously positive effect on the South and the nation. They have opened up our society for the benefit of all. The guaranties of equal participation in the political process, provided in the Voting Rights Act, should be extended to all parts of the nation where minority representation and participation are inadequate without in any way slackening enforcement in those areas already covered by the Act.

I also *support postcard registration* for voting to broaden the opportunities for participation in our political process.

I strongly support *federal legislation to prohibit the practice of red-lining* by federally-sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA. I believe that our platform should reflect a *strong commitment to enforcement of the Open House Act of 1968 and the Community Development Act of 1974.* Moreover, we should *enable the Equal Employment Commission to function more effectively* and expeditiously in employment discrimination complaints. Its backlog is a major problem in enforcing laws guaranteeing nondiscrimination in employment.

I am a strong supporter of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). But more assertive steps are necessary to end discrimination against women. Today, in spite of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the earnings gap between men and women is great. Full-time working women earn sixty cents for every dollar earned by full-time working men. I support actions necessary to close this gap. I also support the need for flexible hours for full-time employees and the additional employment of part-time persons, both of which will greatly aid women in their access to the market place.

Women represent over 40% of our work force — a percentage which is increasing every year. *We need to provide high quality, accessible child-care facilities so that mothers who wish to work can do so.* In addition, mothers who wish to enter or rejoin the work force after a long period of absence should be given access to counseling and training programs to help them resume their careers. In this way, we can move toward meeting two of our national goals: providing a job for every American who wants to work and ending discrimination against women.

Moreover, it is time that women were appointed to high level positions in American education and to the boards of important agencies and as heads of important government departments.

In addition, we must assure that

(a) *laws prohibiting sex discrimination in credit, employment, advancement, education, housing and other endeavors are strengthened and strictly enforced;*

(b) strong efforts are made to pass federal legislation and guidelines to *eliminate sex discrimination in health and disability insurance plans;*

(c) *social security laws are revised to eliminate sex-related discrimination;*

(d) *women have equal access to health care systems and voluntary family planning programs;*

(e) *adequate childcare* is provided for all parents who desire to use it;

(f) *existing rape laws are reformed* and the National Rape Prevention and Control Act is passed.

The dreams, hopes and problems of a complex society demand the talent, imagination and dedication of all its citizens — women and men, black, brown, and white. As partners, we can provide the best leadership available to this country.

N. CONSUMER PROTECTION

The consumer in America is too often mistreated or ignored. It is time to reverse this trend.

Ten to fifteen percent of the consumer's purchasing power is wasted because consumers are unable to obtain adequate information. Twenty percent of deaths and injuries related to household consumer products involve unsafe products. Between one-third and one-half of all consumers have billing disputes with those from whom they buy goods or services. For every dollar spent on auto

insurance premiums, it has been estimated that only 42¢ ever gets back to an individual who gets hurt. The consumer has no effective voice within the Executive Branch of government.

Major reforms are necessary to protect the consumers of this country.

First, we must institutionalize the consumer's role through the *creation of a Consumer Protection Agency.* This agency would serve as a strong voice in government hearings and legislation, would insure that the consumer's interest is considered, and would help assure that government speaks for consumers rather than for the vested interests.

Second, we should establish a strong *nationwide program of consumer education* to give the consumer the knowledge to protect himself in the market place. In Georgia, we set up a program in which state field workers travelled across the state training social workers and teachers in the basics of consumer law and protection. We established a toll free Wats line to help the citizens of our state who had consumer complaints and who needed information. A special program was developed for training prisoners in economic and consumer management.

Third, we should make class actions by consumers more easily available to enable them to enforce consumer laws and to give them standing before agencies and courts.

Fourth, we must *vigorously enforce the anti-trust laws.*

Fifth, to guarantee further protection to the consumer, we should work toward:

– *quality standards, where feasible, for food and manufactured items;*

– *warranty standards* to guarantee that consumers are not cheated by shoddy or defective merchandise;

– full product labeling of relevant information affecting price and quality and price-per-unit labeling;

– strict truth-in-advertising measures to require that manufacturers are able to substantiate product performance claims.

Sixth, *consumers must achieve greater protection against dangerous products.* The 1970 National Commission on Product Safety stated that accidents in American homes associated with consumer products accounted for 30,000 deaths a year. In order to reduce these horrifying statistics, I recommend:

– strong enforcement of existing laws;

– enforcement of stringent flammability standards for clothing;

– adequate research programs to anticipate potential hazards;

– additional automobile safety research;

– *expanded pre-market testing* for all new chemicals to elicit their general characteristics and environmental and health effects.

If our government is truly to be a government of the people, it must also be a government which protects the rights of the consumer.

O. SENIOR CITIZENS

The condition of our senior citizens is a national tragedy. They are twice as likely as the rest of the population to be poor. They spend 50% more of their income on housing than do other Americans. 1.6 million elderly Americans live in houses without basic plumbing. In spite of Medicare, only 65% of the medical bills of old people are covered by government health programs.

Senior citizens need adequate income, housing, health care, and transportation. More important, they need to feel and be wanted and to be assisted by a comprehensive program designed specifically for their benefit.

I have proposed that the Social Security system be strengthened through an increase in the maximum earnings base and an increase in benefits in proportion to earnings before retirement. I likewise favor strengthening and broadening the laws against age discrimination and discouraging the trend by employers toward early forced retirement.

To make the elderly less subject to the financial burden caused by illness, I support a comprehensive, universal national health care program with interim relief until the system is fully implemented through expansion of Medicare coverage.

To provide better housing construction for the elderly, we must rapidly expand housing construction for the elderly under Section 202 of the Housing Act; and we must strengthen the protection the elderly need against displacement by landlords seeking to convert rental housing into condominiums and cooperatives.

Since our elderly often lack mobility, we should encourage public transportation systems receiving federal funds to provide reduced fare programs for the elderly.

We must do much more to make the elderly feel wanted and to take advantage of their experience, which is a true national asset. Therefore, we should consider the establishment of a national senior citizens' service corps and broaden the use by senior citizens of senior citizens multi-purpose centers.

We need to protect American workers against the uncertainties presented by existing pension laws. The Pension Reform Act of 1974 was a good beginning, but there is much that remains to be done. We need strict enforcement of the laws that guarantee the financial integrity of pension funds and strict accountability for those who administer those funds. And we need to minimize the excessive paper work which often slows the distribution of benefits.

I know from the personal experience in my own family, when my mother served as a Peace Corps volunteer at age 68, the tremendous contribution that older Americans can make to themselves and to the world if they are treated with dignity and respect and are given the opportunity to serve. To those ends, this Party and I will always be dedicated.

3. *Government Reorganization and Budget Reform*

The basic difficulty facing American government today cuts across all the other campaign issues. The proliferation of programs and agencies, particularly in the past ten years, has inevitably created duplications, waste and inefficiency. There are over 83 federal housing programs, 228 federal health programs, and over 1,200 assorted commissions, councils, boards, committees, and the like.

We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision and *reorganization of the federal bureaucracy,* to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its services. We must establish mechanisms to set our priorities more systematically and to weigh our spending decisions more carefully. The luxury of multiple agencies functioning within one policy area, often at cross purposes, is no longer available to us.

The reform I am seeking is *not* a retreat; it is a marshalling of our resources to meet the challenges of the last quarter of this Century. The problem is not that program goals are unworthy; it is not that our public servants are unfit. What is at fault is the unwieldy structure and frequently inefficient operation of the government: the layers of administration, the plethora of agencies, the proliferation of paperwork. If we are to succeed in other substantive policy areas, government must cease to be an obstacle to our efforts.

We have a finite amount of resources. They must not be squandered by inefficiency. Government cannot truly serve the people if it cannot operate effectively itself. Reorganization is not a dry exercise of moving around boxes in an organization chart. It is a creative venture toward the better direction of the energies and resources of our government.

The first step is to reshape the way we make federal spending decisions.

First, the federal government should be committed to *requiring zero-base budgeting by all federal agencies.* Each program, other than income support programs, such as Social Security, should be required to justify both its continued existence and its level of funding. We need to continue and expand programs that work and to discontinue those that do not. Without such a comprehensive review, it will be difficult to assess priorities and impossible to redirect expenditures away from areas showing relatively less success. Zero-base budgeting was one of my most important policy innovations in Georgia, and it has been adopted successfully in Illinois, New Jersey and New Mexico. It can work in the federal government.

Second, we must commit ourselves to a greater reliance upon *long-term planning budgets.* I proposed in my Economic Position Paper that we adopt a three year rolling budget technique to facilitate careful, long-term planning and budgeting. Too many of our spending decisions are focused just beyond our noses on next year's appropriations. "Uncontrollable" spending is only uncontrollable in the short run; spending can be controlled if the planning system builds in more lead time.

Third, reforming the budget process will not be enough unless we are also committed to insuring that programs are carried out with efficiency. Improving government's performance will require action on several levels. The Democratic Party should commit itself to undertaking the basic structural reforms necessary to streamline federal operations and to make the government efficient once again. The *number of federal agencies should be reduced to no more than 200.* Other management tools will be required to achieve an acceptable level of performance. We need *increased program evaluation.* Many programs fail to define with any specificity what they intend to accomplish. Without that specification, evaluation by objective is impossible.

In Georgia, we applied rigorous performance standards and performance auditing. Such standards, which are working in state capitols around the nation and in successful businesses, should be imposed upon federal departments and agencies.

Finally, the federal government is ill-equipped to deal with a growing number of problems that transcend departmental jurisdictions. For example, foreign and domestic issues are becoming more interrelated; domestic prosperity and international relations are affected by our foreign agricultural policy, by international raw materials and oil policies, and by our export policies, among others. We must *develop a policy making machinery that transcends narrow perspectives,* that protects the vital interests of the United States, and that provides our citizens and the world with policies that are rational, consistent, and predictable.

Our first priority must be to build a well-managed structure of government — one that is efficient, economical, and compassionate and with systematically established priorities and predictable policies. Government must again become an effective instrument for achieving justice and meeting our critical national needs.

4. *Foreign Affairs*

In the past few years the world has changed greatly and the United States has learned several lessons. One is that we cannot and should not try to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own security is endangered.

We have learned that we must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy.

We have learned the hard way how important it is during times of international stress to keep close ties with our allies and friends and to strive for multilateral agreements and solutions to critical problems.

Another lesson we have learned is that we cannot impose democracy on another country by force. We cannot buy friends, and it is obvious that other nations resent it if we try. Our interests lie in protecting our national security, in preventing war, in peacefully promoting the principles of human freedom and democracy, and in exemplifying in our foreign policy the true character and attitudes of the American people.

Finally, we have learned that every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in our dealings with other nations, such as Cambodia, Vietnam, and Chile, the American people have been excluded from the process of evolving and consummating our foreign policy. Unnecessary secrecy surrounds the inner workings of our own government. Because we have let our foreign policy be made for us, we lost lost something crucial and precious in the way we talk and the way we act toward other peoples of the world.

In the future we must turn our attention increasingly towards the common problems of food, energy, environment, scarce resources, and trade. A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of

the world suffer mass starvation or when there are no established arrangements to deal with population growth, energy, or environmental quality. Better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

Our policies toward the developing countries need revisions. For years, we have either ignored them or treated them as pawns in the big power chess game. Both approaches were deeply offensive to their people. Our program of *international aid* to these nations should be redirected so that it *meets the human needs of the greatest number of people.* This means an emphasis on food, jobs, education, and public health, including access to family planning. In our trade relations with these nations, we should join commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar.

We must *more closely coordinate our policy with our friends,* countries like the democratic states of Europe, North America and Japan – those countries which share with us common goals and aspirations. Our continued propsperity and welfare depend upon increased coordination of our policies.

The policy of East-West detente is under attack today because of the way it has been exploited by the Soviet Union. The American people were told detente would mean a "generation of peace," at no risk to the nation's vital interests. Yet, in places like Syria or Angola, in activities like offensive missile development, the Soviets seem to be taking advantage of the new relationship to expand their power and influence and to increase the risk of conflict.

I support the objectives of detente, but I cannot go along with the way it has been handled by Presidents Nixon and Ford. The Secretary of State has tied its success too closely to his personal reputation. As a result, he is giving up too much and asking for too little. He is trumpeting achievements on paper while failing to insist on them in practice.

The relationship of detente is one of both cooperation and competition, of new kinds of contacts in some areas along with continued hostility in others. In the troubled history of our relationships with the Soviet Union, this is where we have arrived. The benefits of detente must accrue to both sides, or they are worthless. Their mutual advantage must be apparent, or the American people will not support the policy.

To the Soviets, detente is an opportunity to continue the process of world revolution without running the threat of nuclear war. They have said so quite openly as recently as a month ago at their 25th Party Congress. To the Soviet Union, with our acquiescence, detente is surface tranquility in Europe within boundaries redefined to its benefit, together with support for wars of national liberation elsewhere. It is having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of the Accords. This is not the road to peace but the bitter deception of the American people.

But while detente must become more reciprocal, I reject the strident and bellicose voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the cold war with the Soviet Union. I believe the American people want to look to the future. They have seen the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam and have drawn appropriate lessons for tomorrow. They seek new vistas, not a reptition of old rhetoric and old mistakes.

It is in our interest to try to make detente broader and more reciprocal. Detente can be an instrument for long-term peaceful change within the Communist system, as well as in the rest of the world. We should make it clear that detente requires that the Soviets, as well as the United States, refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have.

The core of detente is the reduction of arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings on 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.

Our vision must be of a more pluralistic world and not of a communist monolith. We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interest of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world.

We should remember that Eastern Europe is not an area of stability, and it will not become such until the Eastern European countries regain their independence and become part of a larger cooperative European framework. I am concerned over the long-range prospects for Rumanian and Yugoslavian independence, and I deplore the recent infliction upon Poland of a constitution that ratifies its status as a Soviet satellite. We must reiterate to the Soviets that an enduring American-Soviet detente cannot ignore the legitimate aspirations of other nations. We must likewise insist that the Soviet Union and other countries recognize the human rights of all citizens who live within their boundaries, whether they be blacks in Rhodesia, Asians in Uganda, or Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our relations with China are important to world peace, and they directly affect the world balance. The United States has a great stake in a nationally independent, secure, and friendly China. I believe that we should explore more actively the possibility of widening American-Chinese trade relations and of further consolidating our political relationships.

The Middle East is a key testing area for our capacity to construct a more cooperative international system. I believe deeply that the foundation of our Middle East policy must be insuring the safety and security of Israel. This country should never attempt to impose a settlement in Israel, nor should we force Israel to make territorial concessions which are detrimental to her security. We should attempt to promote direct negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Israel must be allowed to live within defensible borders. As President, I would never force Israel to give up control of the Golan Heights to the Syrians, nor would I recognize the Palestinian Liberation Organization or any other group purporting to represent the Palestinians when those organizations refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist in peace. The negotiations that will lead to permanent peace can only proceed on the basis of a *clear and absolute*

American commitment to insure Israel's security and survival as a Jewish State.

In the future we should make multilateral diplomacy a major part of our efforts so that other countries know the importance the United States attaches to international organizations. We should make a major effort at reforming and restructuring the U. N. systems. The intensity of interrelated problems is rapidly increasing, and it is likely that in the future the issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems that have dominated international relations since 1945.

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 B-1 bomber is an example of a proposed system which should not be funded and would be wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. We have an Admiral for every seventeen ships. The Chief of Naval Operations has more captains and commanders on his own personal staff than serve in all the ships at sea.

The Pentagon bureaucracy is wasteful and bloated. We have more generals and admirals today than we did during World War II commanding a much smaller fighting force. We can thin our troops in Asia and close some unnecessary bases abroad.

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. I am not afraid of hard bargaining with the Soviet Union. Hard bargaining will strengthen support for the agreements that can be reached and will show that we, as well as they, can gain from detente. We can increase the possibility that the fear of war and the burden of arms may be lifted from the shoulders of humanity by the nations that have done the most to place it there.

As I mentioned in detail at the United Nations, we need *firm and imaginative international action to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons* and to place greater safeguards on the use of nuclear energy. The Democratic Party should put itself squarely on record as favoring a comprehensive test ban treaty prohibiting all nuclear explosives for a period of five years.

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.

Finally, I think there are certain basic principles which should guide whatever is done in foreign lands in the name of this country. Our policies should be open and honest, shaped with the participation of Congress from the outset. Our policies should treat the people of other nations as individuals with the same dignity and respect we demand for ourselves. It must be the responsibility of the President to restore the moral authority of this country in its conduct of foreign policy. We should work for peace and the control of arms in everything we do. We should support the humanitarian aspirations of the world's peoples.

And our policies should be aimed at building a just and peaceful world order in which every nation can have a constructive role.

5. *Conclusion*

The proposals I have suggested are likely to remain simply proposals unless we have a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. It is time to put petty differences aside and to unite as a Party to achieve these goals. Together we can lead this nation to a New Beginning as the United States starts its second two hundred years. Together we can have an open, compassionate, and effective government which will reflect the best qualities of the American people.

Planning a Budget from Zero

BY JIMMY CARTER

AT THE NATIONAL GOVERNORS CONFERENCE

June, 1974

On the campaign trail, a lot of promises are made by candidates for public office to improve economy and efficiency in government if they are elected. This pledge has a natural appeal to the financially overburdened taxpayer. But when the winning candidates take office, they too often find that it's easier to talk about economy and efficiency in government than to accomplish it. Entrenched bureaucracy is hard to move from its existing patterns.

Taxpayers, on the other hand, hear the promises but see few results. It seems to them that for every new program in government there must be a tax increase. Each government—whether federal, state or local—seems to have an insatiable financial need. No matter how much money is collected, it never seems to be enough.

When I campaigned for Governor, I promised that if elected there would be no general statewide tax increase during my four-year term in office. At the same time, I outlined a platform of eight general goals and 97 specific objectives that I wanted to accomplish. The twin promises, in my estimation, were not incompatible. I felt that this administration could reverse the past pattern of ignoring campaign promises.

Immediately upon election, I began planning a program to keep my commitments. I knew that simple appeals for greater productivity in government were not the answer. Economy and efficiency must come from basic, subtle changes that slice across the complete spectrum of a government's activity. The two areas that seemed to offer greatest possibilities of success were budgeting and planning. Through tight budgeting, more services can be squeezed out of every tax dollar spent. Through planning, the groundwork can be laid for implementing new programs and expanding existing ones in ways that will avoid possible pitfalls and launch the programs directly towards their goal from the beginning.

As a citizen interested in government and as a former legislator, I had long believed that too many governmental programs are botched because they are started in haste without adequate planning or establishment of goals. Too often they never really attack the targeted problems.

The services provided by Georgia's state government are now greatly improved, and every tax dollar is being stretched further than ever before. There has not been a general statewide tax increase during my term. In fact, there has been a substantial reduction in ad valorem tax. Neither will a tax increase be necessary when my successor takes office next year.

Reorganization Merges Planning and Budgeting

In budgeting, we initiated a new concept called zero-base budgeting to help us monitor state problems better and attain increased efficiency. In the area of planning, we merged the roles of planning and budgeting—which had previously operated completely independent of each other—so that they could work together in promoting more economy in government. At the same time, we clearly defined the various roles of planning and assigned the proper roles to the appropriate organizational unit.

The functions of planning and budgeting were merged in a broad reorganization program that completely streamlined the executive branch of Georgia's state government. Much of our success during the past three years in improving state programs is a direct result of reorganization.

We reduced the number of state agencies from about 300 to 22 major operating agencies and combined functions to eliminate duplication and overlapping of services. For instance, 33 agencies were combined to form the Department of Natural Resources. Reorganization is a separate story of government in action. My interest now is to stress how we changed our budgeting and planning procedures to help accomplish the previously stated goals.

Georgia was the first government to implement a program of zero-base budgeting. Under this novel concept, every dollar requested for expenditure during the next budget period must be justified, including current expenditures that are to continue. It also provides for examining the effectiveness of each activity at various funding levels. This is a dramatically different concept from that followed by most governments, which concentrate almost totally on proposed new expenditures when considering a new budget. Except for non-recurring programs or expenditures, the continuing expenditures in a current budget get little attention.

Take as an example a government with a budget of $1 billion. Projections are that the new budget will grow by $50 million during the next budget cycle because of growth in the economy, a tax increase or other factors. Department heads submit their budget requests with proposed increases to get a slice of the $50 million in new funds, either to expand existing programs, launch new programs, or to cover increases in costs through inflation. The governing officials rarely look at the existing expenditures to judge whether they are meeting their objective. The officials are concerned only with carving up the $50 million in new funds. If graded, a new program actually might become a greater priority than an existing program, but it doesn't get funded unless it can get a slice of the $50 million in new money.

Zero-base budgeting changed this practice in Georgia. Every program, existing and proposed, must now vie for funding in the new budget on an equal level. Every single dollar spent by a department in the current year must be justified if it is to be recommended by the governor for funding in the following year's budget.

Until the concept was implemented in Georgia, only one Texas corporation had ever used zero-base budgeting. The new technique was developed by that corporation as a means of reducing the costs of its overall operation. This was done by ranking every single function within the company's operations and abolishing the lowest-priority functions. Thus, the company was able to reduce expenses as required in a manner that retained the most-needed functions.

Decision Packages Establish Priorities

On a larger scale, zero-base budgeting in Georgia has peeled the veil of secrecy from around bureaucracy by opening up for inspection and scrutiny the activities of every single state employee. For the first time, a Governor, legislator, department head, or anyone else can study in detail what is being accomplished at the lowest level of state activity.

The heart of zero-base budgeting is decision packages, which are prepared by managers at each level of government, from the top to the bottom. These packages —10,000 in Georgia—cover every existing or proposed function or activity of each agency. The packages include analysis of the cost, purpose, alternative courses of action, measures of performance, consequences of not performing the activity, and benefits.

Merely compiling these packages would not accomplish any purpose other than to provide information. Therefore, they are ranked in order of importance against other current and new activities. This ranking forms the basis of determining what functions are recommended for funding in the new budget, depending, of course, upon the amount of money available. If less funds are appropriated than requested, the lowest-ranking functions and activities are cut out.

Planning Requirements

Besides placing priority on spending programs and revealing more information about actual governmental operations, zero-base budgeting achieves one more important action: it forces planning into levels of government where planning may never have existed. It forces all levels of government to find better ways of accomplishing their missions. It also gives a voice in governmental direction to the rank and file state employee who is responsible for delivering services. Besides making him a more integral part of the planning process, it elevates his own sense of importance of his position and prompts him to work harder and deliver more efficient services.

There are three ingredients necessary for successful implementation of zero-base budgeting: (1) unqualified support from top executives, (2) effective design of the system, and (3) effective management of the system.

Zero-base budgeting has been well received in Georgia. It has become an important planning tool to insure that we are placing our priorities on the proper programs and are constantly seeking the maximum services for every state dollar.

I don't want to mislead you and leave the impression that implementation of zero-based budgeting has created miracles in Georgia's state government. Obviously it has not. But it has been subtly at work for three years making basic changes in the operations of our government and will continue to pioneer further improvements in the years ahead.

The merging of budgeting and planning sevices into one cohesive organization has worked so well that one

wonders why they were ever located in separate, non-cooperating agencies.

State planning was a function of the Bureau of State Planning and Community Affairs when I took office, while the Budget Bureau handled all budget matters. Although both agencies were under control of the Governor since he appointed both agency heads, they operated separately with no cooperation between them —a fact that minimized the probability of the planning output being implemented.

One of the most critical problems was that the Bureau of State Planning and Community Affairs, which had been created in 1967, had never really established its mission in Georgia's state government after four years of operation. Legislators didn't understand its functions and were skeptical of its entire operation. They felt that the planning bureau and the individual state departments were overlapping in their responsibilities. In some instances this was true. More importantly, the planning bureau was doing most of the program planning in state government without adequately synchronizing its efforts with the state agencies. When it came time to implement the planning efforts, department heads were skeptical and too often were reluctant to push for implementation of the proposed improvements. This created an impasse that made the work of state planners generally ineffective.

As soon as reorganization brought the budgeting and planning functions together into the same agency, the Office of Planning and Budget, changes began to occur. For the first time, planners and budget analysts worked side by side and began to coordinate their efforts.

Over a period of another year, further changes took place that changed completely the role of state planning. Through reorganization, most state agencies began to do their own functional program planning. This was made possible by creation of planning divisions within these departments for the first time, and also by the fact that the reduction in number of departments made them large enough to justify their own program planning divisions.

A New Role for the Planning Division

Concurrently, planners in the Planning Division of the Office of Planning and Budget assumed a new role of policy planning rather than program planning. By restricting program planning to the agency level, there is now a greater chance that it will be implemented.

Georgia state law changes the OPB Planning Division with the responsibility for assessing accurately Georgia's physical, social and economic needs. On a periodic and timely basis throughout the year, these needs are identified, documented and analyzed.

One method that I have used to secure citizen participation in the state planning process was the Goals for Georgia program. This was a year-long program in 1971 in which Georgia citizens were given a chance to outline the types of programs they wanted their state government to emphasize in the years ahead. Since that time, state planning has been updating the results of this program continuously in the formulation of the state's goals and policies.

The role of OPB planners in preparation of the 1975 budget tells the story of how state planning is now done in Georgia.

Long before the state's budget analysts got deeply involved in preparation of the proposed fiscal year 1975 budget that would be submitted to the General Assembly, OPB planners started meeting with department heads to determine their program priorities for the following year. Detailed analyses were prepared and submitted to me for review. At the same time, I was meeting with the planners to outline my priorities. Later, I met with the planners and each department head to discuss both of our priorities. We reached a mutual agreement on many programs to be pursued and disagreed on others. Even though we didn't reach unanimity, we established a common ground of understanding about our conflicting goals. Later, when the budget analysts started putting together the actual budget proposals in dollars and cents, the spadework done by the planners proved to be an immense help.

OPB's Planning Division didn't stop at this point. Its staff continued to attend every budget meeting and provide assistance in ironing out details of the actual budget proposal to be made. Although planners had been involved in preparation of the proposed fiscal year 1974 budget, this was the first time they had actually been involved with a clear-cut role established for them. I can only say that I wish we had had this type of budgeting-planning relationship available when I became Governor. I am more than pleased with the working rapport that has been established. The relationship between me and all department heads concerning budgeting preparation has been improved considerably.

The work of the planners is reflected in our printed budget documents as well. One of the three budget documents we prepare in Georgia is an outline of proposed spendings on a program basis with a four-year projection of future needs for each program. This document is keyed by page number to the main financial display document for easy cross-reference.

One role of planners has been retained—program evaluation. This involves determining whether each program has attained its objective and making a thorough analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of each program.

OPB planners were left with this function because an objective, outside-the-agency evaluation is needed, and because many programs cross agency lines. It would

not be fair for one line agency to evaluate the effectiveness of a related program in another line agency.

Along with the new objectives of OPB's Planning Division, one major change has taken place in our recruiting efforts. Instead of recruiting trained planners, we hire experts in the various areas of governmental activity such as education, law enforcement, mental health, etc. We provide them the in-house training necessary to work within the framework of our planning organization. This policy has been successful. By virtue of being experts in their activity of assignment, OPB planners can discuss programs on a level with department heads. They have an expertise that is creating more trust in state planning and is helping to establish better rapport between the Governor's office and the various state departments.

Georgia's state government still has a long way to go to achieve the quality of service that I would like to see. But we've come a long way since I took office in 1971.

The innovations involving zero-base budgeting and merging of the budgeting and planning staffs will be felt in Georgia for a long time. We are leaving a legacy to our next Governor that will allow him the flexibility and mechanism to move quickly into the decision-making process of a new administration that hasn't been available to Georgia's past governors.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Urban Policy

TO THE UNITED STATES CONFERENCE ON MAYORS IN MILWAUKEE

June 29, 1976

I.

More than forty years ago, President Franklin Roosevelt declared that America's number one economic problem was poverty in the South.

President Roosevelt was right, and he had the vision and political ability to enact programs such as TVA and REA that changed my life and the lives of millions of Southerners.

Today, America's number one economic problem is our cities, and I want to work with you to meet the problems of urban America just as Franklin Roosevelt worked to meet the problems of the rural South in the 1930's.

I want to make one point at the outset, as plainly as I can.

There is no room in my concept of the Presidency for the politics of alienation and division.

For eight years, our cities and their people and their elected officials have too often been viewed by the White House as adversaries and used as political whipping boys.

Too often our highest federal officials have tried to score political points by pitting the suburbs and the rural areas against the cities.

Too often, these administrations have ignored the common interests which unite our local, state and federal governments.

I pledge to you an urban policy based on a new coalition—recognizing that the president, governors and mayors represent the same urban constituency.

I pledge to you that if I become President, you, the mayors of America, will have a friend, an ally, and a partner in the White House.

The mayors of America will have direct access to the White House to get prompt assistance on any problems that may arise.

It is time for our government leaders to recognize that the people who inhabit even the poorest and most deteriorating of our central cities are our fellow Americans, and that they want the same things we all want: personal security, a decent job, a good education for their children, opportunities for recreation—in short, the basic American promise of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Our goal must be to develop a coherent national urban policy that is consistent, compassionate, realistic, and that reflects the decency and good sense of the American people.

We have never really had a comprehensive urban policy in this country, although we have been moving toward one, in fits and starts, for several decades.

The initial steps came in the late 1930's when we began the first public housing projects. In 1949 we started the Urban Renewal Program. In the 1960's the Anti-Poverty Program and the Model Cities Program broke new ground in urban policy, and gave us some successes, some failures, and much experience to draw upon.

But for the past eight years we have drifted, we have seen indifference replace experimentation, and divisiveness replace the search for unity that this country so urgently needs.

Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Nixon-Ford Administration cut $4.5 billion in urban programs and another $7 billion from programs to aid the poor, the unemployed and the medically indigent.

The cities, with their revenues already reduced by the worst recession in forty years, and with rapidly rising costs, could only respond to the financial crunch with higher taxes or reduced services. Thus, in 1975, our cities enacted $1.5 billion in new taxes while reducing expenditures by $1.4 billion. The result of these increased taxes and reduced services can only be to speed the flight to the suburbs and leave behind urban dwellers bereft of the hope for a better quality of life.

In short, in the absence of understanding and coordinated assistance among government leaders, many of our cities are caught in a vicious cycle, a downward spiral that can only be broken by new attitudes, new initiatives, and new leadership.

II.

The time has come for us to work together toward a restoration of federalism, through the creation of a balanced national partnership that is based on mutual trust, mutual respect, and mutual commitment to the future of the American city.

The balanced national partnership I envision must incorporate three basic elements.

First, the Federal Government must provide predictable and adequate financial support to assist communities in meeting your legitimate fiscal needs, so that localities can avoid excessive service cutbacks and inordinate property tax increases.

Of course, we must be realistic. We cannot just throw money at problems. We must respect the desire of the American taxpayer to get a dollar's worth of results for each dollar spent. But I believe that if we talk sense to the American people, we will find support for a realistic program to meet the urban crisis. That is what I intend to do as President.

Secondly, a balanced national partnership must, to the greatest degree possible, grant to the local governments the administrative freedom needed for innovative, creative programming.

Between the mid-1950's and this year, the number of categorical grant programs grew from 150 to more than 1600, each with its own administrative bureaucracy, its own restrictive conditions, individual application procedures, review conditions and funding priorities.

These categorical grants can often serve important functions. On a program of national dimensions, such grants can maximize local involvement in confronting national problems.

In practice, however, the proliferation of grants has built an irrational structure, which has often limited local initiative and fragmented local efforts toward sound fiscal planning.

It is important to attach conditions to programs which ensure that funds are directed toward the beneficiaries intended by Congress and the President. But too often programs designed for the ghetto families have been shifted to further benefit affluent families whose political influence can prevail.

You, this nation's mayors, are the people on the firing line, fighting a hard battle against heavy odds, and we cannot expect you to fight well if you are trapped in the bureaucratic straightjacket that categorical grants have too often imposed.

To achieve a balanced national partnership, I intend to undertake a review, beginning this year and involving full consultation with state and local officials, and congressional leaders, to determine in which instances consolidation of categorical grants would be desirable.

That process of consolidation will insure that the federal structure is organized to allow localities maximum flexibility in delivering services within the framework of national standards. I can insure that consolidation will not be a cover to reduce needed federal assistance, or to change the distribution of benefits so as to discriminate against those individuals with the greatest need.

Third, a balanced federal partnership must involve the governors and the mayors in the earliest stages of formulating our national urban policy, and in the design of new administrative machinery to implement that policy.

Finally federalism is not going to mean anything until the Federal Government sets its own house in order. I intend as President to direct a complete reorganization of the executive branch of the Federal Government along rational functional lines, one that will enable Washington to work more effectively with you in responding to the urban crisis.

I look forward with interest to observe similar improvements in municipal government organization and management which you are sharing with one another. We have long recognized that federal tax funds should not finance local waste.

My own views on federalism are not just theories: they directly reflect my experiences in dealing with the delivery end of complicated programs when I was Governor of Georgia.

I learned, along with you mayors, just how confused and irrational the Washington bureaucracy can be. For example, when we started a Drug Treatment Program under one state agency, we discovered there were some fourteen different agencies that were funding various aspects of the drug problem, and with little, if any, coordination among them.

But I am absolutely convinced that if we work together on the task, we can come up with a federal system that is effective and efficient and that can be a source of national pride instead of national embarrassment.

We simply can no longer afford the price of the red tape. We must get the money and services to the people who need them, and not just to the communities that happen to be most skilled in the art of grantsmanship.

III.

These are among my beliefs as I consider the urban problem. Now I want to discuss some of the specific programs I support.

The first thing we need is jobs, a job for every American who wants one. Unemployment and poverty are at the heart of the urban problem.

Last year, the central city unemployment rate was 9.6%, and among black teenagers the jobless rate in many areas was over 40%. Those figures are unacceptable. They reflect a national sickness that we must confront head-on. They reflect not only human tragedies but they are at the heart of the fiscal and social problems of cities. The only way to achieve the growth in the urban tax base required to meet rising expenditures is through a healthy local economy.

To provide employment, we need both a program of incentives to private employers and a program of public needs employment.

We must recognize at the outset that almost 85% of America's workers depend on private industry for jobs. I would like to maintain or improve this ratio.

To encourage new industrial development in the cities, I have proposed assistance to local governments for urban economic planning, employment credits to businesses for hiring the unemployed, and federal funds to support on-the-job training by business.

In terms of public employment, I favor an improved CETA Program, an accelerated Public Works Program,

and funds for a total of some 800,000 summer jobs. Like some of you, I remember the impact of the CCC and WPA in the 1930's, and I think similar initiatives are called for today, but with stress on urban, rather than rural work projects, and with maximum possible local control over those projects. Public employment must be meaningful and productive in meeting the most urgent needs of the community.

Our efforts toward full employment must be supplemented by fiscal assistance, and in particular by an improved program of revenue sharing.

I predicted at the outset of the Nixon Administration's Revenue Sharing Program that it would eventually be used to reduce, rather than increase, net federal assistance to our states and cities. Unfortunately, I was correct.

I stand with you in urging Congress to extend the General Revenue Sharing Program with an inflation factor and with full enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill.

As perhaps you know, I have for some time stated my belief, even when I was a governor, that revenue sharing funds should go directly to localities, and that they should be free to use those funds to defray costs of education and social programs.

We also need countercyclical assistance, with revenue sharing and other financial aid designed to meet the special needs of the most hard-pressed urban areas. We need an automatic countercyclical assistance program, with a long-term authorization, triggered by carefully defined economic conditions in particular localities and designed to maintain service levels in our cities and thereby avoid disruptive tax increases and public employee layoffs.

I regret President Ford's veto last year of the Public Works Economic Development Act, with its needed provision for public works, for countercyclical aid to cities, and for waste water treatment plants, and I join you in urging that he sign the new version passed with overwhelming Democratic majorities, which now awaits his action.

The present bill is within the budget resolutions adopted by Congress, and it would not be rejected by a President who genuinely understood and cared about our cities and their people.

In the past year, the dramatic financial difficulties of New York City have been the focus of national attention on urban fiscal problems. But the truth is that cities throughout America share the same problems of declining revenues and increasing costs. Your own 1976 economic report makes that point abundantly clear. For the first time, cities of every size, and in every part of the nation, including the sunbelt, are face to face with financial crisis.

I think the public at large does not yet realize that what we confront is not just New York City's fiscal crisis, but a national problem. It will be your duty and my duty to make the nation aware of the broad nature of the urban problem, and to provide the leadership and the ideas that can cope with it.

Another need in easing urban problems, as I have stressed throughout my campaign, is a complete overhaul of our welfare system.

Our present system is a failure deplored alike by those who pay for it, those who administer it, and those who supposedly benefit from it.

About 10% of those on welfare are able to work full time, and they should be offered job training and jobs. Any such person who refuses training or employment should not receive further welfare benefits.

The other 90% of the people on welfare are children, persons with dependent children, old people, handicapped people, or persons otherwise unable to work full time. They should be treated with compassion and respect.

We should have a simpler National Welfare Program, with one fairly uniform standard of payment, adjusted for cost of living differences by areas and with strong work incentives built in. In no case should the level of benefits make loafing more attractive than working. And we should have welfare rules that strengthen families rather than divide families. Local governments should not be burdened with the cost of welfare and my goal would also include the phased reduction of the states' share as soon as that is financially feasible.

I believe we are competent enough to create a welfare program that is both efficient and compassionate.

We also need presidential leadership in helping cities meet their housing and transportation needs.

1975 was our worst year in nearly three decades in terms of the number of housing units constructed. We set a goal in 1968 of 2½ million new housing units per year; last year we constructed barely one million.

At the same time, costs have been rising so that only one American family in six can now afford new housing.

We need a program that will provide jobs for hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and also fulfill our national commitment to adequate housing construction.

Our long-range, comprehensive and predictable national housing policy must include:

Federal subsidies and low-interest loans for the construction of low and middle-income housing;

Greater effort to direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing;

Expansion of the successful Section 202 Housing Program for the Elderly;

Greater emphasis on the rehabilitation of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods and publicly created jobs to spearhead this rehabilitation;

Continued construction of rental homes for low-income families; and

Prohibition of red-lining practices by lending institutions.

We should give serious consideration to the proposals now before Congress for a domestic development bank that would make low-interest loans to businesses and state and local governments to encourage private sector investment in chronically depressed areas.

The Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 can be improved when it comes up for reauthor-

ization next year. If I become President, it will be necessary for me to submit my proposals on this program to Congress very soon after taking office, and I want your ideas and recommendations on how it can be made more effective.

The plight of our municipal transportation systems is another subject for presidential concern and initiative.

For twenty years we have spent tens of billions of dollars on the interstate highway system while virtually ignoring public transportation. Our bus and subway systems have deteriorated, public use of them has declined, and deficits have mounted.

Although we must expedite final completion of the interstate highway system, we cannot allow mass transit to remain a national stepchild. If people cannot get in and out of our cities in comfort and safety, then the economic strength of our central cities is doomed.

As first steps toward revitalizing our urban transportation system, I propose:

To create a total national policy for all modes of transportation;

To increase the portion of transportation money available for public mass transportation;

To change the current restrictive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities, so more money can be used as operating subsidies;

To revitalize our nation's railroads.

There is also a tremendous opportunity for relatively inexpensive transportation improvement by strong local action to provide off-street parking, one-way streets, exclusive bus lines, limited unloading hours for downtown stores, more carpools, and staggered working hours for public and private employees.

These are some of the necessary first steps if we are to deal with the urban crisis. There are obviously other areas of need, such as parks and recreation, education, pollution, and crime prevention, that must also be addressed.

Perhaps most importantly, we must recognize that many federal programs in the past have had a counterproductive effect on the health and wealth of our cities. It is time to assure that federal spending policy takes into account the best interests of our urban communities.

IV.

In order to have a comprehensive urban strategy, federal, state and local governments must provide incentives to direct the resources of private enterprise into our cities. Our national urban partnership would be incomplete without the creative involvement of private resources. The public sector cannot rebuild our cities alone. *An optimum public-private partnership must be forged.*

In this era of scarce resources, the Federal Government can help magnify limited public sector funds by engaging substantial private sector investment in our cities. As urban economist Anthony Downs noted, "Federal funds alone—and even all public sector funds together—have little chance of stimulating effective community development unless they are used as a catalyst to attract large amounts of additional resources from the private sector."

The government can also help local communities encourage innovative new structures, such as tax increment financing, which allows a city to use growth in its property tax in a given area to stimulate needed urban reinvestments, and joint public-private development mechanisms.

The Community Development Act should not only be extended but its scope should be significantly oriented to encourage financial and political innovation by municipalities and their private sector partners. Community development funds, local tax increment financing, federal loan guarantees and other public and private funds should be used flexibly to create a revolving pool of financial resources for urban redevelopment. Unfortunately, the Ford Administration has not yet even implemented a small scale version of the current act, which affords an outstanding opportunity to combine public and private urban development investments.

Privately operated non-profit organizations committed to urban redevelopment, such as Central Atlanta Progress in my home state's capital, are being formed throughout the country to help serve as a catalyst for private investment in our cities. They must be encouraged in their efforts.

V.

I do not underestimate the magnitude of the problem. But neither do I underestimate the strength and compassion and good sense of the American people, when they are given the right kind of leadership and make up their minds to solve a problem.

A nation that can send men to the moon can meet its urban needs. It is a matter of priorities, of leadership, and of determination.

I think we stand at a turning point in history. If, a hundred years from now, this nation's experiment in democracy has failed, I suspect that historians will trace that failure to our own era, when a process of decay began in our inner cities and was allowed to spread unchecked throughout our society.

But I do not believe that must happen. I believe that, working together, we can turn the tide, stop the decay, and set in motion a process of growth that by the end of this century can give us cities worthy of the greatest nation on earth.

I recall the oath taken by the citizens of Athens:

"We will ever strive for the ideals and sacred things of the city;

"We will unceasingly seek to quicken the sense of public duty;

"We will revere and obey the city's laws;

"We will transmit this city not less, but greater, better, and more beautiful than it was transmitted to us."

Those words are more than two thousand years old, but they are still valid today. They are your goals, and they are my goals, and working together, we can achieve them. Thank you.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR JIMMY CARTER

On Foreign Policy

TO MEMBERS OF THE

AMERICAN CHAMBER OF COMMERCE, TOKYO, JAPAN

May 28, 1975

The world in 1975 is a very different world from that which we knew in the 1950s and the 1960s. Recent events have proven that a stable world order for the future cannot be built on a preoccupation with the old strategic issues which have dominated East-West and North-South relations since the end of World War II.

Recently, with the end of the Vietnam conflict, a tremendous burden has been lifted from our shoulders —both an economic burden and one of divisiveness and doubt. Our over-involvement in the internal affairs of Southeast Asian countries is resulting in a mandatory reassessment by the American people of our basic foreign policies. The lessons we have learned can be a basis for dramatic improvements in the prospects for world peace and the solutions for international problems. The people of the United States are inclined to look toward the future and not to dwell on the mistakes of the past.

What are the lessons we have learned? What are our likely decisions about the future?

There is no doubt that our people are wary of any new foreign involvements, but we realize that many such involvements will be necessary.

We have learned that never again should our country become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another nation unless there is a direct and obvious threat to the security of the United States or its people. We must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy. Such involvements are not in the best interests of world peace, and they are almost inherently doomed to failure.

When we embrace one of the contending leadership factions in a country, too often it is the power of the United States, not the support of the people, which keeps that leader in power. Our chosen leader may then resort to repressive force against his own people to keep himself in power.

We have learned the hard way how important it is during times of international stress and turmoil to keep close ties with our allies and friends and to strive for multilateral agreements and solutions to critical problems. I hope that our days of unilateral intervention such as occurred in Vietnam, Cambodia, and the Dominican Republic are over.

Another lesson to be learned is that we cannot impose democracy on another country by force. Also, we cannot buy friends; and it is obvious that other nations resent it if we try. Our interests lie in protecting our national security, in preventing war, in peacefully promoting the principles of human freedom and democracy, and in exemplifying in our foreign policy the true character and attitudes of the American people.

We understand the vital importance of our relationship with our allies. Our friends in Japan, Western Europe and Israel must know that we will keep our promises; yet, they will be reassured not by promises but by tangible actions and regular consultations. It is particularly important that we recement strained relationships with our allies; that will be far easier to accomplish now that our involvement in Vietnam is over. The United States will always honor those commitments which have been made openly by our leaders and with the full knowledge and involvement of the people of our country.

We must never again keep secret the evolution of our foreign policy from the Congress and the Ameri-

can people. They should never again be misled about our options, our commitments, our progress, or our failures. If the President sets the policy openly, reaching agreement among the officers of the government, if the President involves the Congress and the leaders of both parties rather than letting a handful of people plot the policy behind closed doors, then we will avoid costly mistakes and have the support of our citizens in our dealings with other nations. Our commitments will be stronger; abrupt changes will be fewer.

Secretaries of State and Defense and other Cabinet officers should regularly appear before Congress, hopefully in televised sessions, to answer hard questions and to give straight answers. No equivocation nor unwarranted secrecy should be permitted.

What are the other elements of our future foreign policy? This is no time for thoughts of isolationism. We can now turn our attention more effectively toward matters like the world economy, freedom of the seas, environmental quality, food, population, peace, conservation of irreplaceable commodities, and the reduction of world armaments. The intensity of our interrelated problems is rapidly increasing, and better mechanisms for consultation must be established and utilized before these problems become more dangerous.

Interdependence among nations is an unavoidable and increasing factor in our individual lives. We know that even a nation with an economy as strong as ours is affected by errors such as the excessive sale of wheat to Russia in 1973, by commodity boycotts, and by the ebb and tide of economic events in the rest of the world. Our own temporary embargo of soybeans and other oil seeds was a damaging mistake to ourselves and to our friends like Japan. Such mistakes can be avoided in the future only by a commitment to consultation, as exemplified by the Trilateral Commission relationship among North America, Western Europe, and Japan.

The machinery of consultation must be reexamined and some new mechanisms developed. Others need to be abandoned or revitalized. We must strengthen international organizations such as the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund, and the United Nations. Our new commitment to multinational consultation should be reflected in the quality of the representatives we appoint to international agencies.

It is likely in the near future that issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems which have dominated international relations in the world since World War II.

The relationship between Japan and the United States is based on both firm pillars of interest—our mutual security and our great economic relationship.

The security of Japan is vital to the United States, and we will maintain our commitment to Japan's defense. The sensitive question of the level and deployment of military forces here will, of course, be shaped in a continuing dialogue with Japan.

The enormous trade flow of $24 billion a year is the largest overseas commerce the world has ever known. We rely on one another. There is no place for abrupt unilateral decisions which shock the other trading partner. Major foreign policy actions affecting the other must be thoroughly discussed in advance with our friend.

Interdependence means mutual sacrifice. For example, we must cooperate with our allies in reducing our demands for fossil fuel, assist them in the alternative development of energy resources, build up common stockpiles, plan jointly for future crises, and share the oil investments of the OPEC countries.

Among our people there is broad support for continuing the policy of detente with the Soviet Union and China—but not at the expense of close cooperation and consultation with our friends and allies. We must again reorient our foreign policy attention toward our friends. Our recent emphases have all too often involved our adversaries and ignored the interests and needs of our allies. Detente should be pursued on a mutually beneficial basis through a series of sustained, low key and open discussions among the participants—and not just dramatic or secret agreements among two or three national leaders.

Our concern with foreign policy, however, must go beyond avoiding the mistakes of the past, reaffirming our close relationship with our allies, and continuing the process of detente. We must end the continuing proliferation of atomic weapons throughout the world, which is as senseless as a waste of precious resources as it is a mortal danger to humanity. We should refuse to sell nuclear power plants and fuels to nations who do not sign the nuclear nonproliferation treaty or who will not agree to adhere to strict provisions regarding international control of atomic wastes. The establishment of additional nuclear free zones in the world must also be encouraged.

In addition, however, the United States and the Soviet Union have an obligation to deal with the excessive nuclear armaments which we possess. Our ultimate goal should be the reduction of nuclear weapons in all nations to zero. In the meantime, simple, careful and firm public proposals to implement these reductions should be pursued as a prime

national purpose in all our negotiations with nuclear powers—both present and potential. The Vladivostok agreement obviously permits the continued atomic arms race.

We must play a constructive role in the resolution of local conflicts which may lead to major power confrontations. Peace in the Middle East is of vital interest to us all. While peace is the basic responsibility of the nations in the area, the United States must help secure this peace by maintaining the trust of all sides. We must strive to maintain good relations with the Arab countries as well as Israel, and to recognize Arab needs and aspirations as long as they recognize that the major element of a settlement is the guaranteed right of Israel to exist as a viable and peaceful nation. The rights of the Palestinians must also be recognized as part of any final solution.

It is essential that the flow of oil to Japan and Western Europe never be shut off. The United States should not consider unilateral action in the Middle East to assure our own nation's access to Mideast oil. Open or veiled threats of armed intervention do not contribute toward a peaceful settlement of the problems of this tortured region.

The peoples of the developing nations need the aid, technology and knowledge of the developed nations. We need the developed nations as sources for raw materials and as markets for our exports. The world will not be a safe or decent place in which to live, however, if it continues to divide between countries which are increasingly rich and those which are increasingly impoverished.

The knowledge that food, oil, fertilizer and financial credit are vital must not be the cause of international extortion; rather, our interdependence should provide a basis on which continuing international trade agreements can be reached. There is a danger that the recent economic successes of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries cartel will encourage other confrontations by countries possessing scarce raw materials. This could be a serious and self-damaging mistake, resulting in a series of pyramiding and perhaps uncontrollable confrontations, leading to serious damage to the poorer and weaker nations.

A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation; when the countries with capital and technology belligerently confront other nations for the control of raw materials and energy sources; when open and discriminatory trade has become the exception rather than the rule; when there are no established arrangements for supplying the world's food and energy nor for governing, control and development of the seas; and when there are no effective efforts to deal with population explosions or environmental quality.

We must remember that because of our tremendous and continuing economic, military and political strength, the United States has an inevitable role of leadership to play within the community of nations. But our influence and respect should go beyond our military might, our political power, and our economic wealth—and be based on the fact that we are right, and fair, and decent, and honest, and truthful.

Our United States foreign policy must once again reflect the basic ideals of our people and our nation. We must reassert our vital interest in human rights and humanitarian concerns, and we must provide enlightened leadership in the world community. The people of the United States want to be trusted and respected, and we are determined, therefore, to be trustworthy and respectful of others.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE CHICAGO COUNCIL ON

Foreign Relations

March 15, 1976

I am pleased to speak to you today. This council is the oldest, the largest, and the most active organization of its kind in the country. For over fifty years you have helped make this city and this region better informed about a world which the St. Lawrence Seaway now brings to your doorstep. Men like Adlai Stevenson, Paul Douglas, and Frank Knox studied the world through this council and went on to make history.

I want to take this opportunity to explain how I shall approach the problems of foreign policy if I am elected President:

How I see our international situation today;

What our role in the world should be;

How we should approach our relationships with different kinds of international neighbors;

What kinds of policies, and what kind of policy-makers we shall need so that our international relations can be true expressions of the goals and the character of the people of our country.

Our recent foreign policy, I am afraid, has been predicated on a belief that our national and international strength is inevitably deteriorating. I do not accept this premise.

The prime responsibility of any president is to guarantee the security of our nation, with a tough, muscular, 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.

Our foreign policy today is in greater disarray than at any time in recent history.

Our Secretary of State simply does not trust the judgment of the American people, but constantly conducts foreign policy exclusively, personally and in secret. This creates in our country the very divisions which he has lately deplored. Longstanding traditions of a bi-partisan policy and close consultation between the President and Congress have been seriously damaged.

We are losing a tremendous opportunity to reassert our leadership in working with other nations in the cause of peace and progress. The good will our country once enjoyed, based on what we stood for and the willingness of others to follow our example, has been dissipated.

Negotiations with the Soviets on strategic arms are at dead center, while the costly and dangerous buildup of nuclear weapons continues.

The policy of detente, which holds real possibilities for peace, has been conducted in a way that has eroded the public confidence it must have.

The moral heart of our international appeal — as a country which stands for self-determination and free choice — has been weakened. It is obviously un-American to interfere in the free political processes of another nation. It is also un-American to engage in assassinations in time of peace in any country.

The people of other nations have learned, in recent years, that they can sometimes neither trust what our government says nor predict what it will do. They have been hurt and disappointed so many times that they no longer know what to believe about the United States. They want to respect us. They like our people. But our people do not seem to be running our government.

Every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in our dealings with other nations, the American people have been excluded from the process of evolving and consummating our foreign policy. Unnecessary secrecy surrounds the inner workings of our own government, and we have sometimes been deliberately mislead by our leaders.

For many nations, we have two policies: one announced in public, another pursued in secret. In the case of China, we even seem to have two Presidents.

No longer do our leaders talk to the people of the world with the vision, compassion and practical idealism of men like Woodrow Wilson and John Kennedy and Adlai Stevenson.

Our foreign policy is being evolved in secret, and in its full details and nuances, it is probably known to one man only. That man is skilled at negotiation with leaders of other countries but far less concerned with consulting the American people or their representatives in Congress, and far less skilled in marshalling the support of a nation behind an effective foreign policy. Because we have let our foreign

policy be made for us, we have lost something crucial in the way we talk and the way we act toward other peoples of the world.

When our President and Secretary of State speak to the world without the understanding or support of the American people, they speak with an obviously hollow voice.

All of this is a cause of sorrow and pain to Americans, as well as to those who wish us well and look to us for leadership. We ought to be leading the way toward economic progress and social justice and a stronger, more stable international order. They are the principles on which this nation was founded two hundred years ago, by men who believed with Thomas Paine that the "cause of America is the cause of all mankind."

Every successful foreign policy we have had — whether it was the Good Neighbor Policy of President Franklin Roosevelt, The Point Four of President Truman or the Peace Corps and Trade Reform of President Kennedy — was successful because it reflected the best that was in us.

And in every foreign venture that has failed — whether it was Vietnam, Cambodia, Chile, Angola or in the excesses of the CIA — our Government forged ahead without consulting the American people, and did *things* that were contrary to our basic character.

The lesson we draw from recent history is that public understanding and support are now as vital to a successful foreign policy as they are to any domestic program. *No one can make our foreign policy for us as well as we can make it ourselves.*

The role of the United States in the world is changing. For years, we were the only free nation with the military capacity to keep the peace and the resources to insure world economic stability. Japan and Western Europe would never have been able to achieve their economic miracles without our help. Nor could world exports have risen to their present level of three-quarters of a trillion dollars, had not international trade and investment been backed for so long by the American dollar.

These were historic and generous accomplishments, of which we can be justly proud. But we also had the power to make or break regimes with adroit injections of money or arms, and we sometimes used this power in ways that are less commendable.

The world is different now. The old postwar monopolies of economic resource and industrial power have been swept aside and replaced by new structures. The Common Market countries and others like Japan, Mexico, Brazil, and Iran are strong and self-sufficient.

We have learned that we cannot and should not try to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own nation is endangered.

Over 100 new nations have come into being in the past 30 years. A few have wealth, but most exist in bitter poverty. In many, independence has set loose long-suppressed emotions and antagonisms. In Uganda and Angola, Bangladesh and Lebanon — and recently in the United Nations — we have seen what can happen when nationalist and racial passions, or tribal or religious hatreds, are left to run their course.

We cannot isolate ourselves from the forces loose in the world. The question is not whether we take an interest in foreign affairs, but how we do it and why we do it.

In the last few years, I have travelled in foreign lands, and met with many of their leaders. I have served on international bodies, such as the Trilateral Commission, which makes recommendations on some of these problems. I have given thought to the structure of what our foreign policy should be.

There are certain basic principles I believe should guide whatever is done in foreign lands in the name of the United States of America.

First, our policies should be as open and honest and decent and compassionate as the American people themselves are. Our policies should be shaped with the participation of Congress, from the outset, on a bi-partisan basis. And they should emerge from broad and well-informed public debate and participation.

Second, our policies should treat the people of other nations as individuals, with the same dignity and respect as we demand for ourselves. No matter where they live, no matter who they are, the people of other lands are just as concerned with the struggles of daily life as you and I. They work hard, they have families whom they love, they have hopes and dreams and a great deal of pride. And they want to live in peace. Their basic personal motives are the same as ours.

Third, it must be the responsibility of the President to restore the moral authority of this country in its conduct of foreign policy. We should work for peace and the control of arms in everything we do. We should support the humanitarian aspirations of the world's people. Policies that strengthen dictators or create refugees, policies that prolong suffering or postpone racial justice weaken that authority. Policies that encourage economic progress and social justice promote it. In an age when almost all of the world's people are tied together by instant communication, the image of a country, as seen through its policies, has a great deal to do with what it can accomplish through the traditional channels of diplomacy.

Fourth, our policies should be aimed at building a just and peaceful world order, in which every nation can have a constructive role. For too long, our foreign policy has consisted almost entirely of maneuver and manipulation, based on the assumption that the world is a jungle of competing national antagonisms, where military supremacy and economic muscle are the only things that work and where rival powers are balanced against each other to keep the peace.

Exclusive reliance on this strategy is not in keeping with the character of the American people, or with the world as it is today. Balance of power politics may have worked in 1815, or even 1945, but it has a much less significant role in today's world. Of course, there are rivalries — racial, religious, national, some of them bitter. But the need for cooperation, even between rivals, goes deeper than all of them.

Every nation has a stake in stopping the pollution of the seas and the air. Every nation wants to be free from the

threat of blackmail by international terrorists and hijackers. Every nation, including those of OPEC, sits on limited resources of energy that are running out. The vast majority of countries, including the Soviet Union, do not grow enough food to feed their own people. Every nation's economy benefits from expanding two-way trade. And everyone – except perhaps the speculator – has a stake in a fair and reliable international monetary system.

Our diplomatic agenda must also include preventing the spread of nuclear weapons and controlling the flow of narcotics.

In the future, we must turn our attention increasingly towards these common problems of food, energy, environment, and trade. A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation or when there are no established arrangements to deal with population growth or environmental quality. The intensity of these interrelated problems is rapidly increasing and better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

While the American people have had their fill of military adventurism and covert manipulation, we have not retreated into isolationism. We realize that increased anarchy will not only reverse the progress toward peace and stability that we have made, but also strengthen the hand of our adversaries.

That is why we must replace balance of power politics with world order politics. The new challenge to American foreign policy is to take the lead in joining the other nations of the world to build a just and stable international order.

We need to reorder our diplomatic priorities. In recent years, we have paid far more attention to our adversaries than to our friends, and we have been especially neglectful of our neighbors in Latin America.

It is important to continue to seek agreements with the Russians and the Chinese, especially in the control of weapons. Success there could mean life instead of death for millions of people. But the divisions between us are deep. The differences of history and ideology will not go away. It is too much to expect that we can do much more in these relationships than reduce the areas of irritation and conflict and lessen the danger of war.

Our nation should coordinate its policy with our friends – countries like the democratic states of Europe, North America and Japan – those countries who share with us common goals and aspirations. We should work in concert with them. Ours are the fortunate countries of the world. But our continued prosperity and welfare depend upon increased coordination of our policies. If we can work together on goals which reflect the common needs and shared values of our people, we can make our societies the strong and stable inner core around which world cooperation, prosperity and peace can develop.

If we believe in the importance of this effort, we should make some changes. We must both lead and collaborate at the same time. We must consult with others more about our plans. The days of "Nixon Shocks" and "Kissinger Surprises" must end. Our goal should be to act in concert with these countries whenever we can.

And we must have faith in their commitment to democracy. We do not need to preach to the western Europeans about the dangers of communism as the Secretary of State did last week. Their traditions and political good sense are not inferior to ours.

Our policies toward the developing countries also need revision. For years, we have either ignored them or treated them as pawns in the big power chess game. Both approaches were deeply offensive to their people. The oil embargo taught us that even the least developed nation will eventually have control over its own natural resources and that those countries which, alone or together, can control necessary commodities are a force that can neither be ignored or manipulated.

An attitude of neglect and disrespect toward the developing nations of the world is predicated in part on a sense of superiority toward others – a form of racism. This is incompatible with the character of American people.

We need to enlist the cooperation of the developing nations, for when we speak of the tasks of a stable world order, we include preventing the spread of nuclear weapons, policing the world's environment, controlling the flow of narcotics and establishing international protection against acts of terror. If three-quarters of the people of the world do not join in these arrangements, they will not succeed.

Our policies toward the developing world must be tough-minded in the pursuit of our legitimate interests. At the same time, these policies must be patient in the recognition of their legitimate interests which have too often been cast aside.

The developing world has, of course, a few leaders who are implacably hostile to anything the United States does. But the majority of its leaders are moderate men and women who are prepared to work with us. When we ignore the Third World, as we have for so long, the extremists will usually have their way. But if we offer programs based on common interests, we can make common cause with most of their leadership.

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. The time has come to stop taxing poor people in rich countries for the benefit of rich people in poor countries.

In our trade relations with these nations we should join commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar which will assure adequate supplies to consumers, protect our people from inflation, and at the same time stop the fluctuation in prices that can cause such hardship and uncertainty in single-commodity countries.

The burden of economic development is going to be a heavy one. There are many countries which ought to share

it, not only in Europe and Asia but in the Mideast. Today, a greater proportion of royalties from oil can be channelled to the Third World by international institutions. Tomorrow, they can receive a part of the profits from the mining of the seas. The purpose of such development is not to level the economic lot of every person on earth. It is to inject the wealth-creating process into countries that are now stagnant; it is to help developing countries to act in what is their own best interest as well as ours – produce more food, limit population growth, and expand markets, supplies and materials. It is simply to give every country a sufficient stake in the international order so that it feels no need to act as an outlaw. It is to advance the cause of human dignity.

We must also work with the countries of the Communist World. The policy of East-West detente is under attack today because of the way it has been exploited by the Soviet Union. The American people were told it would mean a "generation of peace," at no risk to the nation's vital interests. And yet, in places like Syria or Angola, in activities like offensive missile development, the Soviets seem to be taking advantage of the new relationship to expand their power and influence, and increase the risk of conflict.

I support the objectives of detente but I cannot go along with the way it has been handled by Presidents Nixon and Ford. The Secretary of State has tied its success too closely to his personal reputation. As a result, he is giving up too much and asking for too little. He is trumpeting achievements on paper while failing to insist on them in practice.

The relationship of detente is one of both cooperation and competition, of new kinds of contacts in some areas along with continued hostility in others. In the troubled history of our relationships with the Soviet Union, this is where we have arrived. The benefits of detente must accrue to both sides, or they are worthless. Their mutual advantage must be apparent, or the American people will not support the policy.

To the Soviets, detente is an opportunity to continue the process of world revolution without running the threat of nuclear war. They have said so quite openly, as recently as a month ago at their 25th party congress. To the Soviet Union, with our acquiescence, detente is surface tranquility in Europe within boundaries redefined to their benefit, together with support for wars of national liberation elsewhere. It is having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of it. This is not the road to peace but the bitter deception of the American people.

But while detente must become more reciprocal, I reject the strident and bellicose voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the cold war with the Soviet Union. I believe the American people want to look to the future. They have seen the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam and drawn appropriate lessons for tomorrow. They seek new vistas, not a repetition of old rhetoric and old mistakes.

It is in our interest to try to make detente broader and more reciprocal. Detente can be an instrument for long-term peaceful change within the Communist system, as well as in the rest of the world. We should make it clear that detente requires that the Soviets, as well as the United States, refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have.

The core of detente is the reduction in arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings on 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.

I am not afraid of hard bargaining with the Soviet Union. Hard bargaining will strengthen support for the agreements that can be reached, and will show that we, as well as they, can gain from detente. We can increase the possibility that the fear of war and the burden of arms may be lifted from the shoulders of humanity by the nations that have done the most to place it there.

Our vision must be of a more pluralistic world and not of a communist monolith. We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interests of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world.

We should remember that Eastern Europe is not an area of stability and it will not become such until the Eastern European countries regain their independence and become part of a larger cooperative European framework. I am concerned over the long-range prospects for Rumanian and Yugoslavian independence, and I deplore the recent infliction upon Poland of a constitution that ratifies its status as a Soviet Satellite. We must reiterate to the Soviets that an enduring American-Soviet detente cannot ignore the legitimate aspirations of other nations. We must likewise insist that the Soviet Union and other countries recognize the human rights of all citizens who live within their boundaries, whether they be blacks in Rhodesia, Asians in Uganda, or Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our relations with China are important to world peace and they directly affect the world balance. The United States has a great stake in a nationally independent, secure, and friendly China. The present turmoil in Chinese domestic politics could be exploited by the Soviets to promote a Sino-Soviet reconciliation which might be inimical to international stability and to American interests. I believe that we should explore more actively the possibility of widening American-Chinese trade relations and of further consolidating our political relationships.

The Middle East is a key testing area for our capacity to construct a more cooperative international system. I believe deeply that a Middle East peace settlement is essential to American interests, to Israel's long-range survival and to international cooperation. Without a settlement, the region will become increasingly open to Soviet influence and more susceptible to radical violence. I believe that the United States should insure Israel's security while at the same time encourage both sides to address themselves to the substance of a genuine settlement.

There is no question that both Africa and Latin America have been ignored since the presidencies of John Kennedy and Lyndon Johnson. These areas should become, and indeed will become, increasingly important in the next decade. Our relationships with these must abandon

traditional paternalism. The United States-Brazilian agreement, signed recently by Secretary of State Kissinger on his trip to Latin America, is a good example of our present policy at its worst. Kissinger's remarks during his visit that "there are no two people whose concern for human dignities and for the basic values of man is more profound in day-to-day life than Brazil and the United States" can only be taken as a gratuitous slap in the face of all those Americans who want a foreign policy that embodies our ideals, not subverts them.

If our aim is to construct an international order, we must also work through the international bodies that now exist. On many of these issues, they are the only places where nations regularly come together. We have all been deeply disturbed by the drift of the United Nations and the other international organizations, and by the acrimony and cliquishness that seems to have taken hold. But it would be a mistake to give up on the United Nations.

In the future, we should make multilateral diplomacy a major part of our efforts so that other countries know in advance the importance the United States attaches to their behavior in the United Nations and other international organizations. We should make a major effort at reforming and restructuring the U. N. systems.

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.

A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of the world suffer mass starvation, when the countries with capital and technology belligerently confront other nations for the control of raw materials and energy sources, when open and non-discriminatory trade has become the exception rather than the rule; when there are no established arrangements for supplying the world's food and energy, nor for governing control and development of the seas, and when there are no effective efforts to deal with population explosions or environmental quality. The intensity to these interrelated problems is rapidly increasing and better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

For it is likely that in the future, the issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems which have dominated international relations since 1945.

Finally, I said I would touch on the kind of people we need to administer our foreign policy. I believe that the foreign policy spokesman of our country should be the President, and not the Secretary of State. The conduct of foreign policy should be a sustained process of decision and action, and not a series of television spectaculars. Under the current administration, the agencies which are supposed to conduct our foreign affairs have been largely wasted and demoralized. They must be revitalized and if necessary reorganized — to upgrade their performance, their quality, and the morale of their personnel.

In our search for peace we must call upon the best talent we can find in the universities, the business world, labor, the professions, and the scientific community. Appointments to our U. N. delegation, to other diplomatic posts, and to international conferences should be made exclusively on a merit basis, in contrast to the political patronage that has characterized appointments under this administration.

The world needs a strong America and a confident America. We cannot and should not avoid a role of world leadership. But our leadership should not be based just on military might or economic power or political pressure, but also on truth, justice, equality, and a true representation of the moral character of our people.

For this leadership the world can derive mutual peace and progress.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON THE

Middle East

ELIZABETH, NJ

June 6, 1976

I am very grateful to all of you for giving me the chance to meet this morning with your Mayor, Thomas Dunn, and those clergymen who could come here from throughout the State of New Jersey, and community leaders who have assembled here and others who have a deep interest in the attitude of our nation toward both domestic and foreign affairs.

For the last sixteen and one-half months, I have been campaigning around our country spelling out with increasing amount of attention among people my positions on issues that are important to you and also of importance to other nations in the world. This morning I wanted to take an opportunity, which is a fairly rare occasion for a candidate, to make a major policy statement in written form because if I do become President of this country I want it to be known very clearly what my policy will be throughout my administration representing you as a spokesman for this country, as commander-in-chief of our armed forces, as a shaper and consummator of our foreign policy on the various important subjects of the Middle East.

The land of Israel has always meant a great deal to me. As a boy I read of the prophets and martyrs in the Bible—the same Bible that we all study together. As an American I have admired the State of Israel and how she, like the United States, opened her doors to the homeless and the oppressed.

I've traveled in Israel, visiting Jerusalem and Tel Aviv, the Golan Heights, the West Bank of the Jordan, visiting personally with Mrs. Meir, Prime Minister Rabin, Mr. Abba Eban, Finance Minister Sapir, and other Israeli leaders, as well. I have also had a chance to meet and talk and learn about Israel's people. Like all of you, I have been inspired by the optimism and courage and the hard work that I have seen in Israel.

When I announced my candidacy for the presidency in December of 1974, I said that the time for American intervention in all the problems of the world is past. I also said that we cannot retreat into isolationism. I pointed out that America must fulfill commitments and maintain its strength if world peace is to be preserved. I stressed also that the integrity of Israel as a Jewish State must be preserved.

Three months ago, in a foreign policy speech in Chicago, I said that balance of power politics should be replaced by a new effort to join with other nations to build a just and a stable world order, and that it is unfortunate that our own nation's foreign policy is being made and executed by just one man—the Secretary of State. I stressed my views that in a democracy a nation's foreign policy should be openly arrived at, and should reflect the essential decency and generosity and honesty of the American people.

I want to speak today about how these principles should apply to the situation in the Middle East.

This region has experienced a resurgence of the tension and conflict which has been its lot for decades and, indeed, for centuries. Since 1948, four wars have been fought there. Countless diplomatic initiatives have been launched. Yet peace seems no closer today than it was in 1948, and the possibility of the Middle East touching off a global war is still very much with us.

But even without war, terrorism runs rampant and the burden of arms bleeds the budget of every nation in the area.

Obviously, all people of goodwill can agree it is time —it is far past time—for permanent peace in the Middle East. A peace based on genuine reconciliation and respect between all the concerned nations there.

And in this quest for peace, the American people as well as the people of Israel and the Arab states look to the United States Government to help lead the way.

We have a unique opportunity to contribute to the solution of this conflict if we can maintain the trust of all sides. Our constant and unswerving goal must be the survival of Israel as a Jewish State, and the achievement for all people of a just and lasting settlement. As long as there is no such settlement, there can be no peace. There will only be periods of uneasy truce punctuated by border raids and terrorism while each side builds up forces preparing for another conflict.

A real peace must be based on absolute assurance of Israel's survival and security. As President, I would never yield on that point. The survival of Israel is not just a political issue, it is a moral imperative. That is my deeply held belief and it is the belief that is shared by the vast majority of American people.

Rarely in history have two nations been so closely bound together as the United States and Israel. We are both democratic nations, we both cherish freedom of the press, freedom of expression, and freedom of religion. We are both nations of immigrants. We both share cultural and artistic values. We are friends and we are constant allies. Ours was the first nation to recognize the State of Israel when it was formed and we must remain the first nation to which Israel can turn in time of need.

Just as we must be clear about our commitment for the preservation and well-being of Israel, we must also be clear about our commitment to meaningful and productive Arab-Israeli negotiations.

Only face-to-face communication can build a trust and insure the accommodations that will be needed. By insisting on these kinds of talks, by demonstrating the seriousness of our commitment to a real peace, we can use our influence to prepare all sides for the best way out of this tragic conflict.

I favor early movement toward discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement. I discussed this particular subject with Mrs. Golda Meir within the last few weeks—an early movement towards discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement. A limited settlement, as we have seen in the past, still leaves unresolved the underlying threat to Israel. A general settlement is needed—one which will end the conflict between Israel and its neighbors once and for all.

Now the guide to a general settlement is to be found in United Nations Resolution 242 which has been accepted by Israel and all her neighboring governments. It sets forth two main principles.

One of these is, and I quote, "termination of all claims on states of belligerency and respect for and acknowledgment of the sovereignty, territorial integrity and political independence of every state in the area and their right to live in peace within secured and recognized boundaries free from threats or acts of force." That is a very important commitment, which I repeat has been accepted by Israel and all the surrounding nations.

This is the heart of the matter. Peace in the Middle East depends more than anything else on a basic change of attitude. To be specific, on Arab recognition of the right of Israel to exist as a Jewish State.

Now this change of attitude on the part of the Arab states must be reflected in tangible and concrete actions including first of all the recognition of Israel, which they have not yet done; secondly, diplomatic relations with Israel; third, a peace treaty with Israel; fourth, open frontiers by Israel's neighbors; last, an end to embargo and official hostile propaganda against the State of Israel.

In justifying these steps to their own people, Arab leaders will have to acknowledge that the Arab-Israeli war is over once and for all, that this is not just another armed truce. Without this basic change, no permanent peace is possible.

The other principle of the United Nations Resolution 242 calls for, and again I quote, "withdrawal of Israel's armed forces from territories occupied in the recent conflict." This language leaves open the door for changes in the pre-1967 lines by mutual agreement.

Final borders between Israel and her neighbors should be determined in direct negotiations between the parties and they should not be imposed from outside.

Now this general settlement we all want to see will take time to negotiate and even more time to implement. Its execution would probably come in stages. This would permit both sides to test the durability of the settlement, and it would give either side the opportunity to halt the process if it found that its own interests were being violated.

We are dealing with a deep and bitter legacy of hatred and distrust which can only be dissipated over time. This makes it all the more important now to lift the sights of all concerned by focusing on the long-term goal.

While we work toward peace, we must acknowledge the lessons of the past wars. Progress towards peace requires that Israel remain strong enough, that it can neither be overrun militarily nor isolated in the international community.

Israel has never sought American soldiers and in all of the many discussions I have had with top Israeli leaders in the present and past governments, in the Knesset, in the military, I have never heard an Israeli leader say they might some day need American troops. They seek only the tools to assure their own defense.

We should continue to supply, in the full amount necessary, economic and military aid so that Israel can pursue peace from a position of strength and power.

We should continue to aid Israel's economy which has been strained to the utmost by the burdens of

defense. Mrs. Meir told me that over 40% of Israel's total budget went for defense.

We must also continue to maintain our strong military presence in the Eastern Mediterranean under every circumstance, with a capacity to reinforce that presence powerfully, if need be, in order to deter outside interference in any local conflict.

Now none of this need prevent our maintaining good relations with the Arab states. Avoiding conflict and achieving a settlement is in their interest as well as in Israel's.

In assisting both sides' efforts to achieve such a settlement we not only fulfill our commitments to Israel, we strengthen the strong lines of friendship that have developed between us and the Arab countries over many years. The process of peace will be best served if these relations deepen—not at the expense of Israel—but in the interest of all countries involved. I do not believe it serves the cause of peace if we arm any country beyond its legitimate needs for defense. Local arms races, besides being very costly, increase the chances of war.

I said two months ago that I do not favor supplying offensive weapons to Egypt and I still hold to that view. We should help Egypt obtain housing and jobs and health care for its people, not such offensive weapons as tanks and attack planes and missiles. Investing in Egypt's economic development is an investment in peace.

We have already developed close ties of investment and economic aid with many Arab countries. This shows that economic interdependence can also be a foundation of peace, that Arab people are no less tired of war than Israel, no less weary of its burden and waste, and no less mournful of their dead. Some Arab states have set goals for economic development and education which are worthy of great respect as well as our aid and participation. But their dreams, like the dreams of Israel, will come true only if there is a lasting peace in the Middle East.

Unless there is peace the Arab countries will inevitably become radicalized, more militant, and more susceptible to Soviet re-entry, both politically and militarily. If that happens, Israel will be confronted with an even greater threat than she faces today.

Peace in the Middle East involves difficult, highly emotional issues. In face-to-face negotiations, if all parties will act with fairness and goodwill, the questions of boundary lines and the status of the Palestinians can be resolved.

There is a humanitarian core within the complexities of the Palestinian problem. Too many human beings, denied a sense of hope for the future, are living in makeshift and crowded camps where demagogues and terrorists can feed on their despair. They have rights which must be recognized in any settlement and the Government of Israel has made it clear that it is sensitive to that fact.

But those terrorists who wage war and deny the very concept of Israeli nationhood only undermine their own people's best interests. We must make it clear to the world that there can be no reward for terrorism.

I am going to speak to you of the Soviet Union. We want no clash with the Soviets, but we cannot accept the intervention of its combat forces into any Arab-Israeli conflict. Our naval and air presence in the eastern Mediterranean should make this clear. Mutual non-intervention by the super-powers serves these powers' interests and also the interest of all states in the area.

By the same token, I do not believe that the road to peace can be found by U.S.-Soviet imposition of a settlement. It would, however, be desirable to attain Soviet agreement and support for any settlement, since we do not want to give the Soviet Union any reason or excuse to subvert or undermine that settlement. We seek the support of the Soviet Government in the search for peace, but we will continue that search with or without her support.

We all want to see a Middle East dedicated to human progress rather than sterile hate. We want to see the desert bloom on both sides of the River Jordan, and along the Nile River, and everywhere that human beings hope for better life for themselves and for their children.

We must work towards these goals through international organizations, as well as bilateral negotiations.

This is a difficult time for Israel in the international arena, primarily because of the importance of oil to the world's developing nations. I deplore the actions taken recently in the United States. I reject utterly the charge that Zionism is a form of racism. Indeed, as you know, Zionism has been, in part, a response to racism against the Jewish people. The concept of the State of Israel was born out of centuries of persecution of human beings because they practiced a different religion.

For these 2000 years, the Jewish people in century after century, in country after country, have faced propaganda, attempts at forced conversion, discrimination, pogroms, and death, until the ultimate horror of the holocaust. Surely, the Jewish people are entitled to one place on this earth where they can have their own State on soil given them by God from time immemorial.

For years the vision of Israel has embodied the dream that there could be at least one place on earth where racism could never exist. Now that dream has come true. As a country founded upon religious freedom and dedicated to brotherhood, America has a special responsibility, not only to oppose this baseless charge wherever it appears, but to keep that dream alive.

Finally, I want to say that there have been far too many secret undertakings, covert assurances, contradictory promises, and diplomatic sleights of hand. Maneuvers of this kind are bound to produce, as they have produced, both failure in negotiations and suspicion among the participants.

American policy toward the Middle East and toward every other part of the world should be shaped with the knowledge of the Congress from the outset on a bi-partisan basis. It would emerge from broad and well-informed public debate. Indeed, this is a necessity. In every foreign venture that has failed, whether it was Vietnam, Cambodia, Chile, Angola or in the excesses of the CIA, our government operated secretly, and forged ahead without consulting the American people. It did things that were contrary to our basic character.

Public understanding and support today are as vital to successful foreign policies as they are to any domestic policies. No one can make our foreign policy for us as well as we can make it for ourselves. It should be based not just on military might or economic power or political pressure, but also on truth, justice, equality and a true representation of our moral character and the compassion of our people. A policy of that kind will reflect the best in all of us. And that kind of policy can succeed.

Peace in the Middle East is not an impossible dream. It can be a concrete objective, and it is one to which the next President should direct his efforts from the date he takes office as a matter of the highest priority and the greatest urgency.

If I become your President, I will do everything in my power to make our nation an agent of peace in the Middle East; a just and lasting peace that will be in keeping with the teaching of Scripture, in keeping with our nation's best traditions and in fulfillment of the highest hopes of all mankind.

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Nuclear Energy and World Order

AT THE UNITED NATIONS

May 13, 1976

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Director-General, Captain Cousteau, Ambassador Akhund, Mr. Lehman:

I have a deep personal concern with the subject of this conference today — "Nuclear Energy and World Order."

I have had training as a nuclear engineer, working in the United States Navy on our country's early nuclear submarine program. I learned how nuclear power can be used for peaceful purposes — for propelling ships, for generating electric power and for scientific and medical research. I am acutely aware of its potential — and its dangers. Once I helped in disassembling a damaged nuclear reactor core in an experimental reactor at Chalk River, Canada.

From my experience in the Navy and more recently as Governor of Georgia, I have come to certain basic conclusions about the energy problem. The world has only enough oil to last about 30 to 40 years at the present rate of consumption. It has large coal reserves — with perhaps 200 years of reserves in the United States alone. The United States must shift from oil to coal, taking care about the environmental problems involved in coal production and use. Our country must also maintain strict energy conservation measures, and derive increasing amounts of energy from renewable sources such as the sun.

U.S. dependence on nuclear power should be kept to the minimum necessary to meet our needs. We should apply much stronger safety standards as we regulate its use. And we must be honest with our people concerning its problems and dangers.

I recognize that many other countries of the world do not have the fossil fuel reserves of the United States. With the four-fold increase in the price of oil, many countries have concluded that they have no immediate alternative except to concentrate on nuclear power.

But all of us must recognize that the widespread use of nuclear power brings many risks. Power reactors may malfunction and cause widespread radiological damage, unless stringent safety requirements are met. Radioactive wastes may be a menace to future generations and civilizations, unless they are effectively isolated within the biosphere forever. And terrorists or other criminals may steal plutonium and make weapons to threaten society or its political leaders with nuclear violence, unless strict security measures are developed and implemented to prevent nuclear theft.

Beyond these dangers, there is the fearsome prospect that the spread of nuclear reactors will mean the spread of nuclear weapons to many nations. By 1990, the developing nations alone will produce enough plutonium in their reactors to build 3,000 Hiroshima-size bombs a year, and by the year 2000, worldwide plutonium production may be over 1 million pounds a year — the equivalent of 100,000 bombs a year — about half of it outside of the United States.

The prospect of a nuclear future will be particularly alarming if a large number of nations develop their own national plutonium reprocessing facilities with the capacity to extract plutonium from the spent fuel. Even if such facilities are subject to inspection by the International Atomic Energy Agency and even if the countries controlling them are parties to the Non-Proliferation Treaty, plutonium stockpiles can be converted to atomic weapons at a time of crisis, without fear of effective sanction by the international community.

The reality of this danger was highlighted by the Indian nuclear explosion of May, 1974, which provided a dramatic demonstration that the development of nuclear power gives any country possessing a reprocessing plant a nuclear weapons option. Furthermore, with the maturing of nuclear power in advanced countries, intense competition has developed in the sale of power reactors, which has also included the sale of the most highly sensitive technologies, including reprocessing plants. With the spread of such capabilities, normal events of history — revolutions, terrorist attacks, regional disputes, and dictators — all could take on a nuclear dimension.

Dr. Alvin Weinberg, former Director of the Oak Ridge National Laboratory and one of the most thoughtful nuclear scientists in the United States was properly moved to observe: "We nuclear people have made a Faustian bargain with society. On the one hand we offer an inexhaustible supply of energy, but the price that we

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.

demand of society for this magical energy source is both a vigilance and a longevity of our social institutions that we are quite unaccustomed to."

Nuclear energy must be at the very top of the list of global challenges that call for new forms of international action. The precise form which that action should take is the question to be addressed by this distinguished group of scientists, businessmen, diplomats and government officials during the next four days.

I would not presume to anticipate the outcome of your expert deliberations. But I suggest that new lines of international action should be considered in three main areas:

(1) action to meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy;

(2) action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons; and

(3) action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.

1. *We need new international action to help meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy.*

In recent years, we have had major United Nations conferences on environment, population, food, the oceans and the role of women – with habitat, water, deserts, and science and technology on the schedule for the months and years immediately ahead. These are tentative first steps to deal with global problems on a global basis.

Critics have been disappointed with the lack of immediate results. But they miss an important point: a new world agenda is energing from this process – an agenda of priority problems on which nations must cooperate or abdicate the right to plan a future for the human condition.

The time has come to put the world energy problem on that new agenda. *Let us hold a World Energy Conference* under the auspices of the United Nations to help all nations cope with common energy problems – eliminating energy waste and increasing energy efficiency; reconciling energy needs with environmental quality goals; and shifting away from almost total reliance upon dwindling sources of non-renewable energy to the greatest feasible reliance on renewable sources. In other words, we must move from living off our limited energy capital to living within our energy income.

Such a conference would have to be carefully prepared. Just as the World Food Conference provided us with a world food balance sheet, this conference could give us a world energy balance sheet. Just as the World Food Conference stimulated international cooperation in agricultural research and development, so a world energy conference could stimulate research and development in the field of energy.

Existing international ventures of energy cooperation are not global in scope. The International Energy Agency in Paris includes only some developed non-Communist countries. The Energy Commission of the Conference on International Economic Cooperation does not include countries such as the Soviet Union and China, two great producers and consumers of energy. And the International Energy Institute now under study does not call for a substantial research and development effort.

A World Energy Conference should not simply be a dramatic meeting to highlight a problem which is then forgotten. Rather, it should lead to the creation of new or strengthened institutions to perform the following tasks:

– improving the collection and analysis of worldwide energy information;

– stimulating and coordinating a network of worldwide energy research centers;

– advising countries, particularly in the developing world, on the development of sound national energy policies;

– providing technical assistance to train energy planners and badly needed energy technicians;

– increasing the flow of investment capital from private and public sources into new energy development;

– accelerating research and information exchange on energy conservation.

An international energy effort would also be the occasion to examine seriously and in depth this fundamental question:

Is it really necessary to the welfare of our countries to become dependent upon a nuclear energy economy and if so, how dependent and for what purposes? Surely, there is a moral imperative that demands a worldwide effort to assure that if we travel down the nuclear road we do so with our eyes wide open.

Such a worldwide effort must also provide practical alternatives to the nuclear option. Many countries, particularly in the developing world, are being forced into a premature nuclear commitment because they do not have the knowledge and the means to explore other possibilities. The world's research and development efforts are now focused either on nuclear energy or on the development of a diminishing supply of fossil fuels.

More should be done to help the developing countries develop their oil, gas, and coal resources. But a special effort should be made in the development of small-scale technology that can use renewable sources of energy that are abundant in the developing world – solar heating and cooling, wind energy, and "bioconversion" – an indirect form of solar energy that harnesses the sunlight captured by living plants. Using local labor and materials, developing countries can be helped to produce usable fuel from human and animal wastes, otherwise wasted wood, fast growing plants, and even ocean kelp and algae.

Such measures would be a practical way to help the poorest segment of humanity whose emancipation from grinding poverty must be our continuing concern.

And all countries could reap benefits from worldwide energy cooperation. The costs to any one country would be small if they were shared among nations; the benefits to each of us from a breakthrough to new energy sources anywhere in the world would be great. We have tried international cooperation in food research and it has paid handsome dividends in high-yielding varieties of corn, wheat, rice and sorghum. We could expect similar benefits from worldwide energy cooperation.

The exact institutional formula for coping with energy effectively on a world level will require the most careful

consideration. The IAEA is neither equipped nor staffed to be an adviser on energy across the board; nor would it be desirable to add additional functions that might interfere with its vitally important work on nuclear safeguards and safety.

One possibility to be considered at a World Energy Conference would be the creation of a new World Energy Agency to work side by side with the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. A strengthened International Atomic Energy Agency could focus on assistance and safeguards for nuclear energy; the new agency on research and development of non-nuclear, particularly renewable, sources.

2. *We need new international action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons.*

In the past, public attention has been focused on the problem of controlling the escalation of the strategic nuclear arms race among the superpowers. Far less attention has been given to that of controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons capabilities among an increasing number of nations.

And yet the danger to world peace may be as great, if not greater, if this second effort of control should fail. The more countries that possess nuclear weapons, the greater the risk that nuclear warfare might erupt in local conflicts, and the greater the danger that these could trigger a major nuclear war.

To date, the principal instrument of control has been the Non-Proliferation Treaty which entered into force in 1970. By 1976 ninety-five non-weapons states had ratified the Treaty, including the advanced industrial states of Western Europe, and prospectively of Japan. In so doing, these nations agreed not to develop nuclear weapons or explosives. In addition they agreed to accept international safeguards on all their peaceful nuclear activities, developed by themselves or with outside assistance, under agreements negotiated with the International Atomic Energy Agency — a little appreciated, but an unprecedented step forward, in the development of international law.

Important as this achievement is, it cannot be a source of complacency, particularly under present circumstances. There are still a dozen or more important countries with active nuclear power programs which have not joined the Treaty. Hopefully, some of these may decide to become members; but in the case of several of them, this is unlikely until the underlying tensions behind their decision to maintain a nuclear weapons option are resolved.

The NPT was not conceived of as a one-way street. Under the Treaty, in return for the commitments of the non-weapons states, a major undertaking of the nuclear weapons states (and other nuclear suppliers in a position to do so) was to provide special nuclear power benefits to treaty members, particularly to developing countries.

The advanced countries have not done nearly enough in providing such peaceful benefits to convince the member states that they are better off inside the Treaty than outside.

In fact, recent commercial transactions by some of the supplier countries have conferred special benefits on non-treaty members, thereby largely removing any incentive for such recipients to join the Treaty. They consider themselves better off outside. Furthermore, while individual facilities in these non-treaty countries may be subject to international safeguards, others may not be, and India has demonstrated that such facilities may provide the capability to produce nuclear weapons.

As a further part of the two-way street, there is an obligation by the nuclear weapons states, under the Treaty, to pursue negotiations in good faith to reach agreement to control and reduce the nuclear arms race.

We Americans must be honest about the problems of proliferation of nuclear weapons. Our nuclear deterrent remains an essential element of world order in this era. Nevertheless, by enjoining sovereign nations to forego nuclear weapons, 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, elimination of nuclear arsenals.

Unfortunately, the agreements reached to date have succeeded largely in changing the buildup in strategic arms from a "quantitative" to a "qualitative" arms race. It is time, in the SALT talks, that we complete the stage of agreeing on ceilings and get down to the centerpiece of SALT — the actual negotiation of reductions in strategic forces and measures effectively halting the race in strategic weapons technology. The world is waiting, but not necessarily for long. The longer effective arms reduction is postponed, the more likely it is that other nations will be encouraged to develop their own nuclear capability.

There is one step that can be taken at once. The United States and the Soviet Union should conclude an agreement prohibiting all nuclear explosions for a period of five years, whether they be weapons tests or so-called "peaceful" nuclear explosions, and encourage all other countries to join. At the end of the five year period the agreement can be continued if it serves the interests of the parties.

I am aware of the Soviet objections to a comprehensive treaty that does not allow peaceful nuclear explosions. I also remember, during the Kennedy Administration, when the roles were reversed. Then the U.S. had a similar proposal that permitted large-scale peaceful explosions. However, in order to reach an accord, we withdrew our proposal. Similarly, today, if the U.S. really pushed a comprehensive test ban treaty, I believe the United States and the world community could persuade the USSR to dispose of this issue and accept a comprehensive test ban.

The non-proliferation significance of the superpowers' decision to ban peaceful nuclear explosions would be very great because of its effect on countries who have resisted the Non-Proliferation Treaty's prohibition of "peaceful" nuclear explosives, even though they are indistinguishable from bombs.

A comprehensive test ban would also signal to the world the determination of the signatory states to call a halt to the further development of nuclear weaponry. It has been more than a decade since the Limited Test Ban Treaty entered into force, and well over 100 nations are now parties to that agreement.

It now appears that the United States and the Soviet Union are close to an agreement that would prohibit underground nuclear tests above 150 kilotons. This so-called threshold test ban treaty represents a wholly inadequate step beyond the limited test ban. We can and should do more. Our national vertification capabilities in the last twenty years have advanced to the point where we no longer have to rely on on-site inspection to distinguish between earthquakes and even very small weapons tests.

Finally, such a treaty would not only be a demonstration on the part of the superpowers to agree to limit their own weapons development. As President Kennedy foresaw in 1963, the most important objective of a comprehensive treaty of universal application would be its inhibiting effect on the spread of nuclear weapons by prohibiting tests by every signatory state.

3. *We need new international action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.*

The danger is not so much in the spread of nuclear reactors themselves, for nuclear reactor fuel is not suitable for use directly in the production of nuclear weapons. The far greater danger lies in the spread of facilities for the enrichment of uranium and the reprocessing of spent reactor fuel — because highly enriched uranium can be used to produce weapons; and because plutonium, when separated from the remainder of the spent fuel, can also be used to produce nuclear weapons. Even at the present early stage in the development of the nuclear power industry, enough materials are produced for at least a thousand bombs each year.

Under present international arrangements, peaceful nuclear facilities are sought to be safeguarded against diversion and theft of nuclear materials by the International Atomic Energy Agency in Vienna. As far as reactors are concerned, the international safeguards — which include materials accountancy, surveillance and inspection — provide some assurance that the diversion of a significant amount of fissionable material would be detected, and therefore help to deter diversion.

Of course, as the civilian nuclear power industry expands around the globe, there will be coresponding need to expand and improve the personnel and facilities of the international safeguards system. The United States should fulfill its decade-old promise to put its peaceful nuclear facilities under international safeguards to demonstrate that we too are prepared to accept the same arrangements as the non-weapon states.

That would place substantial additional demands on the safeguards system of the IAEA, and the United States should bear its fair share of the costs of this expansion. It is a price we cannot afford *not* to pay.

But in the field of enrichment and reprocessing, where the primary danger lies, the present international safeguards system cannot provide adequate assurance against the possibility that national enrichment and reprocessing facilities will be misused for military purposes.

The fact is that a reprocessing plant separating the plutonium from spent fuel literally provides a country with direct access to nuclear explosive material.

It has therefore been the consistent policy of the United States over the course of several administrations, not to authorize the sale of either enrichment or reprocessing plants, even with safeguards. Recently, however, some of the other principal suppliers of nuclear equipment have begun to make such sales.

In my judgment, it is absolutely essential to halt the sale of such plants.

Considerations of commercial profit cannot be allowed to prevail over the paramount objective of limiting the spread of nuclear weapons. The heads of government of all the principal supplier nations hopefully will recognize this danger and share this view.

I am not seeking to place any restrictions on the sale of nuclear power reactors which sell for as much as $1 billion per reactor. I believe that all supplier countries are entitled to a fair share of the reactor market. What we must prevent, however, is the sale of small pilot reprocessing plants which sell for only a few million dollars, have no commercial use at present, and can only spread nuclear explosives around the world.

The International Atomic Energy Agency itself, pursuant to the recommendations of the Non-Proliferation Treaty review conference of 1975, is currently engaged in an intensive feasibility study of multinational fuel centers as one way of promoting the safe development of nuclear power by the nations of the world, with enhanced control resulting from multinational participation.

The Agency is also considering other ways to strengthen the protection of explosive material involved in the nuclear fuel cycle. This includes use of the Agency's hitherto unused authority under its charter to establish highly secure repositories for the separated plutonium from non-military facilities, following reprocessing and pending its fabrication into mixed oxide fuel elements as supplementary fuel.

Until such studies are completed, I call on all nations of the world to adopt a voluntary moratorium on the national purchase or sale of enrichment or reprocessing plants. I would hope this moratorium would apply to recently completed agreements.

I do not underestimate the political obstacles in negotiating such a moratorium, but they might be overcome if we do what should have been done many months ago — bring this matter to the attention of the highest political authorities of the supplying countries.

Acceptance of a moratorium would deprive no nation of the ability to meet its nuclear power needs through the purchase of current reactors with guarantees of a long-range supply of enriched uranium. Such assurances must be provided now by those supplier countries possessing the highly expensive facilities currently required for this purpose.

To assure the developing countries of an assured supply of enriched uranium to meet their nuclear power needs without the need for reprocessing, the United States should, in cooperation with other countries, assure an adequate supply of enriched uranium.

We should also give the most serious consideration to the establishment of centralized multinational enrichment facilities involving developing countries' investment participation, in order to provide the assured supply of enriched

uranium. And, if one day as their nuclear programs economically justify use of plutonium as a supplementary fuel, similar centralized multinational reprocessing services could equally provide for an assured supply of mixed oxide fuel elements.

It makes no economic sense to locate national reprocessing facilities in a number of different countries. In view of economies of scale, a single commercial reprocessing facility and a fuel fabrication plant will provide services for about fifty large power reactors. From an economic point of view, multinational facilities serving many countries are obviously desirable. And the co-location of reprocessing, fuel fabrication and fuel storage facilities would reduce the risk of weapons proliferation, theft of plutonium during transport, and environmental contamination.

There is considerable doubt within the United States about the necessity of reprocessing now for plutonium recycle. Furthermore, the licensing of plutonium for such use is currently withheld pending a full scale review by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission of the economic, environmental, and safeguards issues. And there is a further question to be asked: If the United States does not want the developing countries to have commercial plutonium, why should we be permitted to have it under our sovereign control?

Surely this whole matter of plutonium recycle should be examined on an international basis. Since our nation has more experience than others in fuel reprocessing, we should initiate a new multinational program designed to develop experimentally the technology, economics, regulations and safeguards to be associated with plutonium recovery and recycle. The program could be developed by the U.S. in cooperation with the International Atomic Energy Agency.

If the need for plutonium reprocessing is eventually demonstrated – and if mutually satisfactory ground rules for management and operation can be worked out, the first U.S. reprocessing plant which is now nearing completion in Barnwell, South Carolina, could become the first multinational reprocessing facility under the auspices of the International Atomic Energy Agency. Separated plutonium might ultimately be made available to all nations on a reliable, cheap, and non-discriminatory basis after blending with natural uranium to form a low-enriched fuel that is unsuitable for weapons making.

Since the immediate need for plutonium recycle has not yet been demonstrated, the start-up of the plant should certainly be delayed to allow time for the installation of the next generation of materials accounting and physical security equipment which is now under development.

One final observation in this area: We need to cut through the indecision and debate about the long-term storage of radioactive wastes and start doing something about it. The United States could begin by preparing all high-level radioactive wastes currently produced from our military programs for permanent disposal. Waste disposal is a matter on which sound international arrangements will clearly be necessary.

The nuclear situation is serious, but it is not yet desperate. Most nations of the world do *not* want nuclear weapons. They particularly do not want their neighbours to have nuclear weapons, but they understand that they cannot keep the option open for themselves without automatically encouraging their neighbours to "keep options open" or worse.

It is this widespread understanding that it is *not* in the interest of individual nations to "go nuclear" which we must use as the basis of our worldwide efforts to control the atom. We must have negative measures – mutual restraint on the part of the producers and suppliers of nuclear fuel and technology. But these negative measures must be joined to the larger, positive efforts of the non-nuclear weapon states to hold the line against further proliferation.

The recent initiative of the Finnish Government along these lines deserves commendation. The Finns have urged a compact among the purchasers of nuclear fuel and technology to buy only from suppliers who require proper safeguards on their exports.

This proposal would convert the alleged advantages to a supplier of breaking ranks and offering "bargains" in safeguards into a commercial disadvantage. Instead of broadening his market by lowering his dangerous merchandise than if he maintained a common front on safeguards with other suppliers. There would be competition to offer to buyers the safest product at the best price.

Most important, the Finnish proposal would plainly put the full weight of the non-nuclear world into the effort against proliferation. It would make it evident that this struggle is not a struggle by the nuclear "haves" to keep down the nuclear "have-nots"; it would be a common effort by all mankind to control this dangerous technology, to gain time so that our political structures can catch up with sudden, enormous leaps in our technical knowledge, to turn us around and head us in the right direction – toward a world from which nuclear weapons and the threat of nuclear war have been effectively eliminated. That may be a distant goal – but it is the direction in which we must move.

I have talked to you today about the need for new international action in three areas – action to meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy, action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons, and action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous.

Of one thing I am certain – the hour is too late for business as usual, for politics as usual, or for diplomacy as usual. An alliance for survival is needed – transcending regions and ideologies – if we are to assure mankind a safe passage to the twenty-first century.

Every country – and the United States is no exception – is concerned with maintaining its own national security. But a mutual balance of terror is an inadequate foundation upon which to build a peaceful and stable world order. One of the greatest long-term threats to the national security of every country now lies in the disintegration of the international order. Balance of power politics must be supplemented by world order politics if the foreign policies of nations are to be relevant to modern needs.

The political leaders of all nations, whether they work within four year election cycles or five year plans, are under

enormous temptations to promise short-term benefits to their people while passing on the costs to other countries, to future generations, or to our environment. The earth, the atmosphere, the oceans and unborn generations have no political franchise. But short-sighted policies today will lead to insuperable problems tomorrow.

The time has come for political leaders around the world to take a larger view of their obligations, showing a decent respect for posterity, for the needs of other peoples and for the global biosphere.

I believe the American people want this larger kind of leadership.

In the last two years, I have visited virtually every one of our fifty states. I have found our people deeply troubled by recent developments at the United Nations. But they do *not* want to abandon the U. N. – they want us to work harder to make it what it was created to be – not a cockpit for controversy but an instrument for reconciling differences and resolving common problems.

And they want U. N. agencies to demonstrate the same commitment to excellence, impartiality and efficiency they are demanding of their own government.

We want to cooperate – not simply debate. A joint program – whether on nuclear energy or other global problems – is infinitely preferable to sustained and destructive polemics. Our desire for global cooperation is prompted by America's confidence in itself, in our capacity to engage in effective cooperation, and upon the moral imperative that as human beings we must help one another if any of us is to survive on this planet.

The nuclear age, which brings both sword and plowshare from the same source, demands unusual self-discipline of all nations. If we appraoch these problems with both humility and self-discipline, we may yet reconcile our twin goals of energy sufficiency and world order.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Relations Between the World's Democracies

TO THE FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION

NEW YORK CITY

June 23, 1976

For the past seventeen months, as a candidate for President, I have talked and listened to the American people.

It has been an unforgettable experience and an invaluable education. Insofar as my political campaign has been successful, it is because I have learned from our people, and have accurately reflected their concerns, their frustrations, and their desires.

In the area of foreign policy, our people are troubled, confused and sometimes angry. There has been too much emphasis on transient spectaculars and too little on substance. We are deeply concerned, not only by such obvious tragedies as the war in Vietnam, but by the more subtle erosion in the focus and the morality of our foreign policy.

Under the Nixon-Ford Administration, there has evolved a kind of secretive "Lone Ranger" foreign policy—a one-man policy of international adventure. This is not an appropriate policy for America.

We have sometimes tried to play other nations, one against another, instead of organizing free nations to share world responsibility in collective action. We have made highly publicized efforts to woo the major communist powers while neglecting our natural friends and allies. A foreign policy based on secrecy inherently has had to be closely guarded and amoral, and we have had to forego openness, consultation and a constant adherence to fundamental principles and high moral standards.

We have often sought dramatic and surprising immediate results instead of long-term solutions to major problems which required careful planning in consultation with other nations.

We must be strong in our internal resolve in order to be strong leaders abroad. This is not possible when Congress and the American people are kept in the dark. We simply *must* have an *international policy of democratic leadership,* and we must stop trying to play a lonely game of power politics. We must evolve and consummate our foreign policy openly and frankly. There must be bipartisan harmony and collaboration between the President and the Congress, and we must reestablish a spirit of common purpose among democratic nations.

What we seek is for our nation to have a foreign policy that reflects the decency and generosity and common sense of our own people.

We had such a policy more than a hundred years ago and, in our own lifetimes, in the years following the Second World War.

The United Nations, The Marshall Plan, The Bretton Woods Agreement, NATO, Point Four, The OECD, The Japanese Peace Treaty—these were among the historic achievements of a foreign policy directed by courageous presidents, endorsed by bipartisan majorities in Congress, and supported by the American people.

The world since that time has become profoundly different, and the pace of change is accelerating.

There are one hundred new nations and two billion more people.

East-West tensions may be less acute, but the East-West rivalry has become global in scope.

Problems between the developed and developing nations have grown more serious, and in some regions have come to intersect dangerously with the East-West rivalry.

Economic nationalism complicates international relations, and unchecked inflation may again threaten our mutual well-being.

Finally, such global dilemmas as food shortages, overpopulation and poverty call for a common response, in spite of national and philosophical differences.

It is imperative therefore that the United States summon the leadership that can enable the democratic societies of the world once again to lead the way in creating a more just and more stable world order.

In recent weeks, I have made speeches on the subject of nuclear proliferation and also on the Middle East. In the months ahead I will speak out on other subjects of international concern.

Today I would like to speak about our alliances, and ways they can be improved to serve our national interests and the interests of others who seek peace and stability in the world.

We need to consider how—in addition to alliances that were formed in years past for essentially military purposes—we might develop broader arrangements for dealing with such problems as the arms race and world poverty and the allocation of resources.

The time has come for us to seek a partnership between North America, Western Europe and Japan. Our three regions share economic, political and security concerns that make it logical that we should seek ever-increasing unity and understanding.

I have traveled in Japan and Western Europe in

recent years and talked to leaders there. These countries already have a significant world impact; and they are prepared to play even larger global roles in shaping a new international order.

There are those who say that democracy is dying, that we live in the twilight of an era, and that the destiny of modern man is to witness the waning of freedom.

In Japan, Western Europe, Canada, some countries in Latin America, Israel and among many other peoples, I have found not a decline of democracy but a dynamic commitment to its principles.

I might add that I can testify personally to the vigor of the democratic process in our own country.

In addition to cooperation between North America, Japan and Western Europe, there is an equal need for increased unity and consultation between ourselves and such democratic societies as Israel, Australia, New Zealand, and other nations, such as those in this hemisphere, that share our democratic values, as well as many of our political and economic concerns.

There must be more frequent consultations on many levels. We should have periodic summit conferences and occasional meetings of the leaders of all the industrial democracies, as well as frequent cabinet level meetings. In addition, as we do away with one-man diplomacy, we must once again use our entire foreign policy apparatus to reestablish continuing contacts at all levels. Summits are no substitute for the habit of cooperating closely at the working level.

In consultations, both form and substance are important. There is a fundamental difference between informing governments after the fact and actually including them in the process of joint policy making. Our policy makers have in recent years far too often ignored this basic difference. I need only cite the "Nixon Shocks" and the abrupt actions taken by former Treasury Secretary Connally.

We need to recognize also that in recent years our Western European allies have been deeply concerned, and justly so, by our unilateral dealings with the Soviet Union. To the maximum extent possible, our dealings with the communist powers should reflect the combined views of the democracies, and thereby avoid suspicions by our allies that we may be disregarding their interests.

We seek not a condominium of the powerful but a community of the free.

I

There are at least three areas in which the democratic nations can benefit from closer and more creative relations.

First, there are our economic and political affairs.

In the realm of economics, our basic purpose must be to *keep open the international system* in which the exchange of goods, capital, and ideas among nations can continue to expand.

Increased coordination among the industrialized democracies can help avoid the repetition of such episodes as the inflation of 1972-73 and the more recent recessions. Both were made more severe by an excess of expansionist zeal and then of deflationary reaction in North America, Japan and Europe.

Though each country must make its own economic decisions, we need to know more about one another's interests and intentions. We must avoid unilateral acts and we must try not to work at cross-purposes in the pursuit of the same ends. We need not agree on all matters, but we should agree to discuss all matters.

We should continue our efforts to reduce trade barriers among the industrial countries, as one way to combat inflation. The current Tokyo round of multilateral trade negotiations should be pursued to a successful conclusion.

But we must do more. The International Monetary System should be renovated so that it can serve us well for the next quarter of a century. Last January, at a meeting of the leading financial officials, agreement was reached on a new system, based on greater flexibility of exchange rates. There is no prospect of any early return to fixed exchange rates—divergencies in economic experience among nations are too great for that. But we still have much to learn regarding the effective operation of a system of fluctuating exchange rates. We must take steps to avoid large and erratic fluctuations, without impeding the basic monetary adjustments that will be necessary among nations for some years to come. It will be useful to strengthen the role of the International Monetary Fund as a center for observation and guidance of the world economy, keeping track of the interactions among national economies and making recommendations to governments on how best to keep the world economy functioning smoothly.

Beyond economic and political cooperation, we have much to learn from one another. I have been repeatedly impressed by the achievements of the Japanese and the Europeans in their domestic affairs. The Japanese, for example, have one of the lowest unemployment rates and the lowest crime rate of any industrialized nation, and they also seem to suffer less than other urbanized peoples from the modern problem of rootlessness and alienation.

Similarly, we can learn from the European nations about health care, urban planning and mass transportation.

There are many ways that creative alliances can work for a better world. Let me mention just one more, the area of human rights. Many of us have protested the violation of human rights in Russia, and justly so. But such violations are not limited to any one country or one ideology. There are other countries that violate human rights in one way or another—by torture, by political persecution and by racial or religious discrimination.

We and our allies, in a creative partnership, can take the lead in establishing and promoting basic global standards of human rights. We respect the independence of all nations, but by our example, by our utterances, and by the various forms of economic and political persuasion available to us, we can quite surely lessen the injustice in this world.

We must certainly try.

Let me make one other point in the political realm. Democratic processes may in some countries bring to power parties or leaders whose ideologies are not shared by most Americans.

We may not welcome these changes: we will certainly not encourage them. But we must respect the

results of democratic elections and the right of countries to make their own free choice if we are to remain faithful to our own basic ideals. We must learn to live with diversity, and we can continue to cooperate, so long as such political parties respect the democratic process, uphold existing international commitments, and are not subservient to external political direction. The democratic concert of nations should exclude only those who exclude themselves by the rejection of democracy itself.

Our people have now learned the folly of our trying to inject our power into the internal affairs of other nations. It is time that our government learned that lesson too.

II

The second area of increased cooperation among the democracies is that of *mutual security.* Here, however, we must recognize that the Atlantic and Pacific regions have quite different needs and different political sensitivities.

Since the United States is both an Atlantic and a Pacific power, our commitments to the security of Western Europe and of Japan are inseparable from our own security. Without these commitments, and our firm dedication to them, the political fabric of Atlantic and Pacific cooperation would be seriously weakened, and world peace endangered.

As we look to the Pacific region, we see a number of changes and opportunities. Because of potential Sino-Soviet conflict, Russian and Chinese forces are not jointly deployed as our potential adversaries, but confront one another along their common border. Moreover, our withdrawal from the mainland of Southeast Asia has made possible improving relationships between us and the People's Republic of China.

With regard to our primary Pacific ally, Japan, we will maintain our existing security arrangements, so long as that continues to be the wish of the Japanese people and government.

I believe it will be possible to withdraw our ground forces from South Korea on a phased basis over a time span to be determined after consultation with both South Korea and Japan. At the same time, it should be made clear to the South Korean Government that its internal oppression is repugnant to our people, and undermines the support for our commitment there.

We face a more immediate problem in the Atlantic sector of our defense.

The Soviet Union has in recent years strengthened its forces in Central Europe. The Warsaw Pact forces facing NATO today are substantially composed of Soviet combat troops, and these troops have been modernized and reinforced. In the event of war, they are postured for an all-out conflict of short duration and great intensity.

NATO's ground combat forces are largely European. The U.S. provides about one-fifth of the combat element, as well as the strategic umbrella, and without this American commitment Western Europe could not defend itself successfully.

In recent years, new military technology has been developed by both sides, including precision-guided munitions, that are changing the nature of land warfare.

Unfortunately, NATO's arsenal suffers from a lack of standardization, which needlessly increases the cost of NATO, and its strategy too often seems wedded to past plans and concepts. We must not allow our alliance to become an anachronism.

There is, in short, a pressing need for us and our allies to undertake a review of NATO's forces and its strategies in light of the changing military environment.

A comprehensive program to develop, procure, and equip NATO with the more accurate air defense and anti-tank weapons made possible by new technology is needed to increase NATO's defensive power. Agreement on stockpiles and on the prospective length of any potential conflict is necessary. We should also review the structure of NATO reserve forces so they can be committed to combat sooner.

In all of this a major European and joint effort will be required. Our people will not support unilateral American contributions in what must be a truly mutual defense effort.

Even as we review our military posture, we must spare no effort to bring about a reduction of the forces that confront one another in Central Europe.

It is to be hoped that the stalemated mutual force reduction talks in Vienna will soon produce results so that the forces of both sides can be reduced in a manner that impairs the security of neither. The requirement of *balanced* reductions complicates negotiations, but it is an important requirement for the maintenance of security in Europe.

Similarly, in the SALT talks, we must seek significant nuclear disarmament that safeguards the basic interests of both sides.

Let me say something I have often said in recent months. East-West relations will be both cooperative and competitive for a long time to come. We want the competition to be peaceful, and we want the cooperation to increase. *But we will never seek accommodation at the expense of our own national interests or the interests of our allies.*

Our potential adversaries are intelligent people. They respect strength, they respect constancy, they respect candor. They will understand our commitment to our allies. They will listen even more carefully if we and our allies speak with a common resolve.

We must remember, too, that a genuine spirit of cooperation between the democracies and the Soviet Union should extend beyond a negative cessation of hostilities and reach toward joint efforts in dealing with such world problems as agricultural development and the population crisis.

The great challenge we Americans confront is to demonstrate to the Soviet Union that our good will is as great as our strength until, despite all the obstacles, our two nations can achieve new attitudes and new trust, and until in time the terrible burden of the arms race can be lifted from our peoples.

One realistic step would be to recognize that thus far, while we have had certain progress on a bilateral basis, we have continued to confront each other by proxy in various trouble spots. These indirect challenges may be potentially more dangerous than face to face disagreements, and at best they make mock-

ery of the very concept of detente. If we want genuine progress, it must be at every level.

III

Our democracies must also work together more closely in a joint effort to help the hundreds of millions of people on this planet who are living in poverty and despair.

We have all seen the growth of North-South tensions in world affairs, tensions that are often based on legitimate economic grievances. We have seen in the Middle East the juncture of East-West and North-South conflicts and the resultant threat to world peace.

The democratic nations must respond to the challenge of human need on three levels.

First, by widening the opportunities for genuine North-South consultations. The developing nations must not only be the objects of policy, but must participate in shaping it. Without wider consultations we will have sharper confrontations. A good start has been made with the conference in international economic cooperation which should be strengthened and widened.

Secondly, by assisting those nations that are in direst need.

There are many ways the democracies can unite to help shape a more stable and just world order. We can work to lower trade barriers and make a major effort to provide increased support to the international agencies that now make capital available to the Third World.

This will require help from Europe, Japan, North America, and the wealthier members of OPEC for the World Bank's soft-loan affiliate, the International Development Association. The wealthier countries should also support such specialized funds as the new International Fund for Agricultural Development, which will put resources from the oil exporting and developed countries to work in increasing food production in poor countries. We might also seek to institutionalize, under the World Bank, a "World Development Budget," in order to rationalize and coordinate these and other similar efforts.

It is also time for the Soviet Union, which donates only about one-tenth of one percent of its GNP to foreign aid—and mostly for political ends—to act more generously toward global economic development.

I might add, on the subject of foreign aid, that while we are a generous nation we are not a foolish nation, and our people will expect recipient nations to undertake needed reforms to promote their own development. Moreover, all nations must recognize that the North-South relationship is not made easier by one-sided self-righteousness, by the exercise of automatic majorities in world bodies, nor by intolerance for the views or the very existence of other nations.

Third, we and our allies must work together to limit the *flow of arms into the developing world.*

The North-South conflict is in part a security problem. As long as the more powerful nations exploit the less powerful, they will be repaid by terrorism, hatred, and potential violence. Insofar as our policies are selfish, or cynical, or shortsighted, there will inevitably be a day of reckoning.

I am particularly concerned by our nation's role as the world's leading arms salesman. We sold or gave away billions of dollars of arms last year, mostly to developing nations. For example, we are now beginning to export advanced arms to Kenya and Zaire, thereby both fueling the East-West arms race in Africa even while supplanting our own allies—Britain and France—in their relations with these African states. Sometimes we try to justify this unsavory business on the cynical ground that by rationing out the means of violence we can somehow control the world's violence.

The fact is that we cannot have it both ways. *Can* we be both the world's leading champion of peace and the world's leading supplier of the weapons of war? If I become President I will work with our allies, some of whom are also selling arms, and also seek to work with the Soviets, to increase the emphasis on peace and to reduce the commerce in weapons of war.

The challenge we and our allies face with regard to the developing nations is a great one, a constant one, and an exciting one. It is exciting because it calls for so much creativity at so many levels by so many nations and individuals.

I have suggested steps which we and our allies might take toward a more stable and more just world order. I do not pretend to have all the answers. I hope you will help me find them.

What I do have is a strong sense that this country is drifting and must have new leadership and new direction. The time has come for a new thrust of creativity in foreign policy equal to that of the years following the Second World War. The old international institutions no longer suffice. *The time has come for a new architectural effort, with creative initiative by our own nation, with growing cooperation among the industrial democracies its cornerstone, and with peace and justice its constant goal.*

We are in a time of challenge and opportunity. If the values we cherish are to be preserved—the ideals of liberty and dignity and opportunity for all—we shall have to work in the closest collaboration with like-minded nations, seeking, through the strength that follows from collective action, to build an international system that reflects the principles and standards of our national heritage.

The primary purpose of our foreign policy is to create and maintain a world environment within which our great experiment in freedom can survive and flourish.

Ours would be a chilled and lonely world without the other democracies of Europe, Japan, Australia, New Zealand, Israel and this hemisphere with whom we share great common purposes. There is a special relationship among us based not necessarily on a common heritage but on our partnership in great enterprises. Our present limits are not those of natural resources but of ideas and inspirations.

Our first great need is to restore the morale and spirit of the American people.

It is time once again for the world to feel the forward movement and the effervescence of a dynamic and confident United States of America.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

The Economy

AN ECONOMIC POSITION PAPER FOR NOW AND TOMORROW

Released April 22, 1976

A. CURRENT ECONOMIC REALITIES

Under two Republican Administrations we have been faced with the twin evils of intolerably high unemployment and double-digit inflation. We have experienced the worst recession since the 1930's, and the second recession since 1968. Federal deficits reached unheard of peacetime levels.

For eight years we have seen strict wage and price controls suddenly imposed and just as suddenly lifted. We have witnessed two devaluations of our currency. We have had to live with the consequences of the disastrous 1972 grain giveaway to the Soviet Union. We have watched our petroleum prices increase four and five fold. We have seen overly restrictive monetary policies and high interest rates compound our recession and greatly restrict our construction and homebuilding industry.

While inflation has declined from its previous levels, it still remains unacceptably high. It must not be ignored, for it is a critical problem facing the American people.

The major economic problem, however, is unacceptably high unemployment.

The average unemployment rate in 1975 was 8.5 percent. In *no* other postwar year has it averaged as much as 7 percent. Today, unemployment nationally is 7.5 percent – above the annual unemployment rate of any year since the Great Depression, 60 percent higher than 1972 and over 70 percent higher than in 1973. And yet this figure is itself a gross understatement of the true unemployment problem affecting our country. According to the United States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6 percent. In some major cities unemployment has recently run as high as 17 percent. In 1975, every fourth black worker was unemployed and the majority of them were ineligible for unemployment compensation. Teenage black unemployment in some areas approaches the staggering figure of 40 percent. Unemployment among construction workers is over 20 percent.

Even these figures are deceptive for they do not include the hundreds of thousands of people who have been left out of the labor market due to their frustrating inability to find a job.

These are not simply figures. They represent an incalculable cost both to the unemployed and the nation. They represent the crushed dreams of millions of Americans ready and willing to work. All Americans should be free to have a decent job.

Unemployment not only affects the unemployed, it affects all Americans.

It has been estimated by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress that each one percent of excess unemployment adds at least $4 to $5 billion in direct costs for unemployment compensation, food stamps and welfare.

The federal government is currently spending between $17 and $20 billion for unemployment compensation and an additional $2 to $3 billion on food stamps due to unemployment. The present rate of unemployment compensation due to the recession is now more than four times the cost of two years ago.

High levels of unemployment mean increased crime and violence, lost output, a lower level of productivity, and less investment in new capital.

B. GOALS FOR THE PRESENT AND FUTURE

1. We must develop a *sensible, steady, fair, humane, well-coordinated* national economic policy.

My economic policy will be based on the true complexities of the present economic picture and the time required for any government policy to work its will. It will

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.

avoid the shocks and surprises, the on-again, off-again programs and rapid policy changes which have characterized the last 8 years. It must be geared to alleviating inequities in our economic system and avoiding the harsh and arbitrary actions which paralyze those in our society least able to help themselves.

2. We must give *highest priority to achieving a steady reduction of unemployment and achieving full employment* – a job for everyone who wishes one – as rapidly as possible, *while reducing inflation.*

3. We must insure a *better coordination between fiscal and monetary policy* and insure a closer working relationship between the Executive Branch and the Federal Reserve Board.

4. Given the present state of the economy, we must pursue an expansionary fiscal and monetary program in the near future, with some budget deficits if necessary, to reduce unemployment more rapidly. But with a progressively managed economy we can attain a *balanced budget within the context of full employment* by 1979, prior to the end of the first term of my Administration. A balanced budget can be achieved without reducing social expenditures, through the increased revenues which will be realized by higher incomes in a fully employed economy. Under my administration, economic growth will generate additional revenues, avoiding the need for recession-related expenditures, and insuring both budget stability and an adequate level of public spending. *I favor balanced budgets over the business cycle.*

5. We need *better economic coordination and planning* through an expanded role for the Council of Economic Advisors, to aid government, business, and industry in making intelligent decisions.

C. A NATIONAL ECONOMIC POLICY

1. *Rapid Reduction in Unemployment*

I am committed to a dramatic reduction in unemployment, without reviving double-digit inflation, through the following means:

(a) We must have an expansionary fiscal and monetary policy for the coming fiscal year to stimulate demand and production. This should not mean spending simply for the sake of spending without specific aims and goals, but policy aimed at curbing both cyclical and structural unemployment, creating useful jobs, and solving national needs.

Such an expansionary policy can reduce unemployment without reigniting inflation, because our economy is presently performing so far under capacity.

(b) *Specific stimulation should be given to private industry to hire the unemployed* through

– an increased commitment by the federal government to fund the cost of on-the-job training by business.

– encouragement by the federal government to employers to retain workers during cyclical downturns including reforming the unemployment compensation tax paid by employers.

– public programs to train people for work in private sector jobs.

– incentives specifically geared to encourage employment, including incentives to employers who employ young persons and persons with lengthy records of unemployment, and to those employers who provide flexible hours of employment and flexible jobs, to aid access by women to the market place.

(c) To *supplement our effort* to have private industry play a greater role, the *federal government* has an obligation to provide *funds for useful and productive public employment* of those whom private business cannot or will not hire. Therefore we should:

– create meaningful public jobs in the cities and neighborhoods of the unemployed adjusted to solving our national needs in construction, repair, maintenance, and rehabilitation of facilities such as railroad roadbeds, housing, and the environment.

– improve manpower training and vocational education programs to increase the employability of the hard-core unemployed.

– provide 800,000 summer youth jobs.

– pass an accelerated public works program targeted to areas of specific national needs.

– double the CETA (Comprehensive Educational Training Act) program from 300,000 to 600,000 jobs, and provide counter-cyclical aid to cities with high unemployment.

– develop more efficient employment services to provide better job counseling and to match openings to individuals, and consider establishment of special Youth Employment Services especially geared to finding jobs for our young people.

2. *Curbing Inflation*

There are far more humane and economically sound solutions to curbing inflation than enforced recession, unemployment, monetary restrictions and high interest rates. Much of the inflation we have experienced was not caused by excessive demand but rather by dollar devaluations, external factors such as the increasing oil prices, and by world-wide increases in food and basic material prices. Furthermore, high interest costs, and the final dismantling of the controls program in 1974 contributed to high inflation rates.

A constant effort to battle inflation must accompany our drive for full employment. This requires measures to:

– increase the productive capabilities of our economy, with increased attention to the *supply side* of our economy, now virtually ignored.

– insure a steady flow of jobs and output.

— increase productivity so that growth does not become overly inflationary.
— insure a better relationship between the availability of goods and the demand for them. In the agricultural area, the federal government should assume the primary responsibility for establishing reserves of key foodstuffs in the United States.
— reform those governmental regulations, such as the rule prohibiting a truck from carrying goods on its return haul, which unnecessarily add to prices.
— strictly enforce anti-trust and consumer protection legislation and increase free-market competition.
— adopt a monetary policy which encourages lower interest rates and the availability of investment capital at reasonable costs.
— effectively monitor excessive price and wage increases in specific sectors of the economy.

While I oppose across-the-board permanent wage and price controls, I favor standby controls which the President can apply selectively. I do *not* presently see the need for the use of such standby authority.

3. *Better Coordination Between Fiscal and Monetary Policy*

Fiscal policy covers generally the taxing and spending decisions of the federal government. Fiscal policy formulation is centered in the federal government in the Congress, the Congressional Budget Office, the Office of Management and Budget, the Department of the Treasury, and the Presidency. Monetary policy on the other hand, concerns decisions having to do with money supply, interest rates, and credit market conditions, with policy formulation centered in the Federal Reserve System, and to a lesser extent, the Federal Home Loan Bank Board, the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, the Comptroller of the Currency, and the Congress.

We cannot expect to achieve balanced growth through stable, sensible, and fair economic policies if fiscal and monetary policy are not better coordinated.

I propose the following steps:

— While the Federal Reserve Board should maintain its independence from the Executive Branch, it is important that throughout a President's term he have a Chairman of the Federal Reserve whose economic views are compatible with his own. Currently the Chairman is appointed for a four year term but not necessarily coterminous with the President's term. To insure greater compatibility between the President and the Federal Reserve Chairman, I propose that, *subject to Senate confirmation, the President be given the power to appoint his own Chairman of the Federal Reserve who would serve a term coterminous with the President's.*

— To insure better planning both by government and private industry, the Federal Reserve Board through its Open Market Committee should be held responsible for stating its objectives more clearly and publicly.
— The Federal Reserve Board should be required to submit to Congress and the public a credit market report on past monetary conditions, together with a short term and a year's outlook. This report, included as part of the Economic Report of the President to Congress, should be a definitive annual statement about monetary affairs. It should be the joint responsibility of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to show in their consolidated report that their policies are mutually consistent and, if not, to demonstrate why they are not consistent.

4. *More Effective Budgeting*

The budget of the federal government should serve as an instrument of both economic and general governmental policy. It is a statement of the influences of governmental expenditures on the allocation of resources, an instrument for carrying out economic stabilization policy, and a demonstration of our nation's priorities. It should serve as a guide to and a means of encouraging efficient and economical functioning of government.

For the current fiscal year, an expansionary fiscal and monetary policy is necessary. Social needs and the need for economic stabilization may require from time to time unbalancing of the budget. But, we should strive toward budget balance, *within an environment of full employment,* over the long term. The surplus years should balance the deficits. *I therefore call for balanced budgets over the business cycle.* This can be achieved by 1979. At the present time, there is a clear need for stimulus in order to return the economy to full employment.

A vigorous employment policy will enlarge the revenue base and will likewise reduce recession-related expenditures and will therefore do much to reduce the present deficit. My commitment is to achieve and maintain a high level of real growth in the economy, which will permit us to have a balanced budget without reductions in important social programs and within the context of full employment.

Budget planning within the federal government is presently on a yearly basis. This *does not allow sufficient long-range planning.* Therefore, we should budget on a three year cycle, rolling forward three years at a time when the budget is prepared each year. The first year ahead in a three year cycle should be the usual budget, the next two would be only first approximations, in an initial attempt to smooth out the budgeting process. The budget for the two latter years will normally be revised in the next year when a new third year is added for an initial approximation. The long range budgeting practice will roll forward from year to year.

The three year rolling budget technique will permit businessmen and public officials to do a much better job in laying out their own plans, relying less on the need for more elaborate proposals of comprehensive planning. Moreover, as we did while I was Governor of Georgia, we should predict the costs of programs over a long period of time so that proper long-term budgeting can be done. Also, we should attempt to implement new approaches to government budgeting, such as zero-base budgeting, which insure that there is quality control over government programs and that these programs accomplish their intended end.

5. *Better Government Planning and Management*

I am a firm advocate of the private enterprise system. I am a businessman myself. I *oppose* the type of rigid, bureaucratic centralized planning characteristics of communist countries.

But better general economic planning by government is essential to insure a stable, sensible, fair, humane economic policy, without the roller-coaster dips and curves we have faced in the last eight years. Government must plan ahead just like any business. Planning is widely practiced in the private sector of the American economy.

I favor coordinated government planning to attack problems of structural unemployment, inflation, environmental deterioration, exaggeration of economic inequalities, natural resource limitations, and obstructions to the operation of the free market system.

I believe that this type of planning can be carried out without the creation of a new bureaucracy, but rather through well defined extensions of existing bodies and techniques. I propose that the role of the present Council of Economic Advisors, established under the Full Employment Act of 1946, be expanded to include this type of coordinated planning and to deal with long range problems of individual sectors fitted into an overall economic plan for the economy as a whole, as well as to deal with considerations of supply, distribution, and performance in individual industries.

Many of the economic shocks of the past eight years have come on the supply side of the economy. It is imperative that we study ways to anticipate problems rather than await their arrival and once again react with ill-conceived solutions in a crisis environment. Such detailed studies will be an important new task for the Council of Economic Advisors.

We have no discernible economic goals. Goals must be established and clearly enunciated, so that our programs can be developed within a planned, orderly context.

The techniques I have outlined can and will be carried out within the framework of our present private enterprise system, free market institutions and administrative structures.

D. CONCLUSION

We live in an interdependent world. Problems of inflation, unemployment, scarcity of resources, and economic stabilization cannot be accomplished without a coordinated effort with the rest of the world. We will cooperate with our allies and trading partners, and others to develop long-term solutions to our common problems.

Beware of the person who promises economic wonders of high prosperity, with no problems of inflation, unemployment, or maldistribution of income. This country faces serious economic problems, but they can be dealt with in an honest, sensible way if we set our sights on a steady path towards full employment, wary of inflationary pressures, and geared towards meeting national needs. Exhortation and gimmickry are not going to be very helpful in meeting the economic challenges, but good, sensible policies are. Straightforward, uncomplicated programs aiming at expanding production, getting all segments of the unemployed back to work, insuring the smooth working of our private enterprise system, and introducing reforms in the spirit of more economic equity are the kinds of policies this country needs.

It will be my responsibility as President to insure that this nation has a coherent, coordinated, short and long term economic policy, geared to achieve full employment, low rates of inflation, and cyclically balanced budgets. To these I am committed. These goals will be achieved.

JIMMY CARTER'S ECONOMIC TASK FORCE

LAWRENCE R. KLEIN, President-elect American Economic Association; Benjamin Franklin Professor of Economics and Finance, University of Pennsylvania

CAROLYN SHAW BELL, Katherine Coman Professor of Economics, Wellesley College; Executive Committee, American Economic Association

RICHARD COOPER, Professor of Economics and former Provost, Yale University; former Deputy Assistant Secretary of State

JULIUS EDELSTEIN, Dean, City University of New York; Dean of Urban Policy and Programs, Graduate Center, City University of New York

MARTIN FELDSTEIN, Professor of Economics, Harvard University

ALBERT T. SOMERS, Vice President and Chief Economist, The Conference Board

LESTER THUROW, Professor of Economics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

MICHAEL WACHTER, Associate Professor of Economics, University of Pennsylvania

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Energy

TO THE WASHINGTON PRESS CLUB

WASHINGTON, D.C.

July 11, 1975

A year and a half after the humiliating Arab oil embargo, with its devastating and continuing consequences for our economy, we still have the same national energy policy, developed and maintained by the oil and electric power companies:

"Use more and more energy and pay higher and higher prices for it."

Misleading presidential statements about "Project Independence" merely lulled our people into a false sense of continued trust in inept and timid leaders—while our dependence on foreign oil lunged upward. Our foreign oil bill is now a staggering $25 billion per year, compared to 1/10th of this amount in 1970. We may have to import 60% of our petroleum needs by 1985, compared to about 40% now and only 25% in 1973.

We have bowed quietly and subserviently to the Arab nations who tried to blackmail our great country just a few months ago. Apparently we are now prepared to continue this obeisance as a permanent and increasingly mandatory national posture.

The political leadership of this country has failed to fulfill its responsibilities to the American people. The U.S. Congress has been unable to arouse itself from lethargy and devise a meaningful alternative to President Ford's disastrous energy proposal. The administration's energy policy is easy to describe—a large and sudden increase in the price of oil.

If the Gerald Ford/oil industry policy is implemented:

—It will add from 3% to 4% to the nation's inflation rate;

—It will cost us consumers more than $30 billion annually, draining this purchasing power away from other parts of the floundering economy and increasing already disgraceful levels of unemployment;

—It will encourage additional O.P.E.C. oil price hikes;

—It will aggravate fuel distribution inequities and further damage New England and other areas which are especially dependent on declining oil sources;

—It will not result in decreased consumption equivalent to price increases because of inelastic demand for certain petroleum products;

—It will punish those with low and middle incomes, while the rich continue to waste all the fuel they want;

—It will continue a callous disregard for environmental quality.

In short, the Ford/oil industry energy policy is merely another example of letting the average American pay for the politicians' mistakes.

Our nation must act! Neither the world economy nor the American economy can withstand a continuation of present circumstances and trends. In effect, the O.P.E.C. cartel has levied a $60 billion annual excise tax on the rest of the world, an amount more than equal to the stock value of all international oil companies in the world. By 1980, the liquid capital of oil exporting nations will comprise more than half the world's monetary reserves, creating the potential for devastating world economic damage or threats of damage.

The economies of weak developing countries with no major exportable products are being destroyed, and all major oil importing nations are in effect operating on credit to the oil producing countries. The lives of developed nations depend on adequate energy

supplies, and any drastic reduction in fuel consumption could not be tolerated.

The private oil industry, primarily U.S. companies, has lost control of its former supplies and transmission systems in the Persian Gulf area. The O.P.E.C. nations now unilaterally set prices and export quotas and determine the identity of customers.

So long as the oil cartel remains intact, there is little likelihood of any voluntary price reduction for petroleum. These countries recognize their present strategic advantages and have no intention of relinquishing them.

The oil exporting countries do have a major investment in the soundness of the worldwide economic system. They also see more clearly the importance of close ties to the free nations of the world.

Recognizing these facts, it is imperative that we move boldly toward a goal of reasonable national energy self-sufficiency.

"Project Independence" is a farce.

No substantive steps have been taken to assure that we will be independent of doubtful foreign oil supplies any time in the foreseeable future.

We have no long-range national energy policy.

We are forming no binding alliances with other consuming nations to coordinate research and development efforts or to share future oil shortages.

Our foreign policy toward the O.P.E.C. countries is not designed to force reasonable price reductions.

We have begun no new concerted effort to develop additional types of energy supplies.

There is no major energy conservation program in this country.

No substantial increase in stockpiling facilities is under way.

One of the greatest failures of national leadership in recent history is the failure to convince the American people of the urgency of our energy problems. Americans are willing to make sacrifices if they understand the reason for them and if they believe the sacrifices are fairly distributed. Right now, they think the working people are making the sacrifices while the big shots get richer. They are right.

Imports of oil from foreign countries should be kept at manageable levels. Increasing amounts of oil from remaining domestic and foreign sources should then be channeled into permanent storage facilities until we have accumulated at least an additional thirty-day reserve supply.

If it becomes necessary, petroleum supplies available for consumption should be allocated by the Federal Energy Agency to the individual states, using the basic formula developed through experience during the winter of the oil embargo. The fifty state energy offices have been preparing for the past year and a half to distribute oil locally to meet greatest needs.

If patriotic appeals and strict conservation measures prove to be inadequate to control consumption, standby excise taxes should be available to the President for selective imposition on petroleum products.

The price of all domestic oil should be kept below that of O.P.E.C. oil.

We should place the importation of oil under government authority to allow strict control of purchases and the auctioning of purchase orders.

To insure maximum protection for our consumers during the coming years of increasing energy shortages, antitrust laws must be rigidly enforced. Maximum disclosure of data on reserve supplies and production must be required.

Utility rates are up more than 40% in two years, while electric power plants operate at about 35% efficiency. Electric power companies demand that their present customers finance huge construction projects while less than half of their present capacity is utilized. Some of their projections for annual power consumption increases are double even those of the Federal Energy Agency administrator!

Unnecessary electrical power plant construction should be stopped.

Advertising at consumers' expense to encourage increased consumption of electricity should be prohibited.

Rate structures which discourage total consumption and peak power demand should be established.

Additional major reductions in oil and natural gas consumption must be planned. Recently, government geologists slashed estimates of our off-shore oil reserves by 80% and cut total national reserve estimates by 50%! We have at most a 35-year supply of oil in the world at present rates of consumption.

In a few years, oil and gas will be too valuable to be used for heating buildings or for generating electricity. Almost all of our dwindling supplies will be required for the production of fertilizer and petrochemicals and for transportation.

We must act now to reduce the enormous waste of these valuable products by legal mandate, patriotic appeals, and improved technology. If we do not, the inevitable pressures of rising prices and dwindling sup-

plies will continue to disrupt our economy and punish those who can least afford it.

The potential for dramatic energy conservation remains untapped. Our energy waste in transportation is 85%, in generating electricity 65%. Overall, 50% of our energy is wasted.

When we had to cut our own wood to burn on the farm, we did not waste it.

We need:

—Mandated motor vehicle efficiency standards;

—Rigid enforcement of speed laws;

—Efficiency standards and labeling for electrical appliances;

—Mandatory improvements in building insulation;

—Regulatory agency decisions that reduce fuel consumption;

—And similar conservation measures.

The federal government with all its agencies should set a national example in the conservation and proper use of energy.

In spite of growing dependence on other sources of power, fossil fuels will still be our main source of energy in the year 2000 A.D., with fusion power still in the developmental stage.

A major immediate need is to derive maximum energy from coal, while preserving environmental quality. We have at least a 200-year supply of clean and accessible coal. Power companies and industries must shift to this source of energy, and we must invest in improved mining efficiency, cleaner combustion technology, and a better transportation system for moving coal to its end users.

Substantial increases in coal production and utilization will only come with a stable regulatory climate. The recent veto of the strip mining bill merely prolonged the present climate of uncertainty.

We must also exploit the potential of solar energy in the construction of new homes and offices.

During the past few years, two-thirds of all federal research and development 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 environmental problems, our excessive emphasis on this project should be severely reduced and converted to a long-term, possibly multinational effort.

Our atomic plants use light water with enriched uranium. Some countries, such as Canada, use heavy water with more plentiful natural uranium. Our government's fuel enrichment plants can 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.

The private commercial production of enriched nuclear fuel should be approached with extreme caution.

In addition to the physical damage and human suffering which would result from a nuclear disaster, the economic, psychological and political consequences to our energy supply system would be more devastating than a total Middle East oil embargo. It is imperative that such an accident be prevented. We must maintain the strictest possible safety standards for our atomic power plants, and be completely honest with our people concerning any problems or dangers.

For instance, nuclear reactors should be located below ground level. The power plants should be housed in sealed buildings within which permanent heavy vacuums are maintained. Plants should be located in sparsely populated areas and only after consultation with state and local officials. Designs should be standardized. And a full-time federal employee, with full authority to shut down the plant in case of any operational abnormality, should always be present in control rooms.

An international conference on energy research and development would benefit all nations. It is ridiculous for each of us to go our own separate way and replicate research projects which are being completed in other nations. There is certainly enough challenge and responsibility to go around in energy fields involving: Thermonuclear reaction containment; liquefaction and gassification of coal; use of solid wastes; breeder reactors; electric propulsion and rail development; building insulation and design; heating, cooling and electrical power generation from solar energy; electric power transmission; industrial plant efficiency; automobile engine design; coal mining techniques; efficiency of petroleum extraction from the ground; materials recycling; long-range benefit:cost ratio for energy sources; and nuclear waste disposal. Of course, private industry will be expected to continue research in many of these and other fields of interest, often in cooperation with government.

It is unlikely that we will be totally "independent" of oil imports during this century. Our present trend is still toward increasing dependence on oil supplies from overseas.

Although our country is still the world's largest pro-

ducer of oil, domestic production is decreasing inexorably by about 6% annually—despite a substantial increase in exploration efforts.

It is certainly not possible or necessary for us to be energy independent by 1985, but we should be free from possible blackmail or economic disaster which might be caused by another boycott. Our reserves should be developed, imports reduced to manageable levels, standby rationing procedures evolved and authorized, and aggressive economic reprisals should await any boycotting oil supplier.

With proper national planning and determined execution of those plans, energy conservation can be completely compatible with environmental quality and with economic well-being. Lower energy consumption inherently reduces world pollution levels. The elimination of waste and technological advances into new energy fields can result in enhanced employment opportunities without any reduction in the quality of our economic lives.

Unless we conserve energy drastically, make a major shift to coal, and substantially increase our use of solar energy, we will have no alternative to greatly increased dependence on nuclear power. As one who is intimately familiar with the problems and potential of nuclear energy, I believe we must make every effort to keep that dependence to a minimum.

We need strong leadership, and we need it now!

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

LAW DAY

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA, ATHENS, GA

May 4, 1974

Senator Kennedy, distinguished fellow Georgians, friends of the Law School of Georgia and personal friends of mine:

Sometimes even a distinguished jurist on the Supreme Court doesn't know all of the background on acceptances of invitations. As a matter of fact, my wife was influential in this particular acceptance, but my son was even more influential. This was really an acceptance to repair my ego. There was established in 1969 the L.Q.C. Lamar Society. I was involved in the establishment of it, and I think a lot of it. As Governor of Georgia I was invited this year, along with two distinguished Americans, to make a speech at the annual meeting which is going on now.

I found out when the program was prepared that Senator Kennedy was to speak last night. They charged $10 to attend the occasion. Senator William Brock from Tennessee is speaking to the Lamar Society at noon today. I found out that they charged $7.50 for this occasion. I spoke yesterday at noon, and I asked the Lamar Society officials, at the last moment, how much they were charging to come to the luncheon yesterday. They said they weren't charging anything. I said, "You mean they don't even have to pay for the lunch?" They said, "No, we're providing the lunch free."

So, when my son Jack came and said, "Daddy, I think more of you than you thought I did; I'm paying $7.00 for two tickets to the luncheon," I figured that a $3.50 lunch ticket would salvage part of my ego and that's really why I'm here today.

I'm not qualified to talk to you about law, because in addition to being a peanut farmer, I'm an engineer and a nuclear physicist, not a lawyer. I was planning, really, to talk to you more today about politics and the interrelationship of political affairs and law, than about what I'm actually going to speak on. But after Senator Kennedy's delightful and very fine response to political questions during his speech, and after his analysis of the Watergate problems, I stopped at a room on the way, while he had his press conference, and I changed my speech notes.

My own interest in the criminal justice system is very deep and heartfelt. Not having studied law, I've had to learn the hard way. I read a lot and listen a lot. One of the sources for my understanding about the proper application of criminal justice and the system of equity is from reading Reinhold Niebuhr, one of his books that Bill Gunter gave me quite a number of years ago. The other source of my understanding about what's right and wrong in this society is from a friend of mine, a poet named Bob Dylan. After listening to his records about "The Ballad of Hattie Carol" and "Like a Rolling Stone" and "The Times, They Are a Changing," I've learned to appreciate the dynamism of change in a modern society.

I grew up as a landowner's son. But, I don't think I ever realized the proper interrelationship between the landowner and those who worked on a farm until I heard Dylan's record, "I Ain't Gonna Work on Maggie's Farm No More." So I come here speaking to you today about your subject with a base for my information founded on Reinhold Niebuhr and Bob Dylan.

One of the things that Niebuhr says is that the sad duty of the political system is to establish justice in a sinful world. He goes on to say that there's no way to establish or maintain justice without law; that the laws are constantly changing to stabilize the social equilibrium of the forces and counterforces of a dynamic society, and that the law in its totality is an expression of the structure of government.

Well, as a farmer who has now been in office for three years, I've seen firsthand the inadequacy of my own comprehension of what government ought to do for its people. I've had a constant learning process, sometimes from lawyers, sometimes from practical experience, sometimes from failures and mistakes that have been pointed out to me after they were made.

I had lunch this week with the members of the Judicial Selection Committee, and they were talking about a consent search warrant. I said I didn't know what a consent search warrant was. They said, "Well, that's when two policemen go to a house. One of them goes to the front door and knocks on it, and the other one runs around to the back door and yells 'come in'." I have to admit that as Governor, quite often I search for ways to bring about my own hopes; not quite so stringently testing the law as that, but with a similar motivation.

I would like to talk to you for a few moments about some of the practical aspects of being a governor who is still deeply concerned about the inadequacies of a system of which it is obvious that you're so patently proud.

I have refrained completely from making any judicial appointments on the basis of political support or other factors, and have chosen, in every instance, Superior Court judges, quite often State judges, Appellate Court

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.

judges, on the basis of merit analysis by a highly competent, open, qualified group of distinguished Georgians. I'm proud of this.

We've now established in the Georgia Constitution a qualifications commission, which for the first time can hear complaints from average citizens about the performance in office of judges and can investigate those complaints and with the status and the force of the Georgia Constitution behind them can remove a judge from office or take other corrective steps.

We've now passed a Constitutional amendment, which is waiting for the citizenry to approve, that establishes a uniform Criminal Justice Court System in this state so that the affairs of the judiciary can be more orderly structured, so that work loads can be balanced and so that over a period of time there might be an additional factor of equity, which quite often does not exist now because of the wide disparity among the different courts of Georgia.

We passed this year a judge sentencing bill for non-capital cases with a review procedure. I've had presented to me, by members of the Pardons and Paroles Board, an analysis of some of the sentences given to people by the Superior Court judges of this state, which grieved me deeply and shocked me as a layman. I believe that over a period of time, the fact that a group of other judges can review and comment on the sentences meted out in the different portions of Georgia will bring some more equity to the system.

We have finally eliminated the unsworn statement law in Georgia—the last state to do it.

This year, we analyzed in depth the structure of the drug penalties in this state. I believe in the future there will be a clear understanding of the seriousness of different crimes relating to drugs. We've finally been able to get through the legislature a law that removes alcoholism or drunkenness as a criminal offense. When this law goes into effect next year, I think it will create a new sense of compassion and concern and justice for the roughly 150,000 alcoholics in Georgia, many of whom escape the consequences of what has been a crime because of some social or economic prominence, and will remove a very heavy load from the criminal justice system.

In our prisons, which in the past have been a disgrace to Georgia, we've tried to make substantive changes in the quality of those who administer them and to put a new realm of understanding and hope and compassion into the administration of that portion of the system of justice. Ninety-five percent of those who are presently incarcerated in prisons will be returned to be our neighbors. And now the thrust of the entire program, as initiated under Ellis MacDougall and now continued under Dr. Ault, is to try to discern in the soul of each convicted and sentenced person redeeming features that can be enhanced. We plan a career for that person to be pursued while he is in prison. I believe that the early data that we have on recidivism rates indicates the efficacy of what we've done.

The GBI, which was formerly a matter of great concern to all those who were interested in law enforcement, has now been substantially changed—for the better. I would put it up now in quality against the FBI, the Secret Service or any other crime control organization in this Nation.

Well, does that mean that everything is all right?

It doesn't to me.

I don't know exactly how to say this, but I was thinking just a few moments ago about some of the things that are of deep concern to me as Governor. As a scientist, I was working constantly, along with almost everyone who professes that dedication of life, to probe, probe every day of my life for constant change for the better. It's completely anachronistic in the makeup of a nuclear physicist or an engineer or scientist to be satisfied with what we've got, or to rest on the laurels of past accomplishments. It's the nature of the profession.

As a farmer, the same motivation persists. Every farmer that I know of, who is worth his salt or who's just average, is ahead of the experiment stations and the research agronomist in finding better ways, changing ways to plant, cultivate, utilize herbicides, gather, cure, sell farm products. The competition for innovation is tremendous, equivalent to the realm of nuclear physics even.

In my opinion, it's different in the case of lawyers. And maybe this is a circumstance that is so inherently true that it can't be changed.

I'm a Sunday School teacher, and I've always known that the structure of law is founded on the Christian ethic that you shall love the Lord your God and your neighbor as yourself—a very high and perfect standard. We all know the fallibility of man, and the contentions in society, as described by Reinhold Niebuhr and many others, don't permit us to achieve perfection. We do strive for equality, but not with a fervent and daily commitment. In general, the powerful and the influential in our society shape the laws and have a great influence on the legislature or the Congress. This creates a reluctance to change because the powerful and the influential have carved out for themselves or have inherited a privileged position in society, of wealth or social prominence or higher education or opportunity for the future. Quite often, those circumstances are circumvented at a very early age because college students, particularly undergraduates, don't have any commitment to the preservation of the way things are. But later, as their interrelationship with the present circumstances grows, they also become committed to approaching change very, very slowly and very, very cautiously, and there's a commitment to the status quo.

I remember when I was a child, I lived on a farm about three miles from Plains, and we didn't have electricity or running water. We lived on the railroad—Seaboard Coastline railroad. Like all farm boys I had a flip, a sling shot. They had stabilized the railroad bed with little white round rocks, which I used for ammunition. I would go out frequently to the railroad and gather the most perfectly shaped rocks of proper size. I always had a few in my pockets, and I had others cached away around the farm, so that they would be convenient if I ran out of my pocket supply.

One day I was leaving the railroad track with my pockets full of rocks and hands full of rocks, and my mother came out on the front porch—this is not a very interesting story but it illustrates a point—and she had in her hands a plate full of cookies that she had just baked for me. She called me, I am sure with love in her heart, and said, "Jimmy, I've baked some cookies for

you." I remember very distinctly walking up to her and standing there for 15 or 20 seconds, in honest doubt about whether I should drop those rocks which were worthless and take the cookies that my mother had prepared for me, which between her and me were very valuable.

Quite often, we have the same inclination in our everyday lives. We don't recognize that change can sometimes be very beneficial, although we fear it. Anyone who lives in the South looks back on the last 15 to 20 years with some degree of embarrassment, including myself. To think about going back to a county unit system, which deliberately cheated for generations certain white voters of this state, is almost inconceivable. To revert back or to forego the one man, one vote principle, we would now consider to be a horrible violation of the basic principles of justice and equality and fairness and equity.

The first speech I ever made in the Georgia Senate, representing the most conservative district in Georgia, was concerning the abolition of 30 questions that we had so proudly evolved as a subterfuge to keep black citizens from voting and which we used with a great deal of smirking and pride for decades or generations ever since the War between the States—questions that nobody could answer in this room, but which were applied to every black citizen that came to the Sumter County Courthouse or Webster County Courthouse and said, "I want to vote." I spoke in that chamber, fearful of the news media reporting it back home, but overwhelmed with a commitment to the abolition of that artificial barrier to the rights of an American citizen. I remember the thing that I used in my speech, that a black pencil salesman on the outer door of the Sumter County Courthouse could make a better judgment about who ought to be sheriff than two highly educated professors at Georgia Southwestern College.

Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., who was perhaps despised by many in this room because he shook up our social structure that benefited us, and demanded simply that black citizens be treated the same as white citizens, wasn't greeted with approbation and accolades by the Georgia Bar Association or the Alabama Bar Association. He was greeted with horror. Still, once that change was made, a very simple but difficult change, no one in his right mind would want to go back to circumstances prior to that juncture in the development of our Nation's society.

I don't want to go on and on, I'm part of it. But, the point I want to make to you is that we still have a long way to go. In every age or every year, we have a tendency to believe that we've come so far now, that there's no way to improve the present system. I'm sure when the Wright Brothers flew at Kitty Hawk, they felt that was the ultimate in transportation. When the first atomic bomb was exploded, that was the ultimate development in nuclear physics, and so forth.

Well, we haven't reached the ultimate. But who's going to search the heart and the soul of an organization like yours or a law school or state or nation and say, "What can we still do to restore equity and justice or to preserve it or to enhance it in this society?"

You know, I'm not afraid to make the change. I don't have anything to lose. But, as a farmer I'm not qualified to assess the characteristics of the 91 hundred inmates in the Georgia prisons, 50% of whom ought not to be there. They ought to be on probation or under some other supervision and assess what the results of previous court rulings might bring to bear on their lives.

I was in the Governor's Mansion for two years, enjoying the services of a very fine cook, who was a prisoner—a woman. One day she came to me, after she got over her two years of timidity, and said, "Governor, I would like to borrow $250.00 from you."

I said, "I'm not sure that a lawyer would be worth that much."

She said, "I don't want to hire a lawyer, I want to pay the judge."

I thought it was a ridiculous statement for her; I felt that she was ignorant. But I found out she wasn't. She had been sentenced by a Superior Court judge in the state, who still serves, to seven years or $750. She had raised, early in her prison career, $500. I didn't lend her the money, but I had Bill Harper, my legal aide, look into it. He found the circumstances were true. She was quickly released under a recent court ruling that had come down in the last few years.

I was down on the coast this weekend. I was approached by a woman who asked me to come by her home. I went by, and she showed me documents that indicated that her illiterate mother, who had a son in jail, had gone to the County Surveyor in that region and had borrowed $225 to get her son out of jail. She had a letter from the Justice of the Peace that showed that her mother had made a mark on a blank sheet of paper. They paid off the $225, and she has the receipts to show it. Then they started a 5-year program trying to get back the paper she signed, without success. They went to court. The lawyer that had originally advised her to sign the paper showed up as the attorney for the surveyor. She had put up 50 acres of land near the county seat as security. When she got to court she found that instead of signing a security deed, that she had signed a warranty deed. That case has already been appealed to the Supreme Court, and she lost.

Well, I know that the technicalities of the law that would permit that are probably justifiable. She didn't have a good lawyer. My heart feels and cries out that something ought to be analyzed, not just about the structure of government, judicial qualification councils and judicial appointment committees and eliminating the unsworn statement—those things are important. But they don't reach the crux of the point—that now we assign punishment to fit the criminal and not the crime.

You can go in the prisons of Georgia, and I don't know, it may be that poor people are the only ones who commit crimes, but I do know they are the only ones who serve prison sentences. When Ellis MacDougall first went to Reidsville, he found people that had been in solitary confinement for ten years. We now have 500 misdemeanants in the Georgia prison system.

Well, I don't know the theory of law, but there is one other point I want to make, just for your own consideration. I think we've made great progress in the Pardons and Paroles Board since I've been in office and since we've reorganized the government. We have five very enlightened people there now. And on occasion they go out to the prison system to interview the inmates, to decide whether or not they are worthy to be released after they serve one-third of their sentence. I think

most jurors and most judges feel that, when they give the sentence, they know that after a third of the sentence has gone by, they will be eligible for careful consideration. Just think for a moment about your own son or your own father or your own daughter being in prison, having served seven years of a lifetime term and being considered for a release. Don't you think that they ought to be examined and that the Pardons and Paroles Board ought to look them in the eye and ask them a question and, if they are turned down, ought to give them some substantive reason why they are not released and what they can do to correct their defect?

I do.

I think it's just as important at their time for consideration of early release as it is even when they are sentenced. But, I don't know how to bring about that change.

We had an ethics bill in the State Legislature this year. Half of it passed—to require an accounting for contributions during a campaign—but the part that applied to people after the campaign failed. We couldn't get through a requirement for revelation of payments or gifts to officeholders after they are in office.

The largest force against that ethics bill was the lawyers.

Some of you here tried to help get a consumer protection package passed without success.

The regulatory agencies in Washington are made up, not of people to regulate industries, but of representatives of the industries that are regulated. Is that fair and right and equitable? I don't think so.

I'm only going to serve four years as governor, as you know. I think that's enough. I enjoy it, but I think I've done all I can in the Governor's office. I see the lobbyists in the State Capitol filling the halls on occasions. Good people, competent people, the most pleasant, personable, extroverted citizens of Georgia. Those are the characteristics that are required for a lobbyist. They represent good folks. But I tell you that when a lobbyist goes to represent the Peanut Warehousemen's Association of the Southeast, which I belong to, which I helped to organize, they go there to represent the peanut warehouseman. They don't go there to represent the customers of the peanut warehouseman.

When the State Chamber of Commerce lobbyists go there, they go there to represent the businessman of Georgia. They don't go there to represent the customers of the businessman of Georgia.

When your own organization is interested in some legislation there in the Capitol, they're interested in the welfare or prerogatives or authority of the lawyers. They are not there to represent in any sort of exclusive way the client of the lawyers.

The American Medical Association and its Georgia equivalent—they represent the doctors, who are fine people. But they certainly don't represent the patients of a doctor.

As an elected governor, I feel that responsibility; but I also know that my qualifications are slight compared to the doctors or the lawyers or the teachers, to determine what's best for the client or the patient or the school child.

This bothers me; and I know that if there was a commitment on the part of the cumulative group of attorneys in this State, to search with a degree of commitment and fervency, to eliminate many of the inequities that I've just described that I thought of this morning, our state could be transformed in the attitude of its people toward the government.

Senator Kennedy described the malaise that exists in this Nation, and it does.

In closing, I'd like to just illustrate the point by something that came to mind this morning when I was talking to Senator Kennedy about his trip to Russia.

When I was about 12 years old, I liked to read, and I had a school principal, named Miss Julia Coleman, Judge Marshall knows her. She forced me pretty much to read, read, read, classical books. She would give me a gold star when I read ten and a silver star when I read five.

One day, she called me in and she said, "Jimmy, I think it's time for you to read **War and Peace."** I was completely relieved because I thought it was a book about cowboys and Indians.

Well, I went to the library and checked it out, and it was 1,415 pages thick, I think, written by Tolstoy, as you know, about Napoleon's entry into Russia in the 1812-1815 era. He had never been defeated and he was sure he could win, but he underestimated the severity of the Russian winter and the peasants' love for their land.

To make a long story short, the next spring he retreated in defeat. The course of history was changed; it probably affected our own lives.

The point of the book is, and what Tolstoy points out in the epilogue is, that he didn't write the book about Napoleon or the Czar of Russia or even the generals, except in a rare occasion. He wrote it about the students and the housewives and the barbers and the farmers and the privates in the Army. And the point of the book is that the course of human events, even the greatest historical events, are not determined by the leaders of a nation or a state, like presidents or governors or senators. They are controlled by the combined wisdom and courage and commitment and discernment and unselfishness and compassion and love and idealism of the common ordinary people. If that was true in the case of Russia where they had a czar or France where they had an emperor, how much more true is it in our own case where the Constitution charges us with a direct responsibility for determining what our government is and ought to be?

Well, I've read parts of the embarrassing transcripts, and I've seen the proud statement of a former attorney general, who protected his boss, and now brags on the fact that he tiptoed through a mine field and came out "clean." I can't imagine somebody like Thomas Jefferson tiptoeing through a mine field on the technicalities of the law, and then bragging about being clean afterwards.

I think our people demand more than that. I believe that everyone in this room who is in a position of responsibility as a preserver of the law in its purest form ought to remember the oath that Thomas Jefferson and others took when they practically signed their own death warrant, writing the Declaration of Independence —to preserve justice and equity and freedom and fairness, they pledged their lives, their fortunes and their sacred honor.

Thank you very much.

CITIES

URBAN POLICY FOR THE REMAINDER OF THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

April 1, 1976

I believe that the future of America is directly dependent upon the good health and welfare of our nation's cities.

Our cities and metropolitan areas are the main staff of life for the majority of Americans. They provide entertainment, employment, and housing to millions of Americans. They are the repository of our nation's cultural institutions, art galleries and symphonies. They are the economic backbone for an increasingly urbanized nation.

But our cities are facing a crisis which can no longer be avoided. Many of our major cities are rapidly losing population to smaller communities and to surrounding suburbs. It is often the affluent who have fled, robbing cities of needed talent and depriving them of a needed tax base — leaving the poor, who are more heavily dependent on local government services. Just as people have left many of our urban areas, so too have businesses and jobs, thereby further eroding the municipal tax base, and making it more difficult for localities to provide for the increased demand in municipal services. New forms of revenue have not been made available to localities to replace their shrinking tax base. Crime and the fear of crime in our major urban areas keep people out of our cities and make our cities places of forboding rather than hope.

This disturbing but very real trend has come at a time of both tremendously escalating municipal costs and a rising demand for municipal services.

If our cities fail, so too will our country.

Yet in the face of these enormous problems, our nation's cities have been faced with eight years of self-styled "benign neglect" by the Nixon-Ford Administrations. In fact, the Republican policy toward our cities has been nothing short of conscious, willful indifference to the plight of urban America. They have promised new programs, such as Special and General Revenue Sharing, to supplement existing programs, and have instead used them to supplant current programs and to lower the level of assistance to cities. Two Republican presidents have purely and simply written off our cities. They have pitted our suburbs and rural areas against our major urban communities. Their policy has been divisive and disastrous. Rather than launch an attack on our cities' problems, they have declared a war against the cities of America. Our cities have needed help and the Republicans have turned their backs. Our cities needed financial assistance and the Republicans have given them crumbs. Our cities needed attention and the Republicans have given them neglect.

Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Republican Administration cut $4.5 billion in urban programs and another $7 billion in programs to aid the poor, the untrained, the unemployed, and the medically indigent, all at a time when municipalities lost $3.3 billion in purchasing power.

Our country has no urban policy or defined urban goals, and so we have floundered from one ineffective and uncoordinated program to another. Hopes have been raised only to be dashed on the rocks of despair when promise after promise has been forgotten.

We need a coordinated urban policy from a federal government committed to develop a creative partnership with our cities for the survival of urban America in the balance of the twentieth century. This policy must recognize that our urban problems stem from a variety of factors, each of which must be dealt with directly and forcefully — problems of urban decay, declining tax base, crime, unemployment, lack of urban parks and open spaces.

1. *Human Needs and Unemployment*

We must begin our urban policy by recognizing the *human needs* of the individuals who live in our cities. The essential building block of our urban policy must be the provision of a job for each person capable of holding gainful employment. I believe every person has a right to a job.

But our urban unemployment rate is intolerable. This high level of unemployment means less tax revenue for cities, increased social tension, and higher crime rates.

Unemployment nationally is at 7.6% — at least twice the acceptable level. And yet this figure, to which the Republican Administration in Washington points with pride, is itself a gross understatement of the unemployment problem afflicting our major urban areas. According to the United

States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6%, as opposed to 8% for non-metropolitan areas and 5.3% for the suburbs. For the poverty areas of cities that figure is 13.8%, and for blacks in these areas it is 17.6%. Overall, center city black unemployment is at the rate of 14.1%. In 1975, every fourth black worker was unemployed and the majority of them were ineligible for unemployment compensation. Teenage black unemployment in some areas of America approaches the staggering figure of 40%.

Indeed, even these figures are deceptive of the real problem, for they do not include the literally hundreds of thousands of people who have gotten completely out of the labor market due to their frustrating inability to find a job.

These are not simply figures. They represent the crushed dreams of millions of Americans ready and willing to work. The 9.6% unemployment rate in our central cities alone means 2.6 million people out of work.

To make dramatic improvement in the unacceptably high unemployment rate, I propose a creative, joint program of incentives to private employers and a public needs employment program funded by the federal government. Such programs will more than repay our investment, not simply in making taxpayers of those now on unemployment insurance or on welfare, and not simply in generating additional revenues to the federal, state and local governments—although each 1% decline in the unemployment rate will produce $13 to $16 billion in federal tax revenues; but rather in restoring the pride and self-respect of those too long ignored and cast aside.

These incentives to private industry should be geared directly toward the provision of jobs for the unemployed, and toward encouraging industry to locate new plants and offices in urban areas where unemployment is high.

Almost 85% of America's workers depend on private industry for jobs. Most of the unemployed will depend on recovery in the private sector for renewed job opportunities. We cannot afford to ignore well-designed, job-related incentives to private industry to help reduce unemployment. These should take the form of:

– assistance to local governments for urban economic planning and development and to help local governments encourage private industry to invest in our cities

– an expanded employment credit to give businesses benefits for each person they hire who had been previously unemployed

– as a further stimulant to private industry to hire the unemployed, the federal government should increase its commitment to fund the cost of on-the-job training by business

– encouragement by the federal government to private industry to prevent layoffs.

However, private industry cannot meet the task alone! The federal government has an obligation to provide funds for public employment of those who private business cannot and will not hire.

The Nixon-Ford Administration's priorities have been grossly misplaced. While adequate unemployment compensation is necessary to protect the unemployed, their best protection comes from jobs. It has been estimated by the Joint Economic Committee of Congress that each 1% of excess unemployment adds at least $4 to $5 billion in direct costs for unemployment compensation, food stamps, and welfare.

It is an incredible misallocation of resources for the current Administration to spend between $17 and $20 billion dollars for unemployment compensation and an additional $2 to $3 billion on food stamps due to unemployment, and yet only $2½ billion on public job programs.

Certainly, money is better spent in creating useful public service jobs to take people off of welfare, food stamps and unemployment compensation and make them tax contributors; yet we are asked to tolerate a policy adjusted to support an unacceptable status quo. Therefore, I propose the following program of public employment as an investment in human beings, an investment which will more than be repaid in uplifted lives, increased tax revenues, and decreased welfare, food stamp and unemployment compensation payments:

– *an expansion of the CETA program* (Comprehensive Education and Training Act) through which direct federal funds for municipal and other jobs have been provided, with administrative responsibility resting at the local level. This program was originally designed merely to combat structural unemployment in a period of mild recession. It cannot now deal with the cyclical unemployment caused by the severe recession we are in, without an expanded and strengthened role. It now provides only 300,000 jobs. It should produce at least twice this number of jobs. The 9.6% unemployment rate in our central cities could be markedly reduced by the provision of 600,000 to 700,000 public jobs to the unemployed for useful jobs near their homes, in the cities.

– *Passage of an accelerated public works program* which would help create new jobs, 80% in the private sector and many for our young people. Federal and state governments should also share responsibility for guaranteeing bonds for public works projects.

– *Funds for 800,000 summer youth jobs should be provided.*

– Perhaps the biggest single problem created for the poor who live in our cities is the current welfare system and *Welfare Reform* would be the single most important action we could take.

As currently constituted, it is a crazy quilt of regulations administered by a bloated bureaucracy. It is wasteful to the taxpayers of America, demeaning to the recipients, discourages work, and encourages the breakup of families. The system lumps together dissimilar categories of poor people, and differs greatly in its benefits and regulations from state to state. It is time that we broke the welfare and poverty cycle of our poor people. My recommendations are designed to satisfy the following goals: (a) we must recognize there are three distinct categories of poor people – the unemployable poor, the employable but jobless poor, and the working poor; (b) no person on welfare should receive more than the working poor can earn at their jobs; (c) strong work incentives, job creation and job training should be provided for those on welfare able to

work; (d) family stability should be encouraged by assuring that no family's financial situation will be harmed by the breadwinner remaining with his dependents; (e) efforts should be made to have fathers who abandon their family be forced to continue support; (f) the welfare system should be streamlined and simplified, with a small bureaucracy, less paperwork, fewer regulations, improved coordination and reduced local disparities; (g) persons who are legitimately on welfare should be treated with respect and dignity.

To achieve these goals, I propose a single, fair, uniform, national program of welfare benefits funded in substantial part by the federal government, with strong work and job incentives for the poor who are employable and with income supplementation for the working poor, and with earnings tied so as to encourage employment, so that it would never be more profitable to stay on welfare than to work. No one able to work, except mothers with preschool children, should be continued on the welfare rolls unless job training and a job were accepted. The welfare burden should be removed from a city such as New York City with all welfare costs being paid by the federal and state governments.

The programs I have proposed will be repaid by increased tax revenues generated by the reduction in unemployment from the jobs programs I have outlined. Their financing can be assisted by the $5 billion to $8 billion streamlining of the defense budget I have suggested.

2. *Assisting the Fiscal Needs of the Cities*

While we must concentrate on the human needs of those who live in our cities throughout the country, we cannot ignore the fiscal plight of our cities themselves. A recent authoritative survey showed their plight dramatically. Of the cities and towns surveyed, a total of 122 began the last fiscal year with combined surpluses of $340 million and ended the fiscal year with a combined $40 million deficit. This has forced cities to raise local taxes an estimated total of $1.5 billion, or to cut back on important municipal services. These local governments experiencing fiscal difficulties, which in no way are of their own making, had to eliminate 100,000 municipal positions last year alone. The deflationary adjustments state and local governments together were required to make removed $8 billion from the economy last year.

To alleviate the suffering our cities are being put through by high inflation and continued recession, I propose the following:

– *Counter-cyclical assistance* to deal with the fiscal needs of cities particularly hard hit by the recession. The $2 billion of counter-cyclical assistance recently vetoed by Mr. Ford is essential and affordable. In fact, it is within the budget resolutions adopted by Congress. This aid will go to create new jobs and to maintain current levels of service in hard-pressed cities. Without such aid cities like Detroit may have to cut back essential services.

– *Extension of the Revenue Sharing program* for five years, with an increase in the annual funding level to compensate for inflation and with enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill to guarantee against discriminatory use of the funds. I will study whether the Revenue Sharing formula should be amended in the future to place greater emphasis on areas of high need. Moreover, I believe that all Revenue Sharing funds should go to the cities and that localities should be allowed to use these funds for defraying the costs of health, social services, and education, which they are currently forbidden to do.

– *Study the creation of a Federal Municipalities Securities Insurance Corporation* to assist localities in marketing their Bonds and in reducing interest levels now faced by municipalities, and to provide voluntary self-controls in municipal financial matters.

3. *Solving the Physical Needs of Our Cities*

The problems our cities are facing are compounded by their often deteriorating physical state.

Housing has deteriorated enormously and new housing is often unaffordable. 1975 was the worst this nation has had in 29 years in the number of housing units constructed. Although this nation in 1968 legislated a goal of 2½ million new housing units per year to meet current needs, last year witnessed the construction of barely 1 million units. At the same time, housing costs have risen so rapidly that only three in twenty (15%) of America's families can afford new housing. What is likewise appalling is that the government now has thousands upon thousands of abandoned and unused dwellings under its control and deteriorating due to bureaucratic inaction, while tens of thousands seek better shelter.

Likewise, our municipal transportation systems are faced with difficult times. For the last twenty years, more than $230 billion has been spent at all levels of government for our highway system. From 1967 to 1975, expenditures from the Highway Trust Fund averaged about $4 billion per year; the Administration's 1977 fiscal year budget outlay for highways reached $7.1 billion. From the end of World War II until the middle sixties, no new major transit construction project was undertaken with public support. Cities were faced with deteriorating buses and subways and inadequate maintenance programs and schedules. Public transit ridership declined from almost 19 billion in 1946 to only 5.5 billion in 1973, reflecting the poor state of our municipal transit systems. By the end of 1974, operating deficits for existing public transit systems nationally were expected to have reached $900 million. We cannot continue to allow our mass transit systems to languish and remain a stepchild. Mass transit, if properly supported, can serve as the means to encourage increased use of our cities as places of business, shopping, and entertainment; and can correspondingly enable urban workers to reach jobs located in the suburbs; all with less pollution and energy use than the present system of transportation.

To help solve the physical problems confronting our cities, I submit the following agenda on housing which will, in addition, put back to work hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and fulfill our national

commitment to build 2½ million housing units per year:
— direct federal subsidies and low interest loans to encourage the construction of low and middle class housing.
— expansion of the highly successful Section 202 housing program for the elderly, which utilizes direct federal subsidies.
— greatly increased emphasis on the rehabilitation of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods; certain of our publicly created jobs could be used to assist such rehabilitation. It is time for urban conservation instead of urban destruction.
— greater attention to the role of local communities under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.
— greater effort to direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing.
— prohibiting the practice of red-lining by federally sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA, which has had the effect of depriving certain areas of the necessary mortgage funds to upgrade themselves, and encouraging more loans for housing and rehabilitation to the poor.

In tandem with this program, I propose to bolster our urban transportation system by:
— substantially increasing the amount of money available from the Highway Trust Fund for public mass transportation;
— studying the feasibility of creating a total transportation fund for all modes of transportation;
— changing the current restrictive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities so that greater amounts can be used as operating subsidies, and opposing the Administration's efforts to reduce federal operating subsidies.
— achieving better highway utilization through such means as reserved lanes for bus and car pools.
— reorganizing and revitalizing our nation's railroads.

4. *Meeting the Total Needs of Our Cities: Crime Control, Parks, the Arts.*

Our cities can never be what we desire so long as they remain an undesirable environment in which to live and raise a family. Yet too frequently, the specter of crime destroys this environment and creates an atmosphere in which each person lives in fear of the actions of others. All Americans have the right to live free from the fear of crime.

Surveys indicate that large percentages of the American public fear to come into the cities or walk their neighborhood streets at night. Crime has now become a suburban and rural problem as well as an urban problem. Rising crime rates give reality to these fears. Figures show that one in every four American families will fall victim to crime within the year. A child born in a large American city and remaining in that city throughout his or her entire life stands a greater chance of meeting a violent death than did the average American soldier during World War II.

In order to restore order and tranquility to our cities, I propose:
— a reform of our judicial system to ensure that swift, firm, and predictable punishment follows a criminal conviction. I believe that crime is best deterred by the certainty of swift justice.
— a revision in our system of sentencing eliminating much of the discretion now given to judges and probatior officers, and insuring greater certainty in sentencing and confinement and a higher percentage of serious criminals being imprisoned.
— reasonable restrictions on the purchase of handguns, including the prohibition on ownership of guns by certain persons with criminal records.
— upgrading of the rehabilitation programs available to criminals while in prison.
— a concerted attack on the drug traffic and organized criminal activity with which our cities are afflicted.
— federal assistance to the crime prevention programs of local governments with a minimum of federal regulations.
— an attack on unemployment, the root cause of much of our urban crime, through the programs I have mentioned previously. We should recognize that $3 billion has been spent since 1967 by the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration in order to fight crime, with more than half of this amount going to the nation's police forces. This alone is not sufficient to reduce crime. We cannot seek cosmetic remedies while ignoring the base causes of crime.

Moreover, our urban existence is often lived out in a sea of concrete. To make our cities more attractive and culturally viable, we should direct *greater emphasis on the establishment of parks in urban areas,* and we must also expand programs such as the Urban Walls Program and federal assistance to the arts.

5. *Partnership Between the President and the Mayors*

For too long, the doors of the White House have been shut to the needs of the cities and to the mayors who represent them.

Franklin Delano Roosevelt, one of the prime movers behind the United States Conference of Mayors, recognized the need for a close partnership between the executive branch of the federal government and the mayors of America's cities.

As President, I shall develop close, personal and continuous working relationships with you. I will beef up the role and functions of the Domestic Policy Council to serve as a direct link to you. Moreover, I will have a high-level assistant at the White House to help coordinate programs related to cities between the various government departments, and to serve as the President's direct link to the mayors and other city officials. Mayors need a person at the White House with the President's ear to whom they can relate directly about city problems.

You are on the firing line every minute facing tough problems. I do not intend to let you stay there alone, without the full support of the President, nor disarmed, without the aid and resources to combat those problems.

You also have my assurance that the federal government itself will be pro-city. Too often the federal government has pursued policies which have encouraged urban decay, such as past procedures in the location of federal buildings and the construction of highways through urban neighborhoods. As President I intend to put a halt to such counter-productive policies.

I believe that together we can build an urban America which will be the envy of the rest of the world and, more importantly, a place where our citizens can live and play and work together as brothers in peace and harmony.

John Stewart

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ANNOUNCEMENT SPEECH

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ANNOUNCING HIS CANDIDACY FOR THE 1976 DEMOCRATIC PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION TO THE NATIONAL PRESS CLUB

December 12, 1974

We Americans are a great and diverse people. We take full advantage of our right to develop wide-ranging interests and responsibilities. For instance, I am a farmer, an engineer, a businessman, a planner, a scientist, a governor and a Christian. Each of you is an individual and different from all the others.

Yet we Americans have shared one thing in common: a belief in the greatness of our Country.

We have dared to dream great dreams for our Nation. We have taken quite literally the promises of decency, equality, and freedom—of an honest and responsible government.

What has now become of these great dreams?

—That all Americans stand equal before the law;

—That we enjoy a right to pursue health, happiness and prosperity in privacy and safety;

—That government be controlled by its citizens and not the other way around;

—That this Country set a standard within the community of nations of courage, compassion, integrity, and dedication to basic human rights and freedoms.

Our commitment to these dreams has been sapped by debilitating compromise, acceptance of mediocrity, subservience to special interests, and an absence of executive vision and direction.

Having worked during the last twenty years in local, state and national affairs, I have learned a great deal about our people.

I tell you that their great dreams still live within the collective heart of this Nation.

Recently we have discovered that our trust has been betrayed. The veils of secrecy have seemed to thicken around Washington. The purposes and goals of our country are uncertain and sometimes even suspect.

Our people are understandably concerned about this lack of competence and integrity. The root of the problem is not so much that our people have lost confidence in government, but that government has demonstrated time and again its lack of confidence in the people.

Our political leaders have simply underestimated the innate quality of our people.

With the shame of Watergate still with us and our 200th birthday just ahead, it is time for us to reaffirm and to strengthen our ethical and spiritual and political beliefs.

There must be no lowering of these standards, no acceptance of mediocrity in any aspect of our private or public lives.

In our homes or at worship we are ever reminded of what we ought to do and what we ought to be. Our government can and must represent the best and the highest ideals of those of us who voluntarily submit to its authority.

Politicians who seek to further their political careers through appeals to our doubts, fears and prejudices will be exposed and rejected.

For too long political leaders have been isolated from the people. They have made decisions from an ivory tower. Few have ever seen personally the direct impact of government programs involving welfare, prisons, mental institutions, unemployment, school busing or public housing. Our people feel that they have little access to the core of government and little influence with elected officials.

Now it is time for this chasm between people and government to be bridged, and for American citizens to join in shaping our Nation's future.

Now is the time for new leadership and new ideas to make a reality of these dreams, still held by our people.

To begin with, the confidence of people in our own government must be restored. But too many officials do not deserve that confidence.

There is a simple and effective way for public officials to regain public trust—be trustworthy!

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.

But there are also specific steps that must be taken.

- We need an all-inclusive sunshine law in Washington so that special interests will not retain their exclusive access behind closed doors. Except in a few rare cases, there is no reason for secret meetings of regulatory agencies, other executive departments or congressional committees. Such meetings must be opened to the public, all votes recorded, and complete news media coverage authorized and encouraged.
- Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official.
- Complete revelation of all business and financial involvements of major officials should be required, and none should be continued which constitute a possible conflict with the public interest.
- Regulatory agencies must not be managed by representatives of the industry being regulated, and no personnel transfers between agency and the industry should be made within a period of four full years.
- Public financing of campaigns should be extended to members of Congress.
- The activities of lobbyists must be more thoroughly revealed and controlled.
- Minimum secrecy within government should be matched with maximum personal privacy for private citizens.
- All federal judges, diplomats and other major officials should be selected on a strict basis of merit.
- For many years in the State Department we have chosen from among almost 16,000 applicants about 110 of our Nation's finest young leaders to represent us in the international world. But we top this off with the disgraceful and counterproductive policy of appointing unqualified persons to major diplomatic posts as political payoffs. This must be stopped immediately.
- Every effort should be extended to encourage full participation by our people in their own governments' processes, including universal voter registration for elections.
- We must insure better public understanding of executive policy, and better exchange of ideas between the Congress and the White House. To do this, Cabinet members representing the President should meet in scheduled public interrogation sessions with the full bodies of Congress.
- All our citizens must know that they will be treated fairly.
- To quote from my own inauguration speech of four years ago: "The time for racial discrimination is over. Our people have already made this major and difficult decision, but we cannot underestimate the challenge of hundreds of minor decisions yet to be made. No poor, rural, weak or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job or simple justice."
- We must meet this firm national commitment without equivocation or timidity in every aspect of private and public life.

As important as honesty and openness are—they are not enough. There must also be substance and logical direction in government.

The mechanism of our government should be understandable, efficient and economical . . . and it can be.

We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision of the federal bureaucracy, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its many varied services. Tight businesslike management and planning techniques must be instituted and maintained, utilizing the full authority and personal involvement of the President himself.

This is no job for the fainthearted. It will be met with violent opposition from those who now enjoy a special privilege, those who prefer to work in the dark, or those whose private fiefdoms are threatened.

In Georgia we met that opposition head on—and we won!

We abolished 278 of our 300 agencies.

We evolved clearly defined goals and policies in every part of government.

We developed and implemented a remarkably effective system of zero-base budgeting.

We instituted tough performance auditing to insure proper conduct and efficient delivery of services.

Steps like these can insure a full return on our hard-earned tax dollars. These procedures are working in state capitols around the Nation and in our successful businesses, both large and small.

They can and they will work in Washington.

Our Nation now has no understandable national purpose, no clearly defined goals, and no organizational mechanism to develop or achieve such purposes or goals. We move from one crisis to the next as if they were fads, even though the previous one hasn't been solved.

The Bible says: "If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle." As a planner and a businessman, and a chief executive, I know from experience that uncertainty is also a devastating affliction in private life and in government. Coordination of different programs is impossible. There is no clear vision of what is to be accomplished, everyone struggles for temporary advantage, and there is no way to monitor how effectively services are delivered.

What is our national policy for the production, acquisition, distribution or consumption of energy in times of shortage or doubtful supply?

There is no policy!

What are our long-range goals in health care, transportation, land use, economic development, waste disposal or housing?

There are no goals!

The tremendous resources of our people and of our chosen leaders can be harnessed to devise effective, understandable and practical goals and policies in every realm of public life.

A government that is honest and competent, with clear purpose and strong leadership, can work with the American people to meet the challenges of the present and the future.

We can then face together the tough long-range solutions to our economic woes. Our people are ready to make personal sacrifices when clear national economic policies are devised and understood.

We are grossly wasting our energy resources and other precious raw materials as though their supply was infinite. We must even face the prospect of changing our basic ways of living. This change will either be made on our own initiative in a planned and rational way, or forced on us with chaos and suffering by the inexorable laws of nature.

Energy imports and consumption must be reduced, free competition enhanced by rigid enforcement of antitrust laws, and general monetary growth restrained. Pinpointed federal programs can ease the more acute pains of recession, such as now exist in the construction industry. We should consider extension of unemployment compensation, the stimulation of investments, public subsidizing of employment, and surtaxes on excess profits.

We are still floundering and equivocating about protection of our environment. Neither designers of automobiles, mayors of cities, power companies, farmers, nor those of us who simply have to breathe the air, love beauty, and would like to fish or swim in pure water have the slightest idea in God's world what is coming out of Washington next! What does come next must be a firm commitment to pure air, clean water and unspoiled land.

Almost twenty years after its conception we have not finished the basic interstate highway system. To many lobbyists who haunt the capitol buildings of the Nation, ground transportation still means only more highways and more automobiles—the bigger, the better. We must have a national commitment to transportation capabilities which will encourage the most efficient movement of American people and cargo.

Gross tax inequities are being perpetuated. The most surely taxed income is that which is derived from the sweat of manual labor. Carefully contrived loopholes let the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average wage earner. The largest corporations pay the lowest tax rates and some with very high profits pay no tax at all.

When a business executive can charge off a $50 luncheon on a tax return and a truck driver cannot deduct his $1.50 sandwich—when oil companies pay less than 5% on their earnings while employees of the company pay at least three times this rate—when many pay no taxes on incomes of more than $100,000—then we need basic tax reform!

Every American has a right to expect that laws will be administered in an evenhanded manner, but it seems that something is wrong even with our system of justice. Defendants who are repeatedly out on bail commit more crimes. Aggravating trial delays and endless litigation are common.

Citizens without influence often bear the brunt of prosecution while violators of antitrust laws and other white collar criminals are ignored and go unpunished.

Following recent presidential elections, our U. S. Attorney General has replaced the Postmaster General as the chief political appointee; and we have recently witnessed the prostitution of this most important law enforcement office. Special prosecutors had to be appointed simply to insure enforcement of the law! The Attorney General should be removed from politics.

The vast bureaucracy of government often fails to deliver needed social services to our people. High ideals and good intentions are not matched with rational, businesslike administration. The predictable result is frustration and discouragement among dedicated employees, recipients of services, and the American taxpayers.

There are about 25 million Americans who are classified as poor, two-thirds of whom happen to be white and half of whom receive welfare benefits. At least 10% of these are able to work. A massive bureaucracy of 2 million employees at all levels of government is attempting to administer more than 100 different programs of bewildering complexity. Case workers shuffle papers in a morass of red tape. Often it is financially profitable not to work and even to have a family disrupted by forcing the father to leave home. Some combined welfare payments exceed the average working family's income, while other needy families have difficulty obtaining a bare subsistence.

The word "welfare" no longer signifies how much we care, but often arouses feelings of contempt and even hatred.

Is a simplified, fair and compassionate welfare program beyond the capacity of our American government? I think not.

The quality of health care in this Nation depends largely on economic status. It is often unavailable or costs too much. There is little commonality of effort between private and public health agencies or between physicians and other trained medical personnel. I expect the next Congress to pass a national health insurance law. But present government interest seems to be in merely shifting the costs of existing services to the federal taxpayer or to the employers. There is little interest in preventing the cripplers and killers of our people and providing improved health care for those who still need it most.

Is a practical and comprehensive national health program beyond the capacity of our American government? I think not.

Federal education laws must be simplified to substitute education for paper-shuffling grantsmanship. Local systems need federal funds to supplement their programs for students where wealth and tax base are inadequate.

Is a comprehensive education program beyond the capacity of the American people? I think not.

As a farmer, I have been appalled at the maladministration of our Nation's agricultural economy. We have seen the elimination of our valuable food reserves,

which has contributed to wild fluctuations in commodity prices and wiped out dependable trade and export capabilities. Grain speculators and monopolistic processors have profited, while farmers are going bankrupt trying to produce food that consumers are going broke trying to buy.

I know this Nation can develop an agricultural policy which will insure a fair profit to our farmers and a fair price to consumers.

It is obvious that domestic and foreign affairs are directly interrelated. A necessary base for effective implementation of any foreign policy is to get our domestic house in order.

Coordination of effort among the leaders of our Nation should be established so that our farm production, industrial development, foreign trade, defense, energy and diplomatic policies are mutually supportive and not in conflict.

The time for American intervention in all the problems of the world is over. But we cannot retreat into isolationism. Ties of friendship and cooperation with our friends and neighbors must be strengthened. Our common interests must be understood and pursued. The integrity of Israel must be preserved. Highly personalized and narrowly focused diplomatic efforts, although sometimes successful, should be balanced with a more wide-ranging implementation of foreign policy by competent foreign service officers.

Our Nation's security is obviously of paramount importance, and everything must be done to insure adequate military preparedness. But there is no reason why our national defense establishment cannot also be efficient.

Waste and inefficiency are both costly to taxpayers and a danger to our own national existence. Strict management and budgetary control over the Pentagon should reduce the ratio of officers to men and of support forces to combat troops. I see no reason why the Chief of Naval Operations needs more Navy captains on his staff than we have serving on ships!

Misdirected efforts such as the construction of unnecessary pork-barrel projects by the Corps of Engineers must be terminated.

The biggest waste and danger of all is the unnecessary proliferation of atomic weapons throughout the world. Our ultimate goal should be the elimination of nuclear weapon capability among all nations. In the meantime, simple, careful and firm proposals to implement this mutual arms reduction should be pursued as a prime national purpose in all our negotiations with nuclear powers—present or potential.

Is the achievement of these and other goals beyond the capacity of our American government? I think not.

Our people are hungry for integrity and competence in government. In this confused and fast-changing, technological world we still have within us the capability for national greatness.

About three months ago I met with the governors of the other twelve original states in Philadelphia. Exactly 200 years after the convening of the First Continental Congress we walked down the same streets, then turned left and entered a small building named Carpenter's Hall. There we heard exactly the same prayer and sat in the same chairs occupied in September of 1774 by Samuel Adams, John Jay, John Adams, Patrick Henry, George Washington, and about forty-five other strong and opinionated leaders.

They held widely divergent views and they debated for weeks. They and others who joined them for the Second Continental Congress avoided the production of timid compromise resolutions. They were somehow inspired, and they reached for greatness. Their written premises formed the basis on which our Nation was begun.

I don't know whose chair I occupied, but sitting there I thought soberly about their times and ours. Their people were also discouraged, disillusioned and confused. But these early leaders acted with purpose and conviction.

I wondered to myself: Were they more competent, more intelligent or better educated than we? Were they more courageous? Did they have more compassion or love for their neighbors? Did they have deeper religious convictions? Were they more concerned about the future of their children than we?

I think not.

We are equally capable of correcting our faults, overcoming difficulties, managing our own affairs and facing the future with justifiable confidence.

I am convinced that among us 200 million Americans there is a willingness—even eagerness—to restore in our Country what has been lost—**if** we have understandable purposes and goals and a modicum of bold and inspired leadership.

Our government can express the highest common ideals of human beings—**if** we demand of it standards of excellence.

It is now time to stop and to ask ourselves the question which my last commanding officer, Admiral Hyman Rickover, asked me and every other young naval officer who serves or has served in an atomic submarine.

For our Nation—for all of us—that question is,

"Why not the best?"

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 accomodating 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 be co-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 persued 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 if 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 -Hwakins 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-Hwakins 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 idel 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 reinstitution 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 authori 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

JIMMY CARTER ON RADIO FREE EUROPE AND RADIO LIBERTY

If detente with the Soviet Union and the countries of Eastern Europe is to have real meaning, we must work toward a freer flow of information and ideas into those countries. The most valuable instruments our nation has for this purpose are our international radio stations -- Voice of America (the official radio voice of the U.S. Government abroad), Radio Free Europe (RFE), and Radio Liberty (RL).

These stations, which substitute for a free press in the countries they reach, have for many years been a vital part of the lives of over half the adult population of Poland, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Hungary and Bulgaria and one-fourth the adult population of the Soviet Union. For these people, radio broadcasts from abroad are the primary source of uncensored information.

The Voice of America, with superb technical facilities and a capacity to broadcast an audible signal to all of Eastern Europe and the Soviet Union, has been entangled in a web of political restrictions imposed by the Department of State, which seriously limits its effectiveness. At the same time, for nearly a decade, our foreign policy leadership in Washington has ignored repeated warnings that the broadcast strength of Radio Free Europe and Radio Liberty is growing progressively weaker owing to jamming and inadequate transmitter power. Three years ago, a Presidential Study Commission chaired by Milton Eisenhower concluded that major facility modernization of the two stations should be undertaken on an urgent basis. The President and the authorizing committees of Congress concurred. And yet, the budget request for the period through September, 1977, is now before the Congress and still no funding is being sought by the Administration for the essential transmitters.

I believe that this failure to act stems from the inability of the present Administration to appreciate the importance of an open foreign policy and a free flow of information and ideas through mass communication. There are also signs of a more insidious problem -- a preference by our Secretary of State to deal privately with the Soviets, while they have launched a massive diplomatic attack on the radios demanding that they be shut down and attempting to prevent RFE and RL commentators from covering the Olympic Games. As I said in Chicago, "...having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of it, is not an acceptable formula for detente."

In final analysis, the radios are more than mere transmitters of information. They are the symbol of the U.S. commitment to peaceful change in Eastern Europe and a sign of continued U.S. engagement in Europe's future. If we remove the uncertainties that have arisen around our commitment to the radios, the peoples of the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe -- Poles, Czechs, Slovaks, Hungarians, Russians, Ukranians and others -- will transcend what Alexander Solzhenitsyn has called the "muffled zone." And the American people can once again take pride in the fact that their foreign policy is an accurate reflection of their character and moral heritage.

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.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON RAILROAD REORGANIZATION

Our nation is dependent on its railroads - 40% of all intercity freight, over 60% of the shipments of manufacturers and over 66% of the grain from the North Central states moves by rail. These figures are larger than the combined percentages of trucks, barges, and air carriers. In addition, railroads enjoy low per unit operating, pollution, and fuel consumption costs.

In 1970, Congress took a major step towards improvement of the passenger rail system with the formation of Amtrak. Last year the system carried 18.5 million passengers on the 225 daily trains which serve 424 communities across the nation. Unfortunately, mechanical and other operating problems of the new system contribute to the $90 million a year that Amtrak would lose even if every seat on every train were filled. To operate this system, the federal government has provided almost $1.5 billion in grants and loan guarantees.

In 1973, Congress created Conrail, the consolidated rail system, in an effort to restructure the Penn Central and five other bankrupt railroads. The United States Railway Association blueprint for the new system proposes the abandonment of unprofitable branch lines in the hopes that the consolidated system will be financially self-supporting. The abandonment of 7,000 miles of lines in the Northeast leaves many communities without transportation service.

The problem of transportation services to communities that are to be left without rail service under Conrail makes evident that the problem of railroad reorganization cannot be analyzed in a vacuum but must be treated as one part of a larger transportation problem. We need a national comprehensive transportation policy, and it is obvious that the savings in fuel, operating, and pollution costs from intensive use of railroads should provide them with a competitive advantage over other forms of transportation. For example, the cost of transporting a ton of grain from Buffalo, N.Y. to Scranton, Pa. by rail was $7.80 in March; by truck, the shipment would cost $11.

Part of the problem facing the railroad industry has resulted from the haphazard pattern of regulation in the transportation industry. Railroads are regulated 100% as compared to 39% and 13% in the truck and barge traffic areas respectively. The current transportation policy has been to subsidize airports, highways and canals while railroad roadbeds receive no subsidies for reconstruction. In addition, railroads pay a greater proportion of their revenues in taxes on their right-of-way facilities and have until recently received little federal aid.

It is no wonder then that the reorganization and revitalization of our railroad system remains one of the most important and pressing issues in transportation today. We must deal not only with the immediate problems of the bankrupt railroads of the northeastern and midwestern states, but with longer-range questions focusing on the role of railroads in the future of this country's transportation needs.

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, Washingto . D.C.

We need closer inter-modal coordination at the federal level, along with increased support for research and development. We must also modify the present regulatory structure to encourage better coordination among modes.

There is a need to improve the quality of service. Past trends of deferral maintenance and investment have produced chronic shortages of rail cars and increasing accident rates. The percentage of rail accidents attributable to poor maintenance has doubled in the past ten years.

Containerization remains a most promising means of revitalizing the railroads, and we should make possible the more efficient use of this technology.

The key to success in railroad reorganization will be establishment of a system which makes greater use of inter-modal coordination and which provides support for the substantial effort required to put the system back in shape. While we must safeguard the existence of the railroads, we must also provide an atmosphere in which they can prosper. Government policies which provide a billion dollars a year for air travel but demand that railroads pay their own track and railbed expenses cannot continue. Our interest must be the public good; the interdependence of all systems must be recognized.

JIMMY CARTER ON REVENUE SHARING

As I have proposed since I was governor of Georgia, we need some change in the basic structure of dispersing revenue sharing funds.

While there have been some benefits from revenue sharing in the past, we should recognize that the present program, as now constituted and as the Administration proposes to extend it, has not really achieved the goals for which it was originally created. Increases in revenue sharing funds have been offset by reductions in categorical grants so that the net increase of funds available to local governments has been smaller than might be expected. Social programs of national concern have suffered most in this fund shifting since local areas have understandably chosen, for the most part, to spend money on services or facilities with non-recurring cost.

I would favor an approach which would give funds directly to local cities and communities rather than the states. I would favor this for two reasons. First, it is a means of giving local governments more control over programs that affect them daily, because it is a mechanism that combines effectively local needs and decision-making processes with the federal government's powers of coordination and revenue-raising. Second, and more important, local communities do not have the capacity to generate extra income - through taxes or other methods - that the states have.

Inevitably, under our present tax laws the income of the federal government increases at a very rapid rate compared to that of the state and local governments. For instance, each time the gross national product goes up a certain amount, say 100, state income goes up almost exactly the same amount. Federal government income goes up 135, local government increases only 72. So over a period of time, there ought to be a shift of funding from the federal government to the local governments because of the regressive and tightly-constrained source of local funds which is derived primarily from property tax. Whatever revenue sharing funds are available should go only to local governments, not to states, except perhaps in Alaska and Hawaii where most local services are provided by state funds.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GOVERNMENT AND THE SCIENTIFIC COMMUNITY

It is crucial that the advice of the scientific and professional 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.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON SENATE BILL 1

S.1 is an attempt to reform the federal criminal code. Federal criminal laws have not been codified and their development has been haphazard; an attempt to reform them is laudable.

Unfortunately, the proposed "Criminal Justice Codification, Revision, and Reform Act of 1975" goes beyond what is needed and threatens to disrupt civil liberties guaranteed by the Constitution. The basic problem is the vagueness in the manner that many of the crimes are defined. For this reason, I oppose the bill.

- Sections 1121, 1122, and 1123, which deal with espionage, define "national defense information" so broadly that ordinary agricultural, industrial and economic data could reasonably be protected.

- Section 1124 criminalizes disclosure of classified information whether the information was properly classified or not.

- Section 1103 reenacts the Smith Act, which makes it illegal to incite to imminent lawless conduct, or to act in a manner which could facilitate such conduct.

- Sections 541-544 allow as a defense in the prosecution of a "public servant" that the conduct "was required or authorized by law to carry out the defendant's authority."

After our recent experiences with Watergate, it is important that national government once again become a government of the people. Accountability is an elementary principle of democratic government. S.1 makes government officials less accountable to the people by not only making "just following orders" a valid defense for any public servant, but also by making it illegal to release misclassified documents.

The criminal code is archaic and in need of some reform. But reform can be accomplished without undermining the basis of democratic government. S.1 could possibly allow for the jailing of those who protest Vietnam-type wars. S.1 could possibly stop newspapers from printing such things as the Pentagon Papers, and possibly could prevent reports such as the stories about the grain deals with Russia.

S.1 has many vague provisions which could be used against people disliked by those running the government. And S.1 contains the provisions which would stop us from discovering those abuses. Secrecy in government is cancerous, as Watergate has taught us, and S.1 is designed to make government more - not less - secret.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE ELDERLY AND SOCIAL SECURITY

One of our nation's most priceless, yet unappreciated, natural assets is our senior citizens. Yet their experience and wisdom is often untapped by both government and industry. Our elderly are often treated as second-class citizens.

There are now 23 million Americans over the age of 65 -- and our elderly constitute a growing percentage of our nation's population. But our government has no coherent program to assist the aged and help make them more productive citizens. Indeed for many, the basic necessities of life are still a struggle.

Our older citizens are most likely to be poverty-stricken, to have high health costs, poor housing, and inadequate access to available transportation.

Our senior citizens have contributed much during their lives to the strength and vitality of America. They have the right to expect in their later years that they will have an adequate income, comfortable housing, access to expert and affordable health care, and adequate transportation.

The most important guarantee of a secure income to our elderly comes through the Social Security program. The Social Security program has come under recent attack. It has been damaged by inflation, which has vastly increased costs; and unemployment, which has drained the system of needed revenues. Both are the legacy of Republican economic mismanagement. As a result, the system has been hit with severe deficits.

I pledge to you and Americans around the country that as President I will preserve, with the assistance of Congress, the financial integrity of the Social Security system to which so many millions of Americans have contributed and are contributing. Every year one million American workers contribute to Social Security, building benefits for themselves and their families and insuring the protection of the present beneficiaries.

To solve the current problems of the Social Security system we must energetically insure that:

--we preserve the present cost-of-living benefits for those receiving benefits and stabilize the "replacement rate" of benefits to wages, by guaranteeing to present day contributors that their benefits at retirement will fully reflect increases in their wages. Workers should be guaranteed that when they retire Social Sercurity benefits will bear the same relationship to their recent earnings as is true for those retiring today. This could be accomplished by indexing average monthly earnings under Social Security. The reform I have suggested would cut in half the estimated long-range imbalance in the program.

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.

--rather than increasing the contribution rate as President Ford has suggested, which would put an even greater burden on the average wage earner, would not insure more benefits, and would require everyone to pay more, if additional revenues are needed, I would prefer a more progressive plan to increase gradually the maximum amount of earnings subject to the social security tax.

But our program for senior citizens cannot stop here.

We must move toward national health insurance for all Americans, so that no American, and particularly the elderly, will have to fear that they cannot afford necessary medical care.

It is not acceptable for this country to force the elderly to live in substandard housing. Yet 30% of American's elderly live in substandard, run-down or deteriorated housing. We cannot tolerate Republican failure to deal with this problem. I am committed to a rapid increase in the Section 202 housing program for the elderly, funds for renovation of existing structures, and strong federal protection against the displacement of senior citizens by landlords seeking to convert rental housing into condominums.

Our elderly lack the mobility so essential to enjoyment of the benefits of our country. Our senior citizens must be involved in transportation planning. I believe it is appropriate for the federal government to help to subsidize low-cost fares for the elderly on federally financed public transit systems.

To insure that government policy toward the elderly is coordinated, I will establish in the Office of the President a Counselor on the Aging, to develop innovative programs for the elderly and insure that government action takes into account fully the concerns of the elderly.

Most important, we need a President who is truly concerned with and sympathetic to the problems of older Americans. They must never again feel ignored -- under my Administration they never will.

January 22, 1976

JIMMY CARTER ON SOVIET JEWRY

The official suppression in the USSR of the "Journal of Jews in the USSR" is but the latest tactic in the relentless Soviet harassment of the Jewish emigration movement and its activists. Thirty-five prisoners languish in Soviet prisons in reprisal for their Jewish activities, in some instances after their relatives left for Israel.

Over a thousand "refuseniks" and their families are known to have been repeatedly denied exit visas for reunification with their families. New applicants for exit visas find obstacles continually placed in their way. Emigration of Soviet Jews both to Israel and the United States has dropped drastically since the high point of 35,000 in 1973. Scores of Soviet Jewish activists have been summoned to KGB offices and threatened with trials. Students are expelled from technical schools and universities and are threatened with military draft for their expressions of Jewish identity. Mail and telegrams from the West to Soviet Jewish activists and their families, and to the families of religious prisoners are often undelivered, and telephone calls are jammed or refused by Soviet operators.

I protest these and similar acts of oppression. I support full religious and cultural opportunities for Soviet Jews, including essential Jewish institutions and the free flow of ideas, information, and people. Violations of basic human rights are no longer the internal affair of any one nation. We must be strongly committed to the securing of basic human rights for all people, including the three million Jews in the Soviet Union.

We must make it clear to the Russians, in every endeavor, that their treatment of Jews is unacceptable to us. In our Bicentennial year, our responsibility for world leadership in this effort becomes even stronger.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON TAX REFORM

Our national tax system is a disgrace. Carefully contrived loopholes let the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average wage earner. Some of our largest corporations with extremely high profits pay virtually no tax at all. The average family earning $10,000 per year pays a larger portion of its income in taxes than a family with an annual income of $1 million or more. When a business executive can charge off a $50 luncheon on a tax return and a truck driver cannot deduct his $1.50 sandwich -- when oil companies pay less than 5% on their earnings while employees of the company pay at least three times this rate -- when many pay no taxes on incomes of more than $100,000 -- then we need basic tax reform.

I am considering a drastic simplification of the income tax system that would lower taxes on middle and low income families. To do that you would eliminate hundreds of tax breaks and greatly reduce the tax rate. A recent study says such a plan would allow a reduction of as much as 40% in the tax rate.

Basically, subject to some exceptions, I favor a simplified tax system which treats all income the same, and a system which does not encourage corporations to locate plants abroad, while people who want to work are begging for jobs back home.

The only people who have anything to fear from any Carter tax reform plan are the special interests who do not pay their fair share of taxes and who are responsible for the disgracefully unfair tax system we now have.

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.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON THE UNITED STATES, THE UNITED NATIONS, AND THE SEARCH FOR WORLD ORDER

A central task of American foreign policy in the crucial next quarter of the twentieth century is the building of international institutions to manage critical world problems of vital importance to the American people and to all people and nations.

These problems include the need to protect civilization against the unregulated spread of nuclear reactors and nuclear weapons, the dangerous proliferation of conventional weapons, the increasing financial burden of the arms race, the poisoning of the world's oceans and atmosphere, the depletion of energy and other resources, the threat of global food shortages, the explosive growth in world population, and escalating terrorism and international violence.

The Nixon-Ford Administration and the diplomacy of Henry Kissinger have failed to give adequate priority to these global challenges. Instead, our foreign policy has favored short-term considerations over long-term interests, bilateral diplomacy over multilateral institution-building, and military responses over economic and scientific cooperation.

The maintenance of a global balance of power is obviously essential to the survival of the United States. Equally essential, however, is the building of a stable world order which can give our children and grandchildren safe passage into the twenty-first century. The time has come, therefore, to supplement balance of power politics with world order politics.

A central element in the foreign policy of my Administration will be the building of effective international institutions to manage the critical world problems which now threaten our security as a free and prosperous society. To this end, we must determine which problems can be dealt with effectively through the United Nations system and which cannot. In the former cases, we should work much harder to reform and strengthen the United Nations; in the latter, we should urgently set about building alternative structures.

I pledge to involve the best brains in our nation in the search for peace. In pursuing my commitment to world order politics, I will call upon the best talent I can find in the universities, the business world, the professions, and the scientific community. My appointments to our United Nations delegation and to international conferences will be made exclusively on a merit basis, in contrast to the political patronage that has characterized appointments under the Nixon-Ford Administration.

The American people are justifiably critical of recent developments in the United Nations, particularly the resolution equating Zionism with racism. This resolution could have been avoided had this Administration worked more effectively to win votes at the United Nations and to use our diplomatic power in key foreign capitals.

To defend our interests more effectively in the future, a Carter Administration will:

- Make multilateral diplomacy a central part of our total diplomacy so that other countries know in advance the importance which the United States attaches to their behavior in the United Nations and other international organizations.

- Undertake a systematic political and economic cost-benefit analysis of existing international institutions in the United Nations system and outside, with a view to determining the appropriate level of United States support.

- 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.

- Put the best brains in our nation to work in the search for peace, appointing delegates to the United Nations and other international agencies exclusively on a merit basis.

- Launch a major effort at the reform and restructuring of the United Nations system. We will carefully examine the desirability and feasibility of amending the United Nations charter. However, in view of the practical difficulties of Charter amendment in the immediate future, we will put primary emphasis on strengthening the United Nations through other means, such as those recommended by a group of twenty-five experts on the restructuring of the United Nations. One of the recommendations proposed by this group is to allow a "cooling-off period" during which conciliation can replace voting on contested issues.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON WELFARE PROGRAM

We need an efficient and compassionate welfare system in this country. What we now have is neither of these.

There are about 25 million Americans who are classified as poor. Two-thirds of them are English-speaking and white. About one-half (12 million) receive welfare payments of some kind on a regular basis. Roughly ten percent of these recipients are able to work full time. A massive bureaucracy of over 2 million employees attempts to administer over one hundred different assistance programs of bewildering complexity - one employee for every six recipients. Welfare cheaters flourish in the morass. In some cases, it is financially profitable for a recipient not to work. In others, the system encourages fathers to leave the home so the wife and children will receive increased benefits. Some combined welfare payments exceed the income of the average working family, while other needy families have difficulty obtaining a bare subsistence.

We have been promised welfare reform for over a generation. The basic components of a fair and a workable program are well known. We do not yet have such a program because of a lack of political courage.

The ten percent of recipients who are able to work should be separated from the other ninety percent and treated as part of our unemployed work force. The private and public training and educational programs of this country should be marshalled to prepare them for employment commensurate with their ability and talent. Private job opportunities should be identified and encouraged. Public jobs should be created as necessary for those who are able and willing to work. If a job is offered and not accepted, benefits should be terminated.

The remaining ninety percent are not considered to be employable. There should be an adequate, fairly uniform, nation-wide allocation of funds for these families and individuals to meet the necessities of life. A work incentive program should be included for those who may be able to hold part-time jobs. Earnings from these jobs should not be confiscated by reduction in benefits.

This simplified system, which involves two programs rather than one hundred, will allow welfare workers to work with people instead of paper. It will encourage dignity, self-respect and self-sufficiency instead of despair and continual dependency. The ultimate beneficiaries will be those who pay the taxes as well as those who receive the services.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS

I am firmly committed to equality between women and men and in promoting a partnership concept in all aspects of life. In spite of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the earnings gap between men and women is great. Full-time working women earn 60 cents for every dollar earned by full-time working men. Laws, executive orders and significant interpretations of the law, however, are bringing financial pressure on many employers to end sex discrimination. I support the efforts of women to achieve equality through court action when that is required. As a further aid to working women, I support the concept of flexible hours for full-time employees. The recent upholding by three circuit courts of appeal of the EEOC guidelines stating that childbearing leave must be treated as any other temporary disability has far-reaching implications for working mothers.

I have great concern for the woman who chooses to stay home and devote full time to caring for her family. She is one of the most vulnerable members of our society. Faced with a seriously high divorce rate and the prospect of widowhood at age 55, the average homemaker without a marketable skill has a very difficult time and legal protection is almost non-existent. We must insure that we do not demean the roles of homemaker and rearer of children. I firmly believe that there is no higher calling for a man or woman than the care of the children they bring into the world. I also believe that there is much that our educational, legal and other institutions can do to prepare and support both parents in this extremely crucial role in our society. As we remove the barriers which have denied women participation in business and education and other fields, we also have the tremendous opportunity to give men the opportunity to be fathers and husbands in the finest sense of those terms.

Education is another area where women have not gotten a fair return on their investment. Now that Title IX guidelines have finally been approved, enforcement must be obtained to end sex discrimination in education. Women entering law school have increased from 10.2% in 1970 to 23.7% in 1974; and medical school enrollment for women went from 11.1% in 1970 to 22.2% in 1974. But in spite of these important advances, there are practically no women in administration, few principals, college presidents or superintendents. Under pressure from feminist groups throughout the country, textbook publishers are taking long overdue steps to portray women and men more realistically in their publications. The importance of this cannot be overstated because children accept limiting, stereotyped notions of woman's place and man's place in society at a very early age.

The media too frequently portray women in an inaccurate, belittling manner. More women must be appointed to the Board of Governors of the Public Broadcasting System, the Federal Communications Commission and the Federal Trade Commission.

On October 28th the Equal Credit Opportunity Act became law. This Act and the Housing and Community Development Act promise substantial improvement

in women's problems. The enforcement provisions must be upheld.

I support the Equal Rights Amendment. Even though it has not yet been ratified, the coalitions and organizations forming throughout the country are producing valuable results. These networks of women working together for a common cause will inevitably bring about needed legal reforms; in fact, they are already producing such reforms.

As Governor of Georgia, I provided support from my own budget and contingency fund for the Commission on the Status of Women to enable them to undertake two important studies; rape and the Treatment of Rape Victims, and the Equal Rights Amendment and Georgia law. In addition, I appointed women to seven major positions never before held by women in Georgia, including a state judgeship. I encourage women to seek positions with major decision-making responsibility and I have women in important roles in my campaign for the presidency.

As President, I would ensure that: (1) laws prohibiting sex discrimination in employment, advancement, education, training, credit and housing be strictly enforced; (2) strong efforts be made to create federal legislation and guidelines to eliminate sex discrimination in health and disability insurance plans; (3) social security laws be revised so that women would no longer be penalized; (4) women have equal access to health care systems and voluntary family planning programs; (5) adequate childcare be made available to all parents who need such care for their children; (6) strong efforts be made to reform existing rape laws. I urge passage of the National Rape Prevention and Control Act.

With women making up 52% of our population, it is possible to envision a time in the not-too-distant future when half our doctors, lawyers, scientists, scholars, writers, business leaders and government officials will be women. The dreams, hopes and problems of a complex society demand the talents, imagination and dedication of its finest citizens without regard to sex. As partners we can provide the very best leadership for this country's third century.

STATEMENT BY JIMMY CARTER ON WOMEN'S RIGHTS

PRESENTED JUNE 13, 1976

BEFORE THE COMMITTEE OF 51.3 PERCENT

As a candidate for President I am fully committed to equality between men and women in every area of government and in every aspect of life. As President, I will live up to that commitment.

As perhaps you know, when I was governor of Georgia, my wife and I worked for the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment in our state, and we were unsuccessful.

As President, I intend to see the passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

As a candidate for President, I will try to make it clear to the American People that, despite propaganda to the contrary, ERA is not an elitist issue, but a very basic matter of social justice that directly affects the personal and economic well-being and freedom of every woman in this country.

Let me state briefly some of the positions I will take as President on matters of special concern to women.

I will vigorously enforce laws prohibiting sex discrimination in hiring, job advancement, education, credit and housing.

I will support legislation to end sex discrimination in health and disability insurance.

I will act to end discrimination against women in the Social Security system and in our income taxes.

I will support legislation to provide improved child care services for working parents.

I will continue to oppose any Constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court decisions on abortion.

I will support efforts to provide more part-time jobs, and flexible work schedules, to help families stay together.

I will appoint qualified women early in my administration and in substantial numbers. They will not be in a few token positions at the top of my administration, but in jobs of importance throughout the government.

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.

WOMEN today
WASHINGTON, D.C.

VOL. VI • #6 • MARCH 15, 1976

CARTER ANSWERS 'WOMEN TODAY' QUESTIONNAIRE

In the last issue of *Women Today* (Vol. VI, No. 5) we listed the questions and answers to our Presidential candidate questionnaire. JIMMY CARTER, a Democratic Presidential candidate, did not respond in time to meet our deadline. His response was received in our office March 8, and we are listing his answers below. No other responses were received since our last issue.

1. I strongly support the Equal Rights Amendment. I campaigned for 262 days last year and in every state, including those states which have not yet ratified the Amendment, I have consistently and unhesitatingly advocated passage of the Amendment. As Governor of Georgia, I fought hard for the passage of ERA. But in the South, the textile industry and the John Birch Society have been strong and effective opponents in discouraging ratification of the Amendment. In my own Presidential Campaign, my beliefs in equal rights are evident. Women are fully involved. . . . I believe that the Democratic Party must make an effort to see that the Amendment is passed. As a candidate, I will insist that the ERA be made part of the Democratic Party's national plank. As President, I will use the influence of the office both to see that the Amendment becomes law, and to set a style of leadership that clearly and unmistakingly makes equal rights and equal opportunity national goals.
2. One of the most far reaching social and economic changes of recent years has been the very rapid increase in the employment of women, particularly mothers of young children. Women work because, like men, they need the money. Today, nearly two out of every five mothers of preschool children bring home a paycheck. I believe that federal aid is desirable to help the states and localities fund necessary day care services. The need for these services is growing rapidly. Six and one-half million children under the age of six have gainfully employed mothers—a number which has increased 30 percent in the last seven years. Many of their families cannot afford the full cost of day care which meets essential standards. I do not believe we are now able to extend the concept of public education entitlement to all children below the present school age level whose parents wish them to benefit from early childhood education. Because it is in the public interest that no child be neglected, I favor public subsidies for day care services for children with employed mothers in low income families. For those families with incomes between low and moderate level, and able to meet part or most of the costs, subsidized fees should be scaled to ability to pay. I will, when elected, recommend legislation to implement my policy.
3. I do not believe that colleges and universities should be exempt from the affirmative action provisions of Executive Order 11246 and revision order No. 4. This order requires affirmative action plans of all contractors with contracts of $50,000 or more and 50 or more employees. Enforcement of these plans should be strenuously handled by the Office of Federal Contract Compliance Programs (OFCCP) to end sex discrimination in our educational institutions, as well as in other agencies. Since sexual discrimination in higher education was not legally prohibited until the Higher Education Amendments of 1972, I feel that colleges and universities as employers may actually need the impetus of affirmative action. There is another aspect to this question. According to a 1975 Civil Rights Commission report, "Although DHEW awarded numerous contracts for the evaluation of programs affecting women in 1972, only 5 percent of the total contracting funds were identified as having been awarded to women-owned firms." I see this as a major concern for women since discriminatory practices have historically limited women's participation in business. As President, I would see that Federal contractors hire women without bias, and that OFCCP, in its review of contracts, treats the problem of sexual discrimination against women business owners with honest concern.
4. I do not approve of exempting physical education from the Title IX regulations of the Education Amendments of 1972. Title IX has broken down many barriers to women in institutions of higher learning and will over time be one of the most effective tools to end sexually discriminatory attitudes. If physical education were excluded from the regulations of Title IX, discrimination against women in this segment of their education might continue. I have always felt that physical

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

health is vital to mental health, and excluding women from equal opportunities to participate in all types of sports would be unfair. I would like to see my eight year old daughter, Amy, be able to excel in any sport she might choose, just as my sons have been able to do. I would oppose any legislation that would weaken the provisions of Title IX. I am still studying the issue of revenue-producing sports and will be analyzing that issue on a continuing basis so that I can comment later.

5. I believe that changes are necessary indeed to make the current Social Security system more equitable for women and men. The payroll tax that finances Social Security takes a larger slice out of the income of the low income worker in relation to his or her ability to pay. Anyone earning over $50.00 a quarter pays 5.8 percent to Social Security. Since women are clustered at the bottom of the economic ladder, and since there is still a 60 percent differential between the salaries of men and women for the same work, this has an adverse affect on women. I am presently studying one proposal that has been advanced which would assure every adult his or her own Social Security record. The record would be built up and maintained throughout his or her working life. This proposal aims to eliminate the inequity faced by working wives who do not receive benefits for having contributed to the Social Security system, a goal with which I am certainly in accord. I believe that eventually the Social Security system must be less regressive so that the highly paid contribute more to the system. This would help equalize the system for women.
6. I would strongly recommend that consideration be given to the introduction of an income tax credit for families with two wage earners and to single persons who have family responsibilities. These revisions would make the present income tax structures more equitable for married and unmarried persons.
7. I am firmly committed to equal opportunities for women and men in all aspects of life. The "Displaced Homemaker's Act" would help end discrimination against a segment of our national work force that makes valuable contributions to the welfare and economic stability of the Nation. I have great concern for the woman who chooses to stay home and devote full time to caring for her family. She is one of the most vulnerable members of our society. Faced with a seriously high divorce rate and the prospect of widowhood at age 55, the homemaker without a marketable skill could have a difficult time, and legal protection for her is almost non-existent. This bill would establish nationwide model program centers to provide legal counseling and services for individuals who have worked in the home for a substantial number of years and are having difficulty in finding employment. Therefore, I see the passage of the "Displaced Homemaker's Act" as valuable in meeting two of our national goals. First in our priority to provide jobs for every American who wants to work; and secondly, in our national effort to end discrimination against women.
8. I strongly encourage the availability of more part-time jobs in our economy. I would support legislation which would increase part-time employment, especially that legislation which is intended to benefit housewives, retirees. As a further aid to working women, I support the concept of a more flexible work-scheduling program. A woman who is forced for economic reasons to seek employment outside the home, or a woman who is able to combine her career interests with a family, deserves support from her government.
9. I have consistently stated that I oppose Constitutional amendments to overturn the Supreme Court's decision. I believe that abortion is the doctor's treatment for failed birth control, and that in the long run the need for abortion services can be minimized by providing better family planning services. This means stronger family planning programs, more accessible services, and improved contraceptive technology. I have always believed in preventive health care, and this question is no different. Although we have 159 counties in Georgia, it became one of the few states in the nation with family planning clinics operating in every county health department under my administration. Participation in the family planning programs increased by 200 percent just during the first two years of my administration. The Supreme Court left many questions unresolved including parental or spousal consent, and the problem of late abortions. Those questions are being litigated in the courts. As President, I would be guided and bound by the courts' decisions on these and other questions pertaining to abortion services.
10. I do not like the idea of government money being spent on abortions, and I do not think government should do anything to encourage abortions. But I am aware that the courts have been requiring Medicaid, for example, to pay for this service. I would like to see us as a nation reach the stage where no one who is poor is ever forced to obtain an abortion because she could not obtain proper family planning. On this question, and the question of private hospitals, I will be guided and bound by the courts.
11. No. Please refer to number 9.

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.

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.

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.

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

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

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.

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.

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.

# # #

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.

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 compotent 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 consier 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, extration, 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 liquifaction 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, artifically 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.

# # #



Leaders, for a change.

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT IOWA STATE FAIRGROUNDS

August 25, 1976

I'm glad to be here today, especially to be with you at your Iowa State Fair -- in a state which is #1 in corn, #1 in hogs, and which produces 1/6 of the nation's soybeans and about 10% of all U.S. food.

I understand the Republicans have just decided they don't like the idea of peanut farmers leaving their crops to look for new jobs in Washington. They've even agreed to stop the embargoes for a while to make farming more attractive so I'll stay in Plains. But I prefer to go on from my farm to the White House and stop embargoes once and for all!

I come here as one who has spent the last 20 months travelling throughout our nation. I think I have seen more of our country, and more people, than anyone else in the Unites States. I've been raising votes, and I've been successful in that. I planted my first crop in Iowa last winter, and have already gathered the first harvest in Madison Square Garden. Now I'm looking forward to the next harvest on November 2nd.

When I began my campaign, as you perhaps know, I didn't have a built-in organization. I didn't hold public office. I was not well known. But my wife and I, and many others, went from one living room to another, one union hall to another, one farmer's market and livestock sale barn to another. Sometimes only three or four people would come to a meeting. But I would make a 10-minute speech and answer questions for 45 minutes or so. And I began to form a personal relationship with individual voters that paid rich dividends as the campaign progressed.

And I've learned in the process. I've learned many things that have reinforced my faith in the basic character and strength of our nation and of the American people. I'm sure now that if we can bring our political institutions up to the level of our people we will have a government we can be proud of once again.

But I've also learned about the way we've been wounded, as a people and a nation.

I've seen the walls that have gone up in this country over the last eight years. There's a wall that's gone up around Washington between our people and our government. There's a wall that's gone up between the White House and the Congress. There's a wall that's gone up between the regions of this country. There's a wall that's gone up between us and the standards that made us a great nation.

I want to tear those walls down. And one I want to talk about today is the wall that separates the producers of food and fibre from the other consumers in this country -- a wall that has been built by Earl Butz and his Department of Agriculture.

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

Our people are proud of the American farmers and ranchers. In all the history of our nation, there has been no more dramatic success story than the story of the American farm family. Every person working fulltime on a farm now provides the food for about 100 other people, both in this country and abroad.

Our people respect the American farmer. The family farm has preserved the values -- honesty, dependability, hard work and faith -- which we need to rediscover as a nation.

Our city people are natural partners with those of us in rural American. What is best for the family farmer in the long run is exactly what is best for the consumer.

But in the last eight years, this partnership has been almost destroyed. We have seen conflict where there should be cooperation. The independent producers of America do not want that. The people of America do not want it. Our customers overseas do not want it.

I say it's time to take down the wall. It's time to put our partnership back together -- one that will enable the farmer and the rancher to make a decent living -- especially the family farmer who is the most efficient producer -- and ensure the consumer an adequate supply of food and fibre at a reasonable price. We can do both, if we have national leadership dedicated to the best interests of all the people.

Nobody who's spent as much time on a farm as I have wants the government to manage our farms.

Rural families are just looking for an even break.

That's not much to ask. But it is a lot more than we have been getting these last eight years.

It's not my idea of a fair shake when the government encourages all-out production, and then offers the farmer no protection at all against the surpluses his efficiency creates.

It's not my idea of a fair shake when the government promotes foreign sales, and then cuts them off for political convenience. Four major embargoes in three years is a record of unparalleled incompetence -- and we have really paid the price.

It's not my idea of a fair shake when inside speculators, with special connections in the agriculture department, make windfall profits on grain deals, while the producer himself sells at a loss.

It's not my idea of a fair shake for the farmers to sell clean grain, and then to see chaff and dirt and rubble added to a shipment, and have a crooked inspector approve it for shipment overseas.

It's not my idea of a fair shake to have a one-sided market. You know what that means. When prices go down, the "free market" means hands off for the family farm. But when prices go up, the Republicans are the first to slap on controls and export embargoes. Their kind of free market means the lowest parity level in decades.

That kind of market means farm families are going bankrupt trying to produce food that consumers are going broke trying to buy.

It's not a free market. It's not a partnership. And it's not what we're going to have any more, if we all work together this fall.

On the farm, we're all brought up to speak kinds words, even of those who have harmed us. And the kindest words you can say about the present agriculture department is that it's been true to its own views.

Congress tried to give our rural families a chance, when it passed the Emergency Farm Bill in 1975. But one of the first things President Ford did was to veto that bill.

Congress tried to give them a chance by setting milk support at 85% of pairty. But President Ford vetoed that bill.

Congress tried to give them a chance by sharing conservation costs. But President Ford vetoed that bill.

The Democratic Congresses of years gone by have tried to give them a chance, with rural electrification which made such a difference in my own youth in Georgia, and with other programs, such as the Farm Storage and Direct Loan program. But the Secretary of Agriculture has tried to kill those programs. He has only been held back by the federal courts.

What our farmers and ranchers want is simple. We want a stable and dependable farm program. Final decisions on the farm must often be made 15 to 30 months in advance. Those decisions become little more than desperate gambles, which fewer and fewer young people are willing to take, when we cannot understand or predict basic agriculture policy in Washington.

We want a system of handling carryover stocks which will give our own consumers adequate supplies of food and yet keep control of a good portion of those stocks in the hands of farmers -- to prevent dumping to artifically lower farm prices.

We need to take agricultural leadership in Washington out of the hands of the corporate interests and the grain speculators. We need a President and a Secretary of Agriculture who understand the problems of the family farmer and the American consumer -- and if I am elected we are going to have both.

We need to close the revolving door between the Agriculture Department and the large special interests. Under its present leadership, six of the very top assistants have swung in and out of the department, from large trading companies and speculative firms.

We need to guarantee a decent price for the farmer and a reasonable price for the consumer. Net farm income went down by ¼ between 1973 and 1975. The costs of production have risen much faster than the prices you can get. Support levels are unreasonably low.

If I am elected, we will make sure that our support prices are at least equal to the cost of production. That will not guarantee a profit -- no real farmer wants that -- but it will give the determined farmer a chance to stay in business.

Our new farm policy will also help us develop a stable, and healthy, export market. Our vast acres of agricultural land are not only a great natural resource for us, but also for the entire world. Last year, our sales to Japan, to Europe, and to our other customers overseas brought more than $22 billion in foreign exchange.

Agricultural international trade is the gas and oil for the United States. We export the produce of about one out of every three of our acres -- 60% of our wheat -- 50% of rice and soybeans -- and 25% of our corn.

Our foreign customers know that we produce the best food in the world. They know we can meet competitive world prices. They know we are the world's last dependable granary. But they've started to think we're undependable -- not because of our farmers, but because of our Republican administration. Every time Nixon, Ford and Butz have imposed a new export embargo it has caused permanent damage to foreign markets for farm products. Every time they delay tought and honest grain inspection, the damage is multiplied.

It shouldn't be that way. With new leadership in the Agriculture Department, with a new and stable farm policy, we can win back our reputation as a dependable supplier.

Farmers are the first and foremost environmentalists. We have to use the same resources, and the same land, over and over again. One of the greatest tragedies of the last eight years is the way the administration has cut back on farm conservation efforts. As a companion to building production and stable prices, we must also have conservation programs, to build back the land.

We are going to take the family farmer off the public enemy list. I haven't met a small farmer who wants to be on welfare or guaranteed a profit without work, but we should take away his chains. The general public must understand the farmer's problems. The average family farm represents an investment of $300,000 in land and equipment -- much of it on credit, of course.. If the farmer could invest all that money in the bank, it would earn at least $15,000 in interest every year. In farming, after the entire family works all year, they earn about $10,000 or $12,000 -- 3% or 4% a year on this investment.

We need a true and continuing partnership between consumers, producers of food and fibre, and our own government.

Estate taxes on the average lifetime investment of our farm families will come to $65,000 -- far more than they can afford. If I am elected, we will reduce the estate tax burden, and base the estate tax value of the land on its use for agriculture, rather than its potential value for commercial subdivision.

Those of us who have spent many years on the farm know the price that an indifferent or incompetent government can make us pay. During the Hoover depression, which happened to be the time I was growing up on the farm, the amount of labor expended for any sort of cash return was almost unbelievable. In 1933 peanuts sold for as little as one cent per pound. A farmer with all manual labor and using a mule and mule-drawn equipment would break an acre of land, harrow at least twice, plow up the peanuts, shake each vine manually, and then place them on a stack pole, let them cure for eight to ten weeks, haul the stack poles to the threshing machine, separate the peanuts from the vine, and carry his entire crop to market.

In those days, the average yield was 700 pounds, which gave a <u>gross</u> return for all the year's work of only $7 an acre.

The farm is the place where we still believe in a day's work for a day's pay. We farmers don't like to be paid not to produce. But when we do produce, we want to be paid a fair price. And we will be, if you join me in this new partnership.

The farm has left its mark on me. I believe in my country, and I know you do too. I have deep feelings of patriotism. I know they are mirrored here in Iowa, and everywhere else where independent farmers work the land.

I believe in hard work. I believe that the best government is the one closest to the people.

And I believe in a closeknit family.

These things have got to be preserved. They are the values that have lived on the farm and which our government needs to rediscover. They are the values I will carry with me into the White House, if I am elected.

I want to improve the quality of life of our rural people. I live on the outskirts of a little town of only 683 people. I don't care if 100 years from now it still has less than 1000 population. But it's important to me that my children and your children have as good an education and as high an income, and the same right to shape their own destiny as children who live in the largest or wealthiest community in our nation.

We have a long way to go. We can restore the precious things we've lost, the things which remain strong in rural America. Then all of us can be sure again that we still live in the greatest country on earth.

# # #

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 responsibilites 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 leadershp 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, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

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

REMARKS BY JIMMY CARTER AT TOWN HALL FORUM

Los Angeles, California, August 23, 1976

During the past week, when the attention of the political world was focused on the events in Kansas City, I spent most of my time at my home in Plains, Georgia, reading, studying national issues, talking with friends and advisers, and trying to sort out my thoughts as I look ahead to the Presidential campaign.

I want to share some of those thoughts with you today, and I want to say at the outset that my mood is one of confidence and optimism. Not simply optimism over my own immediate political prospects, but optimism about the future of this country.

I think, and I believe the American people agree, that this is one of our most important elections, that this is one of those elections, as in 1932 and 1960, when we have a chance to break with the past and make a fresh start in our national affairs.

Every election is unique, of course. In 1932 our nation faced an economic disaster, and our people correctly judged that Franklin Roosevelt was the candidate whose personal character and political courage made him best qualified to lead us through that crisis.

In 1960 we faced not an economic crisis but a state of spiritual malaise, a sense of national drift, and the people correctly judged that John Kennedy, with all his youth and vigor, could keep his promise to get the country movin g again, as in fact he did.

Today, as we face the election of 1976, I think there is a feeling in the land, much like those of 1932 and 1960, that we face an economic crisis, and that we are drifting and need to get moving again. But there is something more than that. After all we have been through in recent years, we need to have our faith in our government restored. We want to believe once again that our national leaders are honorable and competent and deserving of our trust. For if we cannot believe that, little else matters.

I have thought for some time that this year's campaign was taking place on two distinct levels. At one level, and quite properly, there is policy, and the economy. In many hundreds of public forums I have discussed all these issues with our people for 20 months, and later this month I will make statements on defense and veterans' affairs, agriculture and economics. But today I would like to discuss with you the other level of this year's campaign, the less tangible issue, which is simply the desire of the American people to have faith again in our own government.

We have been through too much in too short a time. Our national nightmare began with the assassination of John Kennedy, and went on to include the assassination of Robert Kennedy, and of Martin Luther King, Jr., and the wounding of George Wallace. We watched the widespread opposition to the war in Vietnam, and the division and bitterness that war caused, and the violence in Chicago in 1968, and the invasion of Cambodia, and the shootings at Kent State, and revelations of official lying and spying and bugging, the resignations in disgrace of both a disclosure that our top security and law enforcement agencies were deliberately and routinely violating the law.

No other generation in American History has ever been subjected to such a battering as this. Small wonder, then, that the politics of 1976 have turned out to be significantly different from years past. I doubt that four years ago or eight years ago a former Southern governor with no national reputation and no Washington experience would have been able to win the Democratic nomination for President. But this year many voters were looking for new leaders, leaders who were not associated with the mistakes of the past.

This is suggested not only by my own campaign, but by the success that Governor Jerry Brown achieved in several of the Democratic primaries. For, however else we may differ, Governors Brown and Reagan and I have in common the fact that we are all outsiders as far as Washington is concerned, and committed to major changes in our nation's government if elected President.

To want a change, to want a fresh start, to want government that is honest and competent again, is not a partisan issue. Democrats and Republicans, liberals and conservatives, all share those fundamental concerns.

In the last analysis, good government is not a matter of being liberal or conservative. Good government is the art of doing what is right, and that is far more difficult. To be liberal or conservative requires only ideology; to do what is right requires sensitivity and wisdom.

I think that most Americans are not very ideological. Most Americans share a deepseated desire for two goals that might, to an ideological person, seem contradictory. We want both progress and preservation.

We want progress because progress is the very essence of our American dream--the belief that each generation, through hard work, can give a better life to its children. And increasingly in this century we have realized that it is a proper function of government to help make that dream come true.

But we do not want reckless change. We want to preserve what is best in our past--our political traditions, our cultural heritage, our physical resources--as guideposts to our future.

To walk the line between progress and preservation, between too much change and too little, is no easy task. It cannot be achieved by the extremists of

either side, by those who scorn the past or those who fear the future. It can only be accomplished by leaders who are independent and imaginative and flexible in their thinking, and are guided not by closed minds but by common sense.

That is the kind of leadership the American people are looking for this year, and that is the kind of leadership that, if elected, I intend to provide.

As I have observed the political world in recent years, it has seemed to me that there is a process at work, in both political parties and probably in all nations, by which over a period of time the political leadership becomes isolated from, and different from, the people they are supposed to serve.

It seems almost inevitable that if political leaders stay in power too long, and ride in limousines too long, and eat expensive meals in private clubs too long, they are going to become cut off from the lives and concerns of ordinary Americans. It is almost like a law of nature-- as Lord Acton said, power tends to corrupt.

I think this process reached a peak a few years ago, when we had a President who surrounded himself with people who knew everything in the world about merchandising and manipulation and winning elections, and nothing at all about the hopes and fears and dreams of average people.

When government becomes cut off from its people, when its leaders are talking only to themselves instead of addressing reality, then it is time for a process of national self-renewal, time to look outside the existing governing class for new leaders with new ideas. I think that is what happened in the Democratic party this year. I think our party was ready for renewal, for new faces, for a changing of the guard. If the candidate had not been myself, I think we would have chosen someone else who was not part of the old order of things.

My sense is that millions of Americans feel that this is the year in which they will give the system one last chance. They do not want to be disillusioned again. They are going to study the candidates, examine our political records and our personal ability and character, and make a judgment as to which candidate can best restore competence and vision and honesty to our government.

I welcome their scrutiny, and have confidence in their judgment.

Obviously there are some outstanding political leaders in Washington-- one of the most outstanding, Senator Mondale, is my running mate--and yet I think our people are correct in seeking leadership from outside Washington, new leadership which can approach the executive branch of government with fresh eyes and an open mind.

As a governor, I have been on the receiving end of our federal programs. Members of Congress may see the new programs on the drawing board, or hear about their theories, but governors and local and state officials deal with the realities. I have wrestled with the unnecessary regulations, and the paperwork and red tape and the overlapping jurisdictions. I know what it is to try to start a state drug-treatment program and have to negotiate with almost a dozen different federal agencies that have separate legal responsibility for the drug problem.

Let me say that, on the basis of my experience, I have never been more serious or more determined in my life than when I promise to carry out a complete reorganization of the executive branch of government.

Let me say also, in case there is any question in anyone's mind, that I am not anti-government. I am anti-waste in government. I don't believe in give-away programs. I don't believe in wasting money. I do believe in tough, competent management, and I have tried to practice it as a naval officer, as a farmer, as a businessman, and as a governor. I also believe in delivering services to those people who need those services in an efficient, economical, and sensitive way. That is not liberal or conservative. It's just good government, and that's what the American people want, and what I intend to provide.

I think the basic issue in this campaign is going to be whether we want government that looks confidently to the future, or government that clings fearfully to the past.

There's a song in the musical "Oklahoma" called "Everything's Up to Date in Kansas City". But I didn't think everything was up to date in Kansas City last week. We kept hearing the same old tired rhetoric about socialism and reckless spending that we've been hearing every four years since the Roosevelt years. I don't think the American people are much impressed by that kind of rhetoric. The American people don't believe that Social Security and Medicare were reckless spending, or that TVA and the minimum wage were socialism. The American people consider the source of those charges, and look at the record, and aren't decieved by the nay-sayers.

One of the real issues in this campaign is going to President Ford's record of vetoes. It is a record that I cite more in sorrow than in anger, for it is a record of political insensitivity, of missed opportunities, of constant conflict with the Congress, and of national neglect.

In six years as President, Mr. Ford's predecessor vetoed 41 bills that had been passed by Congress. In only two years, Ford has already vetoed 53 bills, about four times as many bills per year as his predecessor-- and to be four times as negative as Mr. Ford's predecessor is a remarkable achievement.

What did these vetoes accomplish? Did they save us from wasteful, reckless spending, as the Administration would like us to believe. I think not.

One of the bills President Ford vetoed was the Emergency Employment Act, which would have created nearly two million full and part-time jobs, to help those millions of Americans who have been rendered jobless by Republican economic policies. I think our government has a responsibility to help those people get back to work. When people can't find jobs, we pay the price over and over in increased costs of welfare and unemployment compensation and lost tax revenues.

Congress also passed a bill that would have granted those unemployed home-owners temporary help in meeting their mortgage payments. I think that was a

responsible action for Congress to take. But Mr. Ford vetoed the bill.

When people are out of work, they and their children still have to eat, and Congress passed the School Lunch Act, to increase the number of families whose children were eligible for school lunch subsidies. But Mr. Ford vetoed that bill.

I had occasion, very close to home, to see what that kind of veto could mean to the real people who were on the receiving end of it. I know a young teacher who taught a remedial class for first-graders in the Plains Elementary School. Most of the students in this special class happened to be black, and were having a hard time getting started in school because of the devastating poverty in which they had been raised.

Free milk was provided twice a day, in the morning and at lunch, for needy students, but then there was a cutback and the morning milk was eliminated. So the young teacher began using her own money to see that all her students had milk. And when she ran out of money she went to her father and he saw to it that her students had milk every morning.

That is the sort of thing that happens when our leaders ignore the human factor in government, when they think in terms of statistics and economic theories instead of in terms of real human needs.

These leaders are so short-sighted. Doesn't it make more sense to spend money on milk and education today, to help children get a fair start in life, than to spend money on police and courts and jails ten years from now, when those children have grown up untrained for a productive life and turned against a society that treated their needs with indifference?

It has been my experience in government that the most profitable investment is in people, and that is the rule I will follow if I become your President.

There were many other vetoes. Mr. Ford vetoed a bill to provide loans and grants to train nurses. He vetoed a bill to send more doctors to rural areas and inner-city slums where there are far too few doctors. He vetoed a bill to provide job training and college educations for Vietnam veterans, the most unappreciated heroes in our nation's history.

These vetoes haven't helped our economy. They haven't balanced the budget -- far from it. They have only contributed to needless human suffering.

An occasional veto may be justified, if legislation is poorly drafted or ill-considered, but 53 vetoes in two years demonstrates a negativism, a dormancy, and a fear of action that can only be harmful to this country. There is something seriously wrong when the members of Congress, all of whom were elected by the people, repeatedly pass legislation the country needs, only to have it vetoed by an appointed President. I believe those men and women in Congress are a great deal closer to the national mood than Mr. Ford has shown himself to be.

We have had enough of government by veto. It is time we had a President who will lead our nation, and who will work in harmony with Congress for a change, with mutual respect for a change, out in the open for a change, so the working families of this country can be represented as well as the rich and the powerful and the special interest groups.

Another major issue this fall is going to be the state of our nation's economy. Republicans have a long tradition of mishandling the economy, one that goes back to Herbert Hoover. Except in election years, when they sometimes manage to make the economy pick up by temporarily adopting Democratic economic programs.

During the Eisenhower, Nixon and Ford Administrations, we had five recessions. Under Kennedy and Johnson we had none. And we all know that recessions are hardest on those people who are weakest, who are poor and uneducated and isolated, who are confused and inarticulate, who are often unemployed and chronically dependent -- in short, those members of society whom a good government would be trying hardest to help.

Do you know what the basic Republican anti-inflation policy has been? To put people out of work. Cooling down the economy, they call it, because that sounds nicer. I say to you that any economic policy that sees virtue in unemployment is morally and politically and intellectually bankrupt.

What's more, those policies have been dismal failures. In 1968, the last year of a Democratic administration, the unemployment rate was 3.6%. Today it's more than twice that -- about 7.8% and rising. Under Kennedy and Johnson the average annual rate of inflation was 2%. During the Nixon and Ford administrations it has been almost 7%.

With all this human suffering, has the Republican administration balanced the budget? In the last three years, the accumulated deficits are about $160 billion, more than the previous 30 years combined. Under Kennedy and Johnson, the average deficit was less than $4 billion. Under Nixon and Ford the average deficit has been more than $24 billion a year.

In short, the Republican economic policies have not worked, and I believe they have failed to work because they were the creations of people who put economic theories and special interests ahead of the realities of human need in this country.

There are many other problems and many other issues in this campaign. I have been speaking about the breakdown of the American family, and I mentioned that among young people the second most prevalent cause of death is suicide and that in the past ten years the gonorrhea rate has tripled among children 14 years of age or younger.

I sensed that some people thought I shouldn't use those words, suicide and gonorrhea, because they are ugly words describing unpleasant facts. But there are many unpleasant problems in our society -- children who need food, overcrowded jails and mental institutions, inadequate treatment for the young men who were maimed in Vietnam, and the heartbreak and family disintegration that unemployment can bring.

All these are ugly problems and it is a natural human instinct for us to want to tune them out. But we cannot tune them out. We can only succeed in tuning out our own humanity, including those qualities of compassion and concern without which no society, however, rich or powerful, can be truly great.

"No man is an island," John Donne wrote many years ago; we are all part of the mainland of humanity. That is still true today, and as American citizens, most of us blessed with a good education and influence in society, we cannot ignore the needs and suffering of our less fortunate fellow citizens -- not if we want this nation to remain great.

"Ask not for whom the bell tolls," Donne went on to say; "it tolls for thee."

I think there is a bell tolling for all of us this year.

It is asking us what kind of America we want.

It is asking whether once again an American President can inspire patriotism and price in all of our people.

It is asking if we can tear down the walls that have divided different races and different religions and different regions in America, and once more be a united nation.

It is asking if we are indeed a tired, worn out, cynical nation, or if we can once more be moved by optimism and hope and love for our fellow human beings.

It is asking if through our democratic system we can once again give this nation a government as competent and as good as our people.

I believe we can. We have lived through a time of torment, and now we are ready for a time of healing. I believe we are ready for new leadership, leaders who come from the people and who speak to the people and who care about the people. I believe we have reached a turning point in our national history, a time of cleansing and rededication, and I promise you I will do all in my power to bring this nation back to the greatness we deserve and that the world expects of us.

Thank you.

JIMMY CARTER ON ABORTION

I do not support constitutional amendments to overturn the Supreme Court ruling on abortion.

However, I personally disapprove of abortion. I do not believe government should encourage abortion. The efforts of government should be directed toward minimizing abortions.

If, within the confines of the Supreme Court ruling, we can work out legislation to minimize abortion with better family planning, adoption procedures, and contraception for those who desire it, I would favor such a law.

Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Abortion should never be considered just one of a number of equally acceptable methods of contraception.

As Governor of Georgia I obtained the first line item appropriation for family planning in the history of the state. I created by executive order the Special Council on Family Planning to spearhead the implementation of a comprehensive, voluntary, family planning program throughout the state.

The Georgia Medical Consent Act was amended to allow all females regardless of age or marital status to receive medical treatment for the prevention of pregnancy.

Although we have 159 counties in Georgia, it became one of the few states in the nation with family planning clinics operating in every county health department. Participation in family planning programs increased by 200 percent just during the first two years of my administration.

I believe my record as Governor and my personal inclinations equip me to insure a more productive role for the government in this area.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ANSWERS QUESTIONS ON AFRICA

1. What are the general objectives that should guide U.S. foreign policy; how do these objectives find expression in Africa?

The United States should pursue a foreign policy which encourages the process of needed change and orderly nonviolent progress for the peoples of the entire earth. As a nation which itself struggled for freedom, we must be aligned with the legitimate aspirations for self-determination and liberty of peoples all over the world. This should be accomplished primarily through support and cooperation with multilateral international institutions.

The development potential of the world can best be encouraged through the World Bank, through the establishment of an economic partnership in the General Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), and by the establishment (through the International Monetary Fund) of an international monetary system which is equitable to the developing nations as well as to ourselves.

The United States must also continue to enter into bilateral aid programs and respond to the emergency needs of those nations that are struggling to develop democratic institutions. When in our national interest, we may also enter into military aid programs whenever the national sovereignty of friendly nations is threatened by external powers. However, I think that the United States should refrain from covert activities which interfere with the internal affairs of friendly nations and should develop the kind of economic interdependence which would assure our ability to relate in a variety of ways to the nations of the world.

The United States of America is a world power and cannot escape from that responsibility and all that it entails. Our economy needs the natural resources which Africa can offer, and we will not be able to solve our problems of unemployment and inflation until there is a worldwide market system in which the producers and the consumers share equitably in the earth's resources.

2. How should aid priorities be determined, as between friends and non-friends, between Africa and the rest of the developing world; between "democratic" and "non-democratic" regimes; between countries with interesting natural resources and those with none; between countries that have potential for economic development and those who need long term humanitarian assistance?

As a nation, we must protect our own self-interest and give some priority to those nations who share the democratic principles and ideals which our nation tries to embody. However, we live in a world in which no nation can be completely written off as unfriendly; a nation's friends are sometimes determined by her interest in a particular situation, and such should be the case with Africa. While it is very difficult to export American concepts of democracy to another continent, we should always show preference for those democratic regimes that are based on majority rule and on the protection of minority rights. But we must not ignore political realities that may not conform to our ideals.

United States business interests will automatically move in the direction of those countries which are rich in natural resources such as Zambia, Zaire, Angola and Nigeria, but the foreign policy needs of the United States might well be further advanced by an association with Tanzania or Mazambique or the Sahel region which are in need of humanitarian assistance. Essentially, our two-fold approach of assistance through the International Development Agency of the World Bank and through improved AID programs will be in the long-term interests of this nation.

3. Do you think that situations such as that pertaining in Angola should be met by an active U.S. reaction, overt or covert?

I think that the United States' position in Angola should be one which admits that we missed the opportunity to be a positive and creative force for good in Angola during the years that we supported Portuguese colonization. We should also realize that the Russian and Cuban presence in Angola, while regrettable and counterproductive of peace, need not constitute a threat to United States interests; nor does that presence mean the existence of a Communist satellite on the continent. The Communists have given military assistance in many African nations but have never been able to remain there once independence is achieved. The OAU policy of non-alignment is so strong in the African tradition that it is reasonable to assume that an independent Angola would continue in that tradition. Furthermore, since Angola's survival economically depends on the sale of oil and other natural resources to the West, there will be some economic ties with any government which emerges.

It is extremely unfortunate that a unified government did not emerge along the lines of the Alvor Agreement, and Americans and Africans alike should deplore the cynical racism and violence perpetuated by the Soviet Union and Cuba on the people of Angola. But it is not in the U.S. interest to perpetuate the killing by covert or overt military assistance which would only prolong the fighting. The need for stability and order will force any government to come to terms with tribal and ideological differences which might exist.

4. How do you perceive the present U.S. government's policy toward southern African issues in general? Toward Namibia, Rhodesia, South Africa? Should stronger sanctions, boycotts, or other measures be taken against South Africa because of its apartheid policies? How do you see the oppression of apartheid, compared with oppression in some Black-ruled states? Is it being partial to take measures against South Africa and none against, for example, Uganda, Central African Republic or Equatorial Guinea?

For almost a decade the United States has had no positive policy toward South Africa. The Angola situation is a result of this policy vacuum. The United States should move immediately toward using leverage on South Africa to encourage the independence of Namibia and the beginning of majority rule in Rhodesia. There is no question that independence will come in the near future. The only question is whether it comes through armed struggle sponsored by the Soviet Union or through an agressive diplomacy of peace encouraged by the United States.

The economic dependence of South Africa on the United States is such that an agressive diplomacy need not include economic sanctions. Our influence on South Africa is even stronger than the influence of Vorster on Rhodesia's Ian Smith.

The experience which we have had with race relations in this country could also help South Africa to develop a system of guaranteed majority rule, while protecting minority rights. It is in the United States' interest to avoid further bloodshed in southern Africa. It is also in the interest of Black Africa to settle the question of African liberation without violence. The oppression of apartheid is a systematic policy institutionalized under law by the South African government, while the oppression in certain Black-ruled states of Africa is the result of a particular dictator and the attempt to deal with historic tribal tension or the vestiges of colonially-inspired division. However, the same policy of aggressive diplomacy toward freedom and justice for all should be the policy in our relationships with Black African states, and we must condemn injustice wherever it is and whatever the color of its originators.

5. Do you think that the U.S. can have a special relationship with Africa because of its own large Black population? Could this relationship be analagous to the U.S.-Israel relationship which exists because of this country's influential Jewish population?

Yes. The involvement of Black Americans, Spanish-speaking Americans and other ethnic and religious groups in our political system should be viewed as a national strength. We are blessed with the fact that we are the world in microcosm. This should make us sensitive to the affairs of the entire world and should also be the basis of very positive and creative relationships with the rest of the world. This is particularly true of this nation's Black minority and Africa, as well as our Spanish-speaking minority and Latin America.

6. Are you aware in your public and political life, of a significant Black constituency for Africa?

I have received a growing number of questions in my political campaigning from Black Americans on the question of Africa. But, for the most part, Black Americans are as domestically oriented as most white Americans, and they predominantly ask about race relations in this country and my approach to the problems of education, unemployment and economic justice in America. It would be a great help to this nation if people in public life were to be made aware of the problems of Africa through a significant Black interest in Africa. Americans might not have made the mistakes we made in Vietnam had there been an articulate Vietnamese minority in our midst. Such an articulate minority could have saved this nation 50,000 of her most promising young men, as well as more than $150 billion from our nation's treasury.

7. If there were such a pressure group on African issues, would you pay attention to it? How might such a pressure group influence you to give a different emphasis to your policies?

Any politician who survives in public office learns to be sensitive to the active and legitimate concerns of the voters. And while I would resist being dictated to by any particular constituency, there is no question that such a group would be influential. A President, however, must consider the total national need and develop foreign and domestic policies which do most for the "common good" and the national interest. There should be strong input from all constituencies into such a policy, but ultimately that policy must be greater than the sum of its parts and become a coherent national policy protective of the interests of the United States and not just responding to the political pressures of any particular constituency.

8. Do you think that African questions, as a whole, receive less than their warranted consideration by the U.S. government?

There is no question that Africa has been ignored since the days of John F. Kennedy. Africa should become, and will become, one of the major foreign policy issues of the coming decade. Many of our domestic and international problems will be determined by the direction of our policies in Africa.

9. What would you like to see as the basis of relations between the U.S. and Africa?

The only basis of relationships between the United States and any part of the world must be that of mutual self-interest. There is an amazing congruity between the interests and needs of the United States and Africa. Africa needs development assistance and technological advances which only the United States can supply, and the United States needs both the resources and markets of an emerging Africa. This relationship should be built on mutual responsibility, mutual need, and a kind of partnership that is best expressed in the concepts of equality, justice and brotherhood.

JIMMY CARTER ON AGRICULTURE

The greatest need among those involved in the agricultural economy of this nation is a coherent, predictable and stable government policy relating to farming and the production of food and fiber.

The second requirement is an emphasis in government policy on the mutual concerns of the family farmer and the consumer, which are irrevocably tied together.

A third requirement is a Secretary of Agriculture who is inclined toward stability, predictability, and honest concern for the needs of family farmers and consumers.

There is now no coordination between our Departments of Agriculture or Commerce or Interior or Defense or any of the countless agencies, boards and bureaus that make decisions affecting agricultural policy. There is no logical reason for separating commodity policy from policies involving energy, land use, foreign affairs, monetary exchange or foreign trade.

We should again maintain a predictable, reasonably small and stable reserve of agricultural products. About a two months' supply would be adequate with about one-half of these reserves being retained under the control of farmers to prevent government "dumping" during times of moderate price increases.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON VIETNAM PARDON

If I am President, I will issue a pardon for all those who are outside our country, or in this country, who did not serve in the armed forces. I am going to issue a pardon, not an amnesty. I think those kids who have lived in Sweden or in Canada or who have avoided arrest have been punished enough. I think it is time to get it over with.

In my opinion, amnesty says what you did was right. Pardon says whether what you did was right or wrong, you are forgiven for it.

For those who deserted due to their opposition to the Vietnam War, I would not issue a blanket pardon, but would treat them on a case by case basis.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE ARTS

The United States government's cultural and educational programs here and abroad have been of enormous benefit to our country. Indeed, more and more of the American public has come to recognize the important role cultural institutions play in improving the quality of commodity life.

However, the very success of the government's role in cultural life focuses renewed attention on a number of identifiable problems.
The Carter Administration will review existing programs and institutions in order to further improve what is by common consent a highly constructive federal role in our domestic cultural life.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE B-1

I oppose production of the B-1 bomber at this time. I believe that research and development should continue. The decision on the production of this weapon system should be made by the next Administration. An addition to our manned bomber fleet may become necessary, but I do not think the B-1 meets this need at this time.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON

BUREAUCRACY AND GOVERNMENT INEFFICIENCY

Our government in Washington now is a horrible bureaucratic mess. It is disorganized, wasteful, has no purpose, and its policies -- when they exist - are incomprehensible or devised by special interest groups with little regard for the welfare of the average American citizen.

This is not an inherent, unavoidable aspect of government. We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision of the federal bureaucracy, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its many varied services.

Tight businesslike management and planning techniques must be instituted and maintained utilizing the full authority and personal involvement of the President himself.

This is no job for the fainthearted. It will be met with strong opposition from those who now enjoy special privileges, those who prefer to work in the dark, or those whose personal fiefdoms are threatened.

In Georgia, we met that opposition head on -- and we won! We abolished 278 of 300 agencies. We evolved clearly defined goals and policies in every part of government. We developed and implemented a remarkably effective system of zero base budgeting. We instituted tough performance auditing to insure proper conduct and efficient delivery of services.

Steps like these can insure a full return on our hard-earned tax dollars. These procedures are working in our state capitols around the nation and in our successful businesses, both large and small. They can and they will work in Washington.

There is no inherent conflict between careful planning, tight management, and constant reassessment on the one hand, and compassionate concern for the plight of the deprived and afflicted on the other. Waste and inefficiency never fed a hungry child, provided a job for a willing worker, or educated a deserving student.

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

JIMMY CARTER ON BUSING

This question of busing has been an integral part of the lives of those who live in the South for the last 15 or 20 years. We have dealt with it as best we could. And I'd like to express as succinctly as I can a view that I think has been evolved after a long and torturous ordeal. And perhaps what we have accomplished there can be some guidance for the rest of the country, that is now going through the same phase of school integration. I just want to say this. The best thing that ever happened to the South in my lifetime was the passage of the Civil Rights Acts and the complete integration of our schools, our public facilities and the granting to black people of a chance to work, to live, to attend public facilities as they choose. It would be almost incomprehensible for those who live outside the South to know what has occurred there. And I will be very quick with this. I have one daughter who is eight years old, she came to me and Rosalynn when we had been married 21 years, we really love her; and we have three older sons. Last year she was in the second grade in the place where we live, a little town, called Plains, total population 683. We have a majority of black citizens there. We live in harmony and peace. In Amy's second grade classroom of the public schools last year she had 13 white classmates, 16 black classmates, a black teacher, a white principal and that is absolutely typical throughout the rural parts of Georgia. And that's the way we like it. She goes there because we want her to be in an integrated school. She likes it, her mother likes it, and I like it.

We have tried in Atlanta mandatory busing. It did not work. The only kids I have ever seen bused are poor children. I have never seen a rich child bused. The rich parents either move or they put their kids in private schools.

At first it is very important to the black citizens to have the busing order, and this is a phase that you have to go through, and I think maybe it's a mandatory phase. I don't argue with it. But eventually the poor parents, mostly blacks, say "We don't want our kids bused any more to a distant school", because these are the very parents who don't have a second car, and if their children get sick in the middle of the day or if they want to go to athletic events, they can't go. So the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in Atlanta, quite liberal, finally said to the NAACP, the SCLC, and to myself as Governor and to then Mayor Sam Massell, who happens to be Jewish, and the then Vice-Mayor, Maynard Jackson, who is black, to sit down and work out a plan that suited us. And this is the plan that we worked out. It is very simple and easily described, and it suits the NAACP and others.

First of all, any child who wants to be bused can be bused at public expense. Secondly, the busing must contribute to increased integration. You can't be bused away from a school just because it's got black kids in it. Third - and this is missing completely in Boston and a lot of other cities, but it's integral for an ultimate solution - the black leaders have to be adequately represented in the decision-making processes of a school system at all levels, so the black people will feel "that's my school system too,

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.

it's not just a white folks' school system that my kids have to go to". And last, and this is important in my opinion, no child is bused against the wishes of the child.

That's what we've evolved; it's been in effect for two or three years, and it's worked. I guess that at the end of four or five more years in Louisville and Boston and many other places, the Atlanta plan is going to be what is accepted by black and white citizens.

I might add one other thing as a political candidate: that's my preference, but when I'm President, I will be sworn to uphold the law, and if Federal Courts rule differently from what I believe I will support the Federal Court. But I believe this is not the subject to be reopened with a constitutional amendment. I would really hate to see that done.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE CIA

The CIA should not be abolished. We need some sort of intelligence gathering service. We cannot rely upon public relations handouts from Communist countries as our sources of information. But there is only one person who ultimately can be responsible for the actions of the CIA. That man is the President. As President, I can assure you that I will take full responsibility for all of the agency's actions.

We have learned recently that never again should our country become militarily involved in the internal affairs of another country unless there is a direct and obvious threat to the security of the United States or its people. We must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy. Such involvements are not in the best interests of world peace, and they are almost inherently doomed to failure.

We must never again keep secret the evolution of our foreign policy from the Congress and the American people. They should never again be misled about our options, commitments, our progress or our failures. If the President sets all policies openly, reaching agreement among the leaders of both parties rather than letting a handful of people plot the policy behind closed doors, then we will avoid costly mistakes and have the support of our citizens in dealing with other nations.

The CIA must operate within the law. The President must be willing to accept responsibility for the mistakes within the executive branch and to take specific steps to see they do not recur. Intelligence is a service to allow foreign policy to be based on more complete information. The function of the intelligence agency should be to provide this service, not to overthrow governments or make foreign policy unilaterally or in secret.

JIMMY CARTER ON CIVIL RIGHTS

I wrote in my inauguration speech (as Governor of Georgia): "I say to you quite frankly that the time for racial discrimination is over. Our people have already made this major and difficult decision, but we cannot underestimate the challenge of hundreds of minor decisions yet to be made. Our inherent human charity and our religious beliefs will be taxed to the limit. No poor, rural, weak or black person should ever have to bear the additional burden of being deprived of the opportunity of an education, a job or simply justice."

It was my privilege as governor to appoint dozens of qualified black citizens to major policy board positions, so they could participate fully in official deliberations such as those concerning the university system, the corrections systems, state law enforcement, and aspects of human resources, the pardon and parole system, and the professional examination boards for dentists, physicians, nurses, funeral directors, beauticians and barbers, and many more.

One of the challenging aspects of my life in Plains revolved around our attitudes toward the race question. During the 1950's, there was strong concern and excitement in Georgia about the Supreme Court rulings and the prospective passage of laws in Congress to eliminate the legal aspects of segregation. My views on the subject were sometimes at odds with those of most of my neighbors.

One of the ideas that swept the south in that time was the formation of White Citizens' Councils. When the White Citizens' Council movement hit Plains, recruitment of new members did not prove to be difficult. After a few days I was visited by two of the town's leading citizens acting as organizers for the new local White Citizens' Council. After some discussion, the two men left, but in a couple of days they returned to my office at the warehouse to notify me that every white male adult in the community had joined the White Citizens' Council . . . except me. I repeated my statement that I did not wish to join and eventually they left again. After a few more days, they came back with several of my close friends, some of whom were customers of mine in the seed and fertilizer business. They pointed out that it would damage my reputation and my success as a businessman in the community if I proved to be the only hold-out in the community, and because of their genuine concern about my welfare they were willing to pay the dues for me. My response was that I had no intention of joining the organization on any basis; that I was willing to leave Plains if necessary; that the $5 dues requirement was not an important factor; and that I would never change my mind.

There was also a serious problem with the churches in the community, brought into focus by the concerted effort of the more activist civil rights groups to integrate the white church congregations. I was a deacon in our church and missed one very critical deacons' meeting during this period. On that occasion, the other eleven deacons and our pastor voted

unanimously to propose to the church congregation that if any blacks attempted to enter the church on Sunday they would be blocked and excluded from the worship service. On the Saturday before our monthly church conference, my family and I were attending the wedding of a cousin of mine north of Atlanta. We decided to get up early and drive home to the church on that Sunday morning of the conference. I asked for recognition and spoke to members of the church urging them to reverse the decision of the deacons and to permit free entry of any blacks who attempted to enter our church. The only six people voting to keep the services open to all worshippers were my mother, my wife Rosalynn, our two sons, myself and one other member of the congregation.

A new degree of freedom for both black and white southerners evolved from the trauma of desegregation. Instead of constant preoccupation with the racial aspect of almost every question, public officials, black and white, are now at liberty to make objective decisions about education, health, employment, crime control, consumer protection, prison reform and environmental quality.

February 17, 1974

REMARKS BY GOVERNOR JIMMY CARTER AT THE CEREMONY FOR UNVEILING OF PORTRAIT OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER KING AT THE GEORGIA STATE CAPITOL

Before I accept this portrait, there are two people that I would like to recognize in a special way. One of them is a young woman who serves on my staff, who has come to me many times to say, "Governor, you have an opportunity to perform a service that will bind all our people together in a common attitude of understanding and communication and love." She has been a constant inspiration to me. Her name is Rita Samuels. She is over in the corner, characteristically not seeking the limelight.

The other person that I would like to recognize again, now that you have seen the product of his great work, is George Mandus, the artist.

As I sat here in the rotunda of our Capitol, I looked up at some of the portraits that already hang in there, that I consider to be, hallowed halls. To my left, on the next floor, is a portrait of George Washington, our first President. On the right is Thomas Jefferson, a great humanitarian who loved the common people. Here on my left, illuminated, is a portrait of Robert E. Lee, who served in a time of great stress in our nation and who, I think, deserved the devotion and respect of men who knew him personally and the admiration of those of us who have come to know his character.

Now, today, we are unveiling the portrait of another great American.

A German philosopher, Hegel, who wrote about 1800, tried to bring together in his writings an analysis of some of the philosophies that had preceded him. One of his more remote comments was that the life of a great man places on the world the responsibility of understanding and explaining his works.

In the history of our nation there has been a constant struggle for greater freedom for our people to understand and to control our government. Many years ago, the state legislatures elected our United States Senators. Then there was an amendment to the Constitution which let the people do this directly.

There was a great wailing and gnashing of teeth among legislators who said, "the people can't make the right judgment. We leaders ought to make those decisions." Later, women were granted the right to vote, and men who occupied a privileged position, and to some degree still do, said, "this will be a catastrophe because we can't trust women to make sound and proper judgments."

These predictions, obviously, have proven to be incorrect.

In Georgia, almost 30 years ago, our Constitution was modified to permit 18 year olds to participate in the electoral process, and just two years ago, I signed into law a bill to give them all the rights of full citizenship. In 1945 and in 1971 many adults said, "this is an improper abrogation of authority to these young people.

These predictions of catastrophe also proved to be untrue.

In the life of Martin Luther King, Jr., our black citizens of Georgia and throughout this nation saw their own aspirations realized, and they saw the prejudices and legal prohibitions against full citizenship begin to be removed. The privileged and powerful leaders of our nation said, "this cannot be".

But I can state to you today a truth that all of your know: that the prediction of Martin Luther King, Jr., that freedom would thus be enhanced among all men has come true.

It would be hard to say who has been more greatly liberated, the black or the white citizens of our nation, because our white citizens have been relieved of a millstone about our necks and of preoccupation with an artificial distinction between the worth of men, which was a handicap to the progress of us all.

I believe we now recognize that we have been liberated, all of us, by granting equality of rights and participation to all Americans regardless of race or color.

Dr. King's works were an inspiration not only to Americans, but throughout the earth, and his awarding of the Nobel Peace Prize was recognition of his contributions.

In closing, let me say that as Governor of this State, I am proud of Georgia. I think it is fair to say that I have taken no innovative nor courageous action contrary to the inclinations of the 5 million people I represent. As I said in my inaugural address three years ago, "the time for racial discrimination is over." I said this not to inspire Georgians to change their minds, but to recognize, as Secretary of State Ben Fortson well knows, a change that has already taken place in the minds and hearts of the people that I love and represent.

I want my country to be number one. I want the United States of America to be the preeminent nation in all the world; but I do not equate preeminence solely with military might nor with the ability to subjugate others or to demonstrate prowess on the battle field. We must have adequate forces to defend ourselves. But, in addition to that, an accomplishment in truth, a recognition of the equality and worth of man, a constant searching for honesty and morality, an openness of government, the ability of all men to control their own destinies and a constant recognition of the values of compassion and love among all our people - these are the proper measures of a great nation.

I accept this portrait of Martin Luther King, Jr., on behalf of all those who live in our State. I believe that it will enhance the education of visiting school children, both black and white; that it will be an inspiration to all Georgians and to other visitors to our Capitol; and that it will stand as a reminder of the proper correlation of natural human frailties in governmental and social affairs with the greatness and purity of our religious principles.

Thank you very much.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

western union **Telegram**

JIMMY CARTER CAMPAIGN HEADQUARTERS JODY POWELL
BOX 1976
ATLANTA GA 30301

THIS MAILGRAM IS A CONFIRMATION COPY OF THE FOLLOWING MESSAGE:

6177554321 TDMT WORCESTER MA 505 01-09 1153A EST
PMS TOM MORGAN, EDITOR THE VILLAGE VOICE, DLR
60 UNIVERSITY PL
NEW YORK NY 10003
THE JANUARY 12 COLUMN BY ALEXANDER COGBURN, "THE RIDDLE OF JIMMY CARTER, CAN A DARK HORSE CHANGE HIS SPOTS," IS A WONDERFUL EXAMPLE OF THE CREATION OF "THE BIG LIE" BY A COMPILATION OF HALF TRUTHS AND DISTORTED FACTS.
JIMMY CARTER IS NOT AND NEVER HAS BEEN GUILTY OF THE KIND OF IMPLIED RACISM OF THESE CHARGES. HE IS ONE OF THE FINEST PRODUCTS OF A MOST MISUNDERSTOOD REGION OF OUR NATION.
PERHAPS THE REAL HEROES AND THE MOST AUTHENTIC LIBERALS OF OUR TIME ARE THOSE WHO EXPRESS THEIR CONVICTIONS IN THEIR OWN HOME TOWNS, POLITICAL COURAGE IN WASHINGTON IS CERTAINLY TO BE RESPECTED, BUT IT CANNOT TOUCH THE CONVICTION AND HEROISM REQUIRED TO BE DIFFERENT IN SUMTER COUNTY, GEORGIA IN THE LATE FIFTIES AND EARLY SIXTIES.
EVEN MORE REMARKABLE IS THE CAPACITY FOR MORAL PERSEVERANCE WHILE MAINTAINING COMPASSION, SYMPATHY, AND GENUINE UNDERSTANDING FOR THOSE BRETHREN WHO STILL LANGUOR IN THE DARKNESS OF INSECURITY AND IGNORANCE.
IT HAS BEEN JUST THIS CAPACITY THAT HAS MADE POSSIBLE THE PROGRESS OF THE SOUTH AND PRODUCED A NEW LEADERSHIP FOR THE NATION.
MARTIN LUTHER KING'S WHOLE APPROACH TO CHANGE EVOLVED OUT OF CONDEMNATION OF THE MISDEEDS AND INJUSTICE OF A SITUATION WHILE MAINTAINING A GENUINE GOOD WILL TOWARD THE PERPETRATORS OF THOSE EVIL ACTS.
A RECONCILIATION OF THE TENSIONS WHICH DIVIDE THIS NATION REQUIRES JUST THIS KIND OF LEADERSHIP.
IT MAY NOT BE TRADITIONAL "LIBERAL" POLITICS TO ACT THIS WAY, AND YOU ARE PROBABLY RIGHT IN QUESTIONING JIMMY'S DOCTRINAIRE LIBERALISM, BUT PROGRESSIVE POLITICS IN 1976 MUST BE BASED ON A "TOUGH MIND AND A TENDER HEART", AND EFFICIENT PRAGMATISM BUILT ON A FOUNDATION OF SOUND VALUES AND A SENSITIVE LOVING HUMAN SPIRIT. I HAVE SENSED THIS NOT ONLY IN JIMMY CARTER, BUT ALSO IN HIS MOTHER WHO JOINED THE PEACE CORPS TO SPEND 2 YEARS IN INDIA AT AGE 68.
LET ME ENCOURAGE YOU TO LOOK AND LISTEN FOR YOURSELF, THE ATLANTA CONSTITUTION AND REG MURPHY WERE ARDENT SUPPORTERS OF CARL SANDERS FOR GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA IN 1970 (AND SO WAS I) AND NEVER COULD FORGIVE JIMMY FOR BEATING HIM SO BADLY, LESTER MADDOX FOUGHT JIMMY

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.

western union Telegram

FOR 4 YEARS ON EVERYTHING HE TRIED TO DO. THEIR TESTIMONY IS HARDLY OBJECTIVE. BOTH WOULD MAKE SIMILAR ATTACKS ON MAYNARD JACKSON, ATLANTA'S BLACK MAYOR.
IDEOLOGUES AND INTELLECTUALS WILL ALWAYS HAVE PROBLEMS UNDERSTANDING AND EXPLAINING A MAN LIKE JIMMY CARTER. HE LOVES PEOPLE - MCGOVERN PEOPLE, WALLACE PEOPLE, POOR PEOPLE, AND RICH PEOPLE. HIS ACTIONS GROW OUT OF SOUND INSTINCTS AND HUMAN SENSITIVITIES WHICH TRANSCEND TRADITIONAL PATTERNS AND CATEGORIES.
I'M SURE THERE ARE SOME LEGITIMATE CRITICISMS OF JIMMY CARTER. I HAVE KNOWN HIM PRETTY WELL FOR THE PAST 5 YEARS, AND WHILE I AM A SUPPORTER I RESIST THE TRUE BELIEVER SYNDROME THAT OVERWHELMS POLITICAL CAMPAIGNS. BUT I MUST CONFESS SO FAR MY BIGGEST PROBLEM WITH JIMMY IS THAT HE WANTS TO BE PRESIDENT, SO THERE MUST BE SOMETHING THE MATTER WITH HIM. I HAVE NOT FIGURED OUT YET JUST WHAT IT IS, AND NEITHER HAVE YOU.
CONGRESSMAN ANDREW YOUNG, ATLANTA, GEORGIA

11:53 EST

MGMATLT HSB

JANUARY 22, 1976

JIMMY CARTER ON CONSUMER AFFAIRS

It is said that 10% to 15% of the consumer's purchasing power is wasted because consumers are unable to get the information they need to make the best buy. About 20% of deaths and injuries related to household consumer products involve unsafe products. Roughly 1/3 to 1/2 of all consumers have billing disputes. A Department of Transportation study of the automobile insurance system revealed that for every dollar spent on auto insurance premiums, only 42¢ ever gets back to an individual who gets hurt. It is obvious that major reforms are needed to protect the consumers of this nation.

First of all, we need a new dialog between producers and consumers. Years ago, when we lived in a perdominantly rural society, we did not need consumer protection since our friends and neighbors were the people with whom we did business. But unprecendented population growth, accelerated urbanization and mechanization in the last 25 years have created almost unsolvable consumer problems. It is quite possible today to operate a large business in an urban center and never see the same customer twice. Already, some businesses are moving to establish consumer departments within their companies. I encourage this move. It is important for business to be aware that it cannot survive unless the people trust and support it.

Next, we need some sort of strong nationwide program of consumer education. The average consumer has little or no knowledge of the laws designed to protect him or her in the marketplace. In Georgia, we set up a program in which state field workers traveled across the state, training social workers and teachers in the basics of consumer law and protection. We set up a Toll Free WATS line to help the citizens of our state with their consumer complaints and need for information. The last year I was Governor, more than 25,000 Georgians called this number. Through this program, we found that the aged have special consumer problems, and we developed a separate program to deal with their needs. We developed a program with Offender Rehabilitation for training prisoners in economic management.

As President, I would like to set up similar programs on a nationwide scale. I would put a strong emphasis on consumer education in our schools, teaching our students everything from how to write a check to a basic understanding of the energy shortage and what we, as a nation, must do to conserve our resources.

But education, by itself, will not be enought. There must be a strong agency voice for consumers within the government itself. Such an agency could research information for all government hearings, presenting evidence supporting the voice of the consumer. Such an agency could assure all our citizens that their federal government is a government that speaks for them. Those consumer offices which do exist within government today frequently lack money and staff and are often excluded from policy making.

Through executive order, by law and by public commitment, our people must be assured that positive steps will be taken to prevent the mistakes and abuses of the past.

An all-inclusive "Sunshine" law, similar to those passed in several states, should be implemented in Washington. Meetings of federal boards, commissions, and regulatory agencies must be open to the public, along with those of congressional committees. (The only exceptions should be those actually involving narrowly defined national security, those dealing with unproven charges similar to grand jury proceedings, and those whose preliminary knowledge might cause serious damage to our nation's economy).

Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official. A report of all minor personal gifts should be made public.

Maximum personal privacy for private citizens should be guaranteed.

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

The activities of lobbyists must be more thoroughly revealed and controlled, both within Congress and within executive department agencies. The federal regulation of the lobbying act of 1946 is weal and ill-enforced.

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

The attorney general should be removed from politics and be given the independence and authority granted recently to the special prosecutor. The attorney general and all assistants should be barred from any political activity.

All requests for special government consideration by private or corporate interest should be made public and decisions should be made only on the basis of merit.

Broad public access, consonant with the right of personal privacy, should be provided to government files. Maximum security declassification must be implemented.

As President, I will be responsible for the conduct of the executive branch of government. Errors or malfactions will be immediately revealed and an explanation given to the public, along with corrective action to prevent any recurrence of such actions.

These are some of the reforms I would propose in order to set a "code of ethics" for our federal government and executive branch. But there are other reforms I would hope to implement to protect the consumers of this nation.

The revolving door which now exists between regulatory agencies and the regulated industries should be closed. A recent report stated that a

total of 350 decision-makers once worked for the industries they now regulate. At least 41 high-level officials - and probably many more - have left those agencies in the last five years to take often more lucrative posts with companies in those same regulated industries.

More than 100 of the government officials who decide what drugs can be sold and what chemicals can be put in food once worked for drug or chemical companies.

More than 30 top-level regulatory officials are now making the rules for sale of stocks and bonds to the public by their former employers - including brokerage firms and stock exchanges.

We obviously need federal legislation to restrict the employment of any member of a regulatory agency by the industry being regulated.

To make certain the voice of the consumer is heard within government, we also need the following reforms:

- additional formal machinery to permit class actions by consumers, private causes of action to enforce consumer laws and to permit "standing" by consumers in both agencies and courts.

- enhanced informal grievance settlement machinery, mediation and arbitration, and available and convenient small claims systems.

At the same time, we must also restore a spirit of competition to our economic system. Strong antitrust enforcement must be at the root of any consumer policy. To fulfill this commitment, I would recommend the following measures:

- renew effective antitrust enforcement.

- reinstitute competition in non-competitive and ineffectively competitive industries and markets.

- make available necessary and relevant economic date (for example, in regard to the energy industry).

I would also recommend the following measures to enhance competition in the marketplace:

- quality standards wherever possible and feasible for such food items as produce and such manufactured products as tires.

- mimimum warranty standards to ensure that consumers are not cheated by shoddy or defective merchandise.

- full product labeling of relevant information affecting price and quality and price-per-unit labeling.

- "truth in advertising" measures to require that manufacturers be prepared to substantiate product performance claims.

The 1970 National Commission on Product Safety stated that accidents in American homes associated with consumer products account for 30,000 deaths, 110,000 permanent disabilities, and more than 20 million minor injuries a year. To assure safety, I would recommend the following reforms:

- strong enforcement of existing laws.

- enforcement of adequate flammability standards for clothing for children and the elderly.

- development of adequate research programs to anticipate potential hazards.

- implementation of automobile safety research through enforceable regulations.

There are other areas of government which can be reformed to aid consumer protection. The airline industry would be more competitive without regulatory interference. We need stronger action in the area of credit and insurance.

But none of these measures will be an ultimate solution without a strong awareness among all our people that they together form a class of consumers. If our government is truly going to be a government of the people, it must also be a government that protects the rights of the consumer.

JIMMY CARTER ON CRIME

Every American has a right to expect that laws will be administered in an evenhanded manner, but it seems that something is wrong even with our system of justice. Defendants who are repeatedly out on bail commit more crimes. Aggravating trial delays and endless litigation are common. Citizens without influence often bear the brunt of prosecution. Violators of anti-trust laws and other white-collar criminals are often ignored and go unpunished.

Overall, I think the best way to reduce crime in a substantive manner is to reduce unemployment. The best deterrent to crime from within the criminal justice system is the certainty of swift, firm punishment. That doesn't exist now. I think a streamlining of court procedures, an abbreviation of the trial procedure, a sure punishment for a brief period of time, administrative offices for the courts, an emphasis on prevention of crime in areas where crime is so rampant, all of these could contribute to reducing the crime problem.

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. The Administration's record is a record of one lost opportunity after the other, having 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.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON DAIRY FARMING

I favor adequate milk price supports to assure dairy farmers an adequate and reasonable profit. As President, I would have signed the bill President Ford vetoed raising supports to 85% of parity. Such adjustments are needed to account for higher production costs. If such adjustments are not made, milk prices could rise even more in the coming months as more farmers become discouraged and cut production.

I oppose the subsidizing of European dairy product imports. The farmers of this country can compete on even terms with unsubsidized imports but we should not give other countries' products an unfair advantage in our markets.

I also urge that funds for the "Sire proofs" program in the dairy industry be retained in the federal budget. This program is the basis for genetic improvement of dairy herds to increase per cow production of milk. Under the President's proposed budget, this $1.5 million a year program will be phased out. As Senator Nelson has pointed out, application of the genetic selection program can double per cow production and in many cases surpass it.

I also support automatic quarterly reevaluation of milk support prices. I hope that such legislation will not tie adjustments to an arbitrary formula. Adjustments should also reflect many other economic factors, such as the state of the economy and the demand for milk.

JIMMY CARTER ON THE DEATH PENALTY

My position on the death penalty was spelled out as Governor. It should be retained for a few aggravated crimes like murder committed by an inmate with a life sentence. The penalty must be assessed by a jury and must be reviewed in each case by a 3-judge panel of the State Supreme Court.

Since there has not been an execution since 1967 in the U.S., the death penalty actually means ineligibility for parole consideration.

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON DEREGULATION OF GAS

There is no need to deregulate the price of old oil. The price of all domestic oil should be kept below that of O.P.E.C. oil.

However, our natural gas supply is rapidly approaching critically low levels. As our shallower wells gradually become exhausted, we must depend more and more on deeper wells to supply our natural gas needs. Under the present regulated price structure, producers who attempt to exploit these deeper wells are forced to take a loss on every cubic foot of gas they pump.

We need to deregulate the price of gas for a period of five years. During this time, presently existing contracts will remain in force. At the end of a five-year period, the success of the programs should be evaluated and appropriate new actions taken.

Such a policy would help ensure an adequate supply of gas during the coming years.

It is certainly not possible or necessary for us to be energy independent by 1985, but we should be free from possible blackmail or economic disaster which might be caused by another boycott. Our reserves should be developed, imports kept at manageable levels, standby rationing procedures evolved, and aggressive economic reprisals should await any boycotting oil supplier.

With proper national planning and determined execution of long-range goals, energy conservation and development can be completely compatible with environmental quality and economic well-being. The elimination of waste, and technological advances into new energy fields along with our current resources can result in enhanced employment opportunities without any reduction in the quality of our economic lives.

JIMMY CARTER ON OIL COMPANY DIVESTITURE

I support restrictions on the right of a single company to own all phases of production and distribution of oil. However, it may not always be in the consumer's interest to limit a company to one single phase of production. Such a restriction, for example, might make it illegal for the same company to explore for oil and then extract that oil from the ground once discovered. This would clearly result in tremendous price increases to the consumer.

I support legal prohibitions against ownership of competing types of energy, oil and coal for example. However, I cannot promise to oppose any joint responsibility for any phase of production of competing energy sources. Fuel oil and some propane, for example, are produced from crude oil. Their production clearly cannot be separated until after extraction and refining take place. It may not be beneficial to the consumer to separate control of these two competing energy sources until even futher down the distribution line.

When competition inadequate to insure free markets and maximum benefit to America's consumers exists, I will support divestiture. 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.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON EDUCATION

America's commitment to education has facilitated equality of opportunity, yet we still do not provide all citizens with the education necessary to develop their natural potential and participate meaningfully in the decisions of their government. Moreover, those educational institutions and methods we have produced are being seriously undermined by today's fiscal pressures.

The average cost per student in public schools has approximately doubled within the last 10 years, but unfortunately, much of the increased expenditure pays for inflation rather than qualitative improvements. Two thirds of our institutions of higher education, according to the Carnegie Commission, are likely to be facing financial difficulties either now or in the near future. Private colleges, which in the 1950s served 50 percent of all students, have now shrunk to 25 percent of the market.

Meanwhile we are graduating teachers each year who will not be able to find jobs—in 1974, 290,000 teachers for less than 120,000 jobs; in 1976, 164,500 new teachers for 115,000 new positions. The job situation is even more bleak for PhDs, whose numbers tripled during the 1960s. High school enrollment will have reached its peak in 1976; enrollment in elementary schools is already decreasing; colleges have ended their period of great growth and their enrollment is expected to enter a period of decline by 1980.

The fiscal crisis is naturally affecting students too. Many face tuition increases at the very time that grants and loans are difficult to acquire. When they graduate, they confront a ceiling in job demand. Cutbacks in numbers of teachers and course offerings are harming the quality of their education. Mean SAT scores have decreased annually for the past 12 years; this year's drop was the greatest in two decades. Top American high school students ranked seventh in scientific knowledge when compared with similar students from 19 other advanced nations. More tragically, 14 million citizens of this wealthiest nation in the world are judged "functionally" illiterate.

Reform must begin with methods of financing. My early predictions that revenue sharing would be used as an excuse to steal funds from a wide range of social programs, including education, have proven true. Funds for local governments should be greatly increased, and the prohibition against using this money for education should be eliminated.

The federal share of public education costs was 10 percent in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, this portion must be increased. But most of the funding for public education will continue to come from state and local sources. Unfortunately, regressive and haphazard methods of local financing produce severe inequalities. As governor, I successfully sponsored a major reform of education financing in Georgia to help eliminate disparities based on the relative wealth of the area in which a child lives.

As President, I will initiate a comprehensive program as one of my early, major priorities for implementation by the President, the Congress, and the states. I will not hesitate to propose and support such basic and controversial changes as:

- *The creation of a separate Department of Education.* Generally, I am opposed to the proliferation of federal agencies, now numbering some 1,900, which I believe should be reduced to 200. But a Department of Education would consolidate the grant programs, job training, early childhood education, literacy training, and many other functions currently scattered throughout the government. The result would be a stronger voice for education at the federal level.
- *Expanded vocational and career education opportunities.* Although the number of students enrolled in career education has more than doubled within the last six years, two-and-one-half million leave the educational system without adequate vocational training; it is estimated that 750,000 untrained young enter the unemployment pool annually. Community colleges and other existing programs must be strengthened and extended. By 1980, 80 percent of all jobs are expected to require education beyond high school but less than a four-year degree.
- *The expansion of educational rights of the handicapped.* Of our six million school-age handicapped children, only three million are now receiving the attention they need. Yet recent federal court decisions have guaranteed the handicapped their right to an education. Since such education costs five to six times that of nonhandicapped children, increased federal expenditure is necessary in this sphere.

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.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

GUEST OPINION

"for if the trumpet be given an uncertain sound, then who shall prepare themselves for the battle"

Jimmy Carter

Late one afternoon five years ago when I was campaigning for the Governorship of Georgia, I looked in my rear view mirror to see the saddening haze of black smoke draped over the city I had just left as I drove along the interstate. Suddenly, I saw a flash of bronze in the air. Twenty yards ahead of my car a turkey gobbler had set his wings to sail into the swampland to my right.

I then thought to myself: Would my three-year-old daughter, Amy, ever see a wild turkey gobbler in this county? Will the natural areas of our nation be preserved? Will the quality of our air improve? Will our land and water be protected?

Not long ago, I noted that one of the Cabinet members made a statement, "Earth Day is over," while another prominent Washington official referred to conservationists like myself as "green bigots." I think such talk is inevitable. Environmentalists are now under attack for one basic reason and that is because we accurately predicted what would happen in our modern, fast-changing technological world if we did not make long-range plans concerning the population explosion, food shortages, pollution control, depletion of commodities, natural resources, energy supplies, and now with those predictions having come through, in some strange ways those of us who accurately predicted several years ago are being blamed for the consequences of a lack of planning.

There is no incompatability between careful planning and economic progress on the one hand and environmental quality on the other. Our present economic distress, in a major degree, has come from waste and from the lack of planning to correlate the disparate elements that affect us.

I am an engineer, a conservationist, a scientist, environmentalist, nuclear physicist, outdoors man, a Christian, and I've never seen this diverse background as a conflict. When I was elected governor, I approached the office with a great deal of anticipation, not as a politician but as a businessman, an outdoors man, a planner, and a farmer. I found a terrible, bureaucratic mess. We had 300 agencies and departments in the Georgia government, 278 were abolished., We set up a simple structure, one that was understandable and that could deal with comprehensive problems of the people of the state in an effective, aggressive, comprehensive and understandable way.



Jimmy Carter, former Governor of Georgia, is a candidate for the Democratic nomination for President in 1976.

We established a new kind of budgeting technique called "zero" based budgeting, where every year we stripped down the Georgia budget to zero and we analyzed every single program that delivered services to the Georgia people. If it was doing a good job, we kept it; sometimes we even enhanced it; if it was ineffective, we eliminated it.

Each year a proper priority of the delivery of services to the Georgia people was carefully assembled and a proper allocation of funds paid in by taxes of the people served. Long-range plans in every parameter of Georgia's life — mental health, physical health, transportation, education, environmental quality, recreation, parks, game and fish management, coastal plains, preservation of

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

Jimmy Carter's Code of Ethics

Released March 1, 1976

The two questions I hear again and again across this country are: "Can our government be competent?" "Can our government be honest and decent and open?" I have to say that a majority of people would say, "no." This is the first time since polling was started that a majority of our people say that our national and economic status will be worse in 5 years than it is now. But we don't need to be pessimistic.

I have run the Georgia government in a tough, business-like way. As a scientist, businessman, planner and farmer, I've managed it tightly and brought about some dramatic changes in its costs, long-range planning and budgeting techniques and organizational structure. We cut administrative costs more than 50% in Georgia. We abolished 278 out of 300 agencies and departments. So, I know it is possible to run an efficient government.

We ought not to lower our standards in government. Our government in Washington ought to be an inspiration to us all and not a source of shame. I want to spell out to you a number of things that can be done:

— An all-inclusive "Sunshine Law" similar to those passed in several states, should be implemented in Washington. Meetings of federal boards, commissions and regulatory agencies must be opened to the public, along with those of Congressional committees. The only exceptions should involve narrowly defined national security issues, unproven legal accusations or knowledge that might cause serious damage to the nation's economy.

— Broad public access, consonant with the right of personal privacy, should be provided to government files. Maximum security declassification must be implemented.

— The activities of lobbyists must be more thoroughly revealed and controlled, both within Congress and the Executive Department agencies. The new lobbying law should apply to those executive agencies and departments which are not now covered as well as to the Congress. Quarterly reports of expenditures by all lobbyists who spend more than $250 in lobbying in any three month period should be required. The act should include any lobbying expenditures aimed at influencing legislation or executive decisions and should cover those who lobby directly, solicit others to lobby or employ lobbyists in their own behalf.

— The sweetheart arrangement between regulatory agencies and the regulated industries must be broken up, and the revolving door between them should be closed. Federal legislation should restrict the employment of any member of a regulatory agency by the industry being regulated.

— All requests for special government consideration by p vate or corporate interests should be made public, and decisions should be made only on the basis of merit.

— Complete revelation of all business and financial involvement of all major officials should be required, and none should be continued which constitute a possible conflict with the public interest. I have released an audit of my personal finances and will do so annually throughout my term of office. I will insist that the same requirement apply to the Vice President and to those appointed to major policy-making positions in my Administration. As President, I will seek legislation to make such disclosure mandatory.

— Everyone who serves in a position of policy-making ought to reveal to the public his or her financial holdings, where his or her riches are invested and where his or her special interests are so that no conflict with the public interest will exist.

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

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

JIMMY CARTER ON FEDERAL JUDICIAL REFORM

The Attorney General of this nation must be removed from politics and given the full prerogatives, independence, and authority of his or her own office, plus those allotted temporarily to the Special Prosecutor during the Watergate scandals. The Attorney General should be appointed for a specific period of time and should be removed from office only for malfeasance, as mutually determined by the President and designated leaders of Congress. The Attorney General and all assistants should be barred from all political activity.

Substantial improvements can be made in the administration of the federal courts with administrative officers assigned to federal court districts to help insure rapid reductions in court dockets and trial delays. The expectation of quick and certain justice can be the greatest deterrent to crime.

The legal community should be encouraged to marshal its efforts to minimize the time involved in appellate procedures.

All federal judges and prosecutors should be appointed strictly on the basis of merit without any consideration of political aspect or influence. We can no longer afford to treat the administration of justice as political patronage. Even the ability to meet minimum standards is no longer enough; we must search out the very best. Independent, blue ribbon judicial selection committees should be established to give recommendations to the President of the most qualified persons available for positions when vacancies occur.

Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

JIMMY CARTER ON GOVERNMENT GROWTH AND BUDGETING

There is a pervasive tendency in government toward unrestrained growth in salaries, number of personnel, and expenditure of funds. This growth often bears little relationship to the actual need for government services.

In times of prosperity, there is almost irresistible pressure to expand existing agencies and offices and to create new ones. Seldom is there a careful, realistic assessment of just what benefits will be derived from the increased expenditures. Not only is this wasteful in the short run, it also adds to the pressure for further growth in the future.

When economic hardship arrives, there is a tendency to cut back, not in administrative costs or government overhead, but in programs that provide services to our people.

One of the most difficult responsibilities of the executive is to keep a close and constant check on this built-in tendency to expand. Under the present federal budgeting system, it simply cannot be done.

The present budgeting system is inefficient, chaotic, and virtually uncontrollable by either the President or the Congress. The executive budget should be prepared using the zero base budgeting technique which has been evolved and proven in Georgia for the last four years and is now being implemented in other states across the nation. This budgeting procedure examines each year the need for specific programs, insures the elimination of unneeded or obsolescent programs, provides a routine means for the reduction or the modification of unsatisfactory programs which need to be continued, and provides for a logical and enlightened expansion of service delivery systems which need to be increased.

We should strive for a balanced budget for this nation during times of normal employment and prosperity. Most importantly, necessary imbalances during times of economic or military crises should be controllable and be a matter of carefully determined policy and clear intent, a sharp contrast to the present uncontrolled, irrational, and unplanned system.

To insure firm legislative and executive control, revenue for the upcoming year should be carefully estimated; and those making proposals to spend above that figure should be required to state how those expenditures will be financed on a continuing basis.

Zero-based budgeting is the best tool for insuring constant assessment of all government programs, new as well as old. But no system will work unless the Chief Executive understands the workings of a mass bureaucracy, is willing to work long hours to find out what is going on, and has the political courage to face tough decisions.

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 establsihed 12 new wildlife management areas, expanded our game

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.

JIMMY CARTER ON HIGHWAY TRUST FUNDS

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 of the American landscape.

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 need to reevaluate the Highway Trust Fund and consider whether its past success might be extended to other modes of transportation. What we need most today is a balanced multi-modal approach to maintaining and improving the nation's transportation system.

Federal aid to the states has been restricted primarily to expenditures associated with new construction. Our progress with the Interstate and rural road systems, however, will reduce our future needs for new highways. We should shift attention to maintenance and modernization of the present system.

Under the Highway Act of 1973, the Highway Trust Fund was made available -- on a very limited basis -- for use in financing public mass transportation. However in several cases, such financing has proven to be difficult to use because of the divergent goals and objectives of state and local officials. We should try to set a national transportation policy, while making urban transportation implementation truly a matter of local discretion.

In the 15 years between 1950 and 1965, the annual federal aid to highways increased roughly 800%. During this time, the highway systems' share of the total freight revenue in the United States increased rapidly also, largely at the expense of rail transportation, so that now highways have the largest share of this revenue. While federal aid to highways did not cause the current crisis in our nation's railroad system, it has had a definite impact. We need a more balanced approach to funding to stress our future, not our past needs.

We need a balanced view of 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.

We should learn from the Highway Trust Fund experience and extend the lesson to our total transportation policy. We need a balanced approach to development and maintenance to meet our future needs.



HOUSING

We have a housing crisis, both in terms of the individual looking for a home and in terms of the industry. Housing has been priced out of reach for many Americans. Housing prices now average three times the income of the average buyer. We have a surplus of expensive homes which we do not need while there is a scarcity of homes which Americans with average incomes can afford. Virtually no new housing is being built for low income Americans, the elderly, and the handicapped.

Approximately one household in eight continues to live in substandard and overcrowded conditions. Yet between January, 1973, and December, 1975, housing starts dropped by over half. The housing industry has not been in such bad shape since the Department of Commerce began keeping records in 1946.

Over half a million construction workers across the nation are out of work - nearly twice the national average.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has been rocked by scandal. Over two hundred Administration housing officials, some of them political appointees, have been convicted of criminal offenses; and many more are under indictment.

Time and time again, we have heard the pledge from Washington: a decent home in a decent environment for every American. Yet, given this ideal and the importance of housing for our entire economy, one can only be appalled at the shabby leadership of the Nixon and Ford Administrations in the housing area.

I doubt that anyone could tell me what the Ford Administration's housing policy is - because a policy does not exist. Those of us who are interested in low and moderate cost housing have absolutely no way of learning what our government's intentions are.

It was the abandonment of our national housing goals by the Nixon and Ford Administrations which led to our present housing disaster and which has contributed to the poor state of our national economy as a whole. The government impounded funds for existing programs and also tightened credit, which sent up the price of borrowed money and drained capital from housing.

Instead of production, we have been given moratoriums and illegal impoundments. Since the January, 1973, moratorium, there has been virtually no new subsidized housing for low and middle income Americans. Many projects begun earlier have died lingering deaths due to administrative delays by H.U.D. and due to the continuing increase in costs. The Administration housing moratorium was based not on the quality of these programs. Rather, it was a meat cleaver attempt to cure inflation, and it had disastrous consequences.

P.O. Box 1976, Atlanta, Georgia 30301, Telephone 404/897-5000
Paid for and authorized by 1976 Democratic Presidential Campaign Committee, Inc.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

JIMMY CARTER ON LABOR

Labor unions have had and continue to have an important and constructive role to play in our nation's economic and social life. By providing a forum within which labor and management can settle disputes and plan for the future, labor unions help increase worker morale and industrial productivity, while ensuring that adequate pay and benefits, safe working conditions and other needs leading to an improved standard of living are achieved. Indeed, the well-organized, well-led unions which we have in the United States have played an important role in eliminating the costly and destructive general strikes and worker unrest that have plagued other industrial nations.

Labor unions are necessary to balance the economic power of business and industry. Without the collective voice which labor unions provide for American working people, they would be economically powerless to achieve the standard of living to which their sweat and handiwork entitle them.

Moreover, labor unions have played and are playing a vital role in assisting this country out of its economic crisis and in regaining our sense of purpose as a nation.

JIMMY CARTER'S RECORD AS GOVERNOR OF GEORGIA

As Governor of Georgia, Jimmy Carter always exhibited great concern for the problems of working people. Though only 13.9% of Georgia's working force is unionized - the national average is approximately 28% - early in his Administration, Carter announced a new day for labor in Georgia government. As his term drew to a close, he told the IUD, AFL-CIO:

> "There was a time in the past when the Georgia General Assembly was heavily dominated by the rural communities in Georgia and the leaders of the unions in this state may not have been well-received in the halls of the State Capitol, but that time is gone."

Governor Carter formed a firm coalition with labor, together they drafted new and progressive legislation in tax reform, unemployment compensation, and health care. Regarding unemployment compensation, the Governor devised a law elminiating the waiting period when a worker is laid off. He worked with organized labor on Consumer Protection Laws, vocational training, and the upgrading of Georgia's Workmen's Compensation Program - including improved compensation benefits.

Governor Carter personally intervened to resolve a legislative dispute that thad blocked implementation of the state's occupational safety and health regulations. Speaking to a convention of the Georgia State AFL-CIO, the Governor characterized this legislation as guaranteeing ". . . to every working man and woman in this State a right to a clean, safe place to work. This is a guarantee that I intend to see enforced without exception," he added.

An agressive seeker of new industry and jobs for Georgia workers, Carter

those who earn their living by personal labor can work in safe and healthy environments.

As President, one of Jimmy Carter's priorities will be to establish a comprehensive, nationwide system of health insurance. Quality health care must be made available to all our citizens on a regular basis, regardless of age, sex, economic status or geographic location, and at a cost all our citizens can afford.

Jimmy Carter believes that one of our government's foremost commitments must be to provide a job for every American who wants to work. In his own words, "We need to recognize that there are millions of jobs crying out to be filled, such as the installation and manufacture of solar units, the repair of our railroads, improvement of environmental quality and recreational opportunities, adequate health care for all our citizens, and mass transportation. These programs, with federal stimulation, will provide jobs in both the private and public sectors."

For areas and groups afflicted by acute unemployment, and for those areas where private industry fails to adequately relieve unemployment, Jimmy Carter favors a program of federally created jobs. The cost of such a program would be only slightly higher than existing relief programs, and the benefits in additional national productivity, taxes paid and human dignity would be enormous.

Jimmy Carter believes in the Democratic Party and its coalition with labor originating in the thirties. His campaign for Governor was waged on the streets and in the factory shifts. He is presently engaged in the same kind of one-to-one campaign for the Presidency. He is looking to organized labor for advice and support in his campaign. In this spirit, he concluded his speech to C.O.P.E. near the end of his term of Governor by saying:

> "I want to tell you that our people are just as great now as they were when our nation was founded. If we can tap their generosity and their idealism and their courage and their fortitude and their intensity of commitment to the principles on which this nation was founded, we can restore that greatness to a major degree. Sometimes, the responsibility falls on the shoulders of the leaders of the great labor movement, which has always been benevolent in its attitude and courageous in its purpose."

nevertheless disavowed the old methods of industry hunting that placed the burden on the working people of the state. Every speech before industrial prospects contained these words: "If you are looking for special tax breaks, cheap labor, or sub-standard environmental protection laws, you have come to the wrong state."

Perhaps even more importantly, he proved that this new approach to new jobs for Georgians worked. Despite a series of national economic crises during his Administration, he was able to attain the highest level of new jobs and new capital investment in the history of the state.

Governor Carter vetoed an attempt to raise the state sales tax. With labor support he was able to sustain that veto. Twice previously Carter and labor had worked together successfully to defeat bills in the legislature which would raise this regressive form of taxation.

As Governor, Carter also successfully promoted a bill to designate all high school principals as Deputy Voting Registrars. This program made it significantly easier for the young - particularly minorities and the children of working families - to register to vote.

More recently, as National Campaign Chairman for the Democratic Party, Jimmy Carter worked closely with organized labor to elect a larger Democratic majority in Congress in 1974. In a speech delivered to C.O.P.E., he said:

> "The Democratic Party is one with a heart. But we have got to restore in this party and in this nation the Roosevelt Coalition of enlightened, patriotic, unselfish, dedicated, working Americans who don't want any benefits or special interest, but just want to be treated fairly and to have government minister to their needs and to the people who need those ministrations."

Jimmy Carter has always maintained a close relationship with state labor officials. He has likewise long supported and continues to support issues of vital interest to labor- the right of farm workers to organize, better working conditions for migrant laborers, reduction of unemployment through direct government assistance, postcard registration for voting, creation of a national health insurance system, development of a more just tax system, and passage of the Equal Rights Amendment.

Moreover, he has recognized that there is a housing crisis in America which has helped to create unemployment for nearly half a million construction workers. He supports direct government subsidies and other stimulation for the housing industry to put these workers back to productive employment.

He has called for a coordinated and agressive program to sell American goods overseas, and an end to tax breaks which encourage the location of American industry overseas.

As President, Jimmy Carter would approve legislation to repeal section 14-b of the Taft-Hartley Act.

In Georgia, Jimmy Carter took positive steps to improve working conditions and work-related health and safety programs. As President, he would continue this commitment and strengthen or extend existing OSHA legislation so that

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

"A New Beginning"

PRESENTATION BY JIMMY CARTER TO THE PLATFORM COMMITTEE OF THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY

June 16, 1976

GOALS: OPENNESS, COMPASSION, EFFICIENCY

Let me again express my regret that I was not able to meet with you personally. As I indicated in my telegram to the Democratic National Committee, the need to campaign in a large number of states over a short period of time left me with no reasonable alternative.

You have an historically important opportunity. It is time for a New Beginning in our Bicentennial Year — a new beginning so that as a nation we can rededicate ourselves to the ideals upon which our country was founded and reinvigorate the basic principles that made our country great, principles which have been honored in the breach in the last few years. What is at stake in 1976 is whether we are going to begin the process of restoring the precious things we have lost in this country. You can begin that process of restoring the precious things we have lost in this country. You can begin that process with a platform which reaffirms the Democratic Party's traditional values, presents clear policy initiatives and commits this Party to three basic propositions.

Our Party and the platform should emphasize three themes — (1) The need for an *open, responsive, honest government,* at home and abroad. (2) The need to restore a *compassionate government* in Washington, which cares about people and deals with their problems, after eight long years of conscious indifference by two Republican Administrations. (3) The need for a *streamlined, efficient* government, without the incredible red tape, duplication, and overlapping of functions which has hamstrung the effectiveness of government and deprived the American people of the benefits of many of its programs. This government must become *efficient again.* Our first duty is to create a decent living environment and opportunities for those unable to help themselves. Government must become open. If we intend to rebuild confidence in the government process itself, policy must be shaped through the participation of Congress and the American people.

Yours is a serious responsibility that extends beyond fashioning a document we can win with in November. I believe you have an obligation to write a platform that will be a binding contract with the American people. The American people are tired of inflated promises which cannot be kept, of programs which do not work, of old answers to new problems. Our platform should not mislead the American people. Our platform should not signal a retreat. Rather it should set forth realistic goals and achievable, affordable policies which can and should be attained.

If our Party intends to have the trust of the American people in 1977, then we ought to trust them.

If our platform is drafted with integrity and care, it will give a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress a mandate that will shape our national agenda for the next four years.

The Republican Party cannot seek that mandate because it lacks a coherent set of ideals. The Republicans are trapped, not only by their own recent past, but by the American people's understanding that the Republican Party has no vision of this country's future.

The Democratic Party has an identity and a sense of itself. Individual policies may have failed, but our basic beliefs never changed.

We Democrats still agree with Woodrow Wilson that, "Democracy is not so much a form of government as a set of principles."

We Democrats still agree with Franklin Rooselvelt that, "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

We Democrats still agree with Harry Truman that full employment is, and ought to be, a national policy and a national goal — and we ought to be pursuing that goal with all the determination and imagination we can muster.

We Democrats still agree with Adlai Stevenson that, "A hungry man is not a free man."

We Democrats still agree with John Kennedy that our nation must inspire the unique contributions of all its people, and that we must have leadership that can again say, "Ask not what your country can do for you, but what you can do for your country."

We Democrats still agree with Lyndon Johnson that if our Constitution "doesn't apply to every race, to every religion, it applies to no one."

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.

The Democratic Party has never shied away from adopting new approaches to achieve traditional objectives. Over the past eighteen months, I have suggested new directions in a number of substantive areas. As a candidate, I have taken positions, which are publicly available, on virtually every conceivable issue. In the sections that follow, I have summarized for your consideration some of the major policy recommendations I have made during the campaign. I would be happy to forward more detailed supporting material if you desire.

1. *An Open and Honest Government: Code of Ethics for the Federal Government*

The Democratic Party must commit itself to steps to prevent many of the abuses of recent years.

– *The Attorney General of this nation must be removed from politics* and given the full prerogatives, independence and authority of his or her own office, plus those allotted temporarily to the Special Prosecutor during the Watergate scandals. The Attorney General should be appointed without respect to political considerations and should be *removed from office only for cause.* The Attorney General and all his or her assistants should be *barred from all political activity.*

– All *federal judges and prosecutors should be appointed strictly on the basis of merit* without any consideration of political aspects or influence. Independent blue ribbon judicial selection committees should be utilized to provide recommendations to the President when vacancies occur from which the President must make a selection.

– An *(all-inclusive 'Sunshine Law,'* similar to those passed in several states, should be implemented in Washington. With narrowly defined exceptions, meetings of federal boards, commissions and regulatory agencies must be opened to the public, along with those of congressional committees.

– *Broad public access, consonant with the right of personal privacy, should be provided to government files. Maximum security declassification must be implemented.*

– *The activities of lobbyists must be much more thoroughly revealed and controlled,* both with respect to Congress and the Executive Departments and agencies. Quarterly reports of expenditures by all lobbyists who spend more than $250 in lobbying in any three-month period should be required.

– The sweetheart arrangement between regulatory agencies *and the regulated industries must be broken up* and the revolving door between them should be closed. Federal legislation should restrict the employment of any member of a regulatory agency by the industry being regulated for a set period of time.

– *Annual disclosure of all financial involvements* of all major federal officials should be required by statute. Involvements creating conflicts should be discountinued.

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

– *Fines for illegal campaign contributions* have often been minimal. They should be *at least equal to the amount of the illegal donation.*

– *Absolutely no gifts of value should ever again be permitted to a public official.* A report of all minor personal gifts should be made public.

– *Requests to the IRS for income tax returns by anyone, from the President down, should be recorded.* Access to this essentially private information should be strictly circumscribed.

– *Maximum personal privacy for private citizens should be guaranteed.*

– *Errors or malfeasance* in the Executive Branch should be *immediatley revealed* by the President and an explanation given to the public, along with corrective action, where appropriate, to prevent any recurrence of such actions.

2. *A Compassionate and Effective Government Must Return to Washington*

A. THE ECONOMY

The next Administration must deal with both high unemployment and high inflation – the unprecedented twin legacy of the Nixon-Ford years.

For eight years, we have lived with on-again, off-again wage and price controls, two devaluations of our currency, a disastrous grain giveaway to the Soviet Union, a five-fold increase in fuel prices, restrictive monetary policies, and high interest rates.

The Democratic Party should be committed to a *sensible, predictable, steady, fair, humane and coordinated national economic policy.*

The first priority must be a rapid reduction of unemployment and the achievement of full employment with price stability. For the near future, *economic policy should be expansionary. By 1979, we can achieve a balanced budget within the context of full employment.*

(1) To reach full employment we must assure:

(a) Support for the *Full Employment Act* of 1976;

(b) *Countercyclical assistance* to cities with high unemployment;

(c) An *expansionary fiscal and monetary policy* for the coming fiscal year to stimulate demand, production and jobs;

(d) *Stimulation and incentives for the private sector* to hire the unemployed even during periods of economic downturn. To provide an additional incentive, the unemployment compensation tax paid by employers should be provided for businesses which hire persons previously unemployed.

(e) An increased commitment by the federal government to fund the cost of *on-the-job training* by business;

(f) *More efficient employment services* to match people to jobs;

(g) Improved *manpower training* programs;

(h) Creation of meaningful and productive *public needs* jobs as a supplement to the private sector, including jobs for unmet needs in areas such as housing, rehabilitation and repairing our railroad roadbeds;

(i) We should provide 800,000 summer youth jobs and *double the CETA program* from 300,000 to 600,000 jobs.

(2) There are more humane and economically sound solutions to inflation than the Republican program of forced recessions and high unemployment. We must battle inflation through:

(a) *Steady flow of jobs and output;*

(b) A better matching of *supply and demand;*

(c) *Reform of government regulations,* such as the backhaul rule, which unnecessarily add to consumer costs.

(d) *Strict anti-trust and consumer protection enforcement;*

(e) Increased emphasis on *productivity;*

(f) *Lower interest rates;*

(g) Effective *monitoring of inflationary trends and forces;*

(h) Standby wage and price controls, which the President could apply selectively. There is no present need for the use of such standby authority.

(3) Better coordination between fiscal and monetary policy should be assured by:

(a) Giving the President the power to *appoint the Chairman of the Federal Reserve for a term coterminous with the President's;*

(b) Requiring the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board to *state its objectives* more *clearly and publicly;*

(c) Requiring the Federal Reserve Board to submit a *credit market report* on past and expected monetary conditions to be included with the Economic Report of the President.

(d) Requiring the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to show in a consolidated report that their policies are *mutually consistent* or explain the reasons they are not consistent.

I believe the measures I have proposed can move us forward toward full employment, reasonable price stability, and budgets that are balanced over the economic cycle.

B. THE CITIES

Many of our major cities are caught in a crisis which cannot be fully resolved at a local level. On the one hand, businesses and the middle class tax base are flowing to the surrounding suburbs, and in many instances, out of the industrialized sector of the country entirely. On the other hand, the costs of urban government are inherently higher than in non-urban areas, and expenditures are accelerating rapidly.

There is no meaningful Republican policy that addresses the growing urban revenue-expenditure imbalance. There is no Republican policy to arrest the steady deterioration of the inner cities. In fact, the Republican policy has been nothing short of conscious, willful indifference to the plight of urban America. They promised general revenue sharing to supplement existing programs, and instead used the funds to supplant current programs and to lower the level of assistance to cities.

Our cities have needed help and the Republicans have turned their backs. Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Republican Administration cut $4.5 billion in urban programs and another $7 billion in programs to aid the poor, the untrained, the unemployed, and the medically indigent, all at a time when municipalities lost $3.3 billion in purchasing power.

Our country has no urban policy or defined policy or defined urban goals, and so we have floundered from one ineffective and uncoordinated program to another. Hopes have been raised only to be dashed on the rocks of despair when promise after promise has been forgotten.

We need a coordinated federal urban policy that recognizes that our urban problems stem from a variety of factors, each of which must be dealt with directly and forcefully — problems of urban decay, declining tax base, crime, unemployment, lack of urban parks and open spaces.

We must begin our urban policy by recognizing the *human needs* of the individuals who live in our cities. According to the United States Department of Labor, central city unemployment for 1975 was 9.6%, as opposed to 8% for non-metropolitan areas and 5.3% for the suburbs. For the poverty areas of cities that figure is 13.8%, and for blacks in these areas it is 17.6%. Teenage black unemployment in some areas of America approaches the staggering figure of 40%.

Indeed, even these figures are deceptive, for they do not include the literally hundreds of thousands of people who have left the labor market entirely due to their frustrating inablilty to find work.

To make dramatic imporvement in the unacceptably high unemployment rate, I propose a creative, joint program of incentives to private employers and a public needs employment program funded by the federal government. Such programs will more than repay our investment, not simply in making taxpayers of those now on unemployment insurance or on welfare, and not simply in generating additional revenues to the federal, state and local governments — although each 1% decline in the unemployment rate will produce $13 to $16 billion in federal tax — but rather in restoring the pride and self-respect of those too long ignored and cast aside. In the section on "The Economy," I have set forth policies which would dramatically reduce unemployment in urban areas where it is most severe.

While we must concentrate on the human needs of those who live in our cities throughout the country, we cannot ignore the fiscal plight of the cities themselves.

To alleviate the suffering our cities are being put through by high inflation and continued recession, I propose the following:

— *Countercyclical assistance* to deal with the fiscal needs of cities particularly hard hit by recession. The $2 billion of countercyclical assistance recently vetoed by Mr. Ford is essential and affordable, and is with in the budget resolutions adopted by Congress.

— *Extension of the Revenue Sharing program for five years, with an increase in the annual funding level* to compensate for inflation, and with stricter enforcement of the civil rights provisions of the bill to guarantee against discriminatory use of the funds. We should explore whether the Revenue Sharing formula might be amended in the future to place greater emphasis on areas of high need. All

Revenue Sharing funds should go to the cities, and the priority areas for which funds can be expended should be broadened to include education.

The key to an effective urban policy is the understanding that an integrated approach addressing each of the separate facets of the urban malaise is necessary if deteriorating conditions are to be arrested. In other sections of this paper, specific programs relating to welfare reform, housing, and crime control are suggested. In the context of those programs, we can establish a creative partnership between the federal government and our urban areas.

C. TAX REFORM

Our national tax system is a disgrace. The income most certain to be taxed is that which is derived from manual labor. Carefully contrived loopholes have created a regressive system which lets the total tax burden shift more and more toward the average wage earner. Some of our largest corporations with extremely high profits pay virtually no tax at all. When a business executive can charge off a $50 luncheon on a tax return and a truck driver cannot deduct his $1.50 sandwich – when oil companies pay less than 5% on their earnings while employees of the company pay at least three times this rate – when many pay no taxes on incomes of more than $100,000 – then we need basic tax reform.

A piecemeal approach to change will not work. Basically, I favor a *simplified tax system which treats all income the same, taxes all income only once, and makes our system of taxation more progressive.*

D. WELFARE REFORM

Our welfare system is a crazy quilt of regulations administered by a bloated bureaucracy. It is wasteful to the taxpayers of America, demeaning to the recipients, discourages work, and encourages the breakup of families. The system lumps together dissimilar categories of poor people, and differs greatly in its benefits and regulations from state to state. It is time that we broke the welfare and poverty cycle of our poor people.

My recommendations are designed to satisfy the following goals: (a) we must recognize there are *three distinct categories of poor people* – the employable poor, the 1.3 million employable but jobless poor, and the working poor; (b) *no person on welfare should receive more than the working poor can earn at their jobs;* (c) *strong work incentives, job creation and job training* should be provided for those on welfare able to work; (d) *family stability should be encouraged* by assuring that no family's financial situation will be harmed by the bread-winner remaining with his dependents; (e) efforts should be made to have *fathers who abandon their family be forced to continue support;* (f) the welfare system should be streamlined and simplified, with less paperwork, fewer regualtions, improved coordination and reduced local disparities; (g) *persons who are legitimately on welfare should be treated with respect and dignity.*

To achieve these goals, I propose one fairly *uniform, nationwide payment,* varying according to cost of living differences between communities. It should be funded in substantial part by the federal government with *strong work and job incentives* for the poor who are employable and with earnings tied so as to *encourage employment,* so that it would never be more profitable to stay on welfare than to work.

We should repeal laws that encourage a father to leave the home.

No one able to work, except mothers with preschool children, should be continued on the welfare rolls unless job training and a meaningful job were accepted. The 1.3 million people drawing welfare who are able to work full-time should be taken out of the welfare system; they should be trained for a job and offered a job. If they decline the job, they should be ineligible for further benefits.

The welfare burden should be removed from cities, with all welfare costs being paid by the federal and state governments.

E. EDUCATION

The average cost per student in public schools has approximately doubled within the last 10 years, but unfortunately, must of the increased expenditure pays for inflation rather than qualitative improvements. Two-thirds of our institutions of higher education, according to the Carnegie Commission, are likely to be facing financial difficulties either now or in the near future. Private colleges which in the 1950's served 50% of all students have now shrunk to 25% of the market.

Meanwhile we are graduating teachers each year who will be unable to find jobs – in 1974, 290,000 teachers for less than 120,000 jobs; in 1976, 164,000 new teachers for 115,000 new positions.

The fiscal crisis is naturally affecting students too. Many face tuition increases at the very time that grants and loans are difficult to acquire. When they graduate, they confront a ceiling in job demand.

The federal share of public education costs was 10% in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, this *federal portion must be increased.*

The following steps are necessary:

– The creation of a *separate Department of Education.* A Department of Education would consolidate the grant programs, job training, early childhood education, literacy training, and many other functions currently scattered throughout the government. The result would be a stronger voice for education at the federal level.

– *Expanded vocational and career education opportunities.* Although the number of students enrolled in career education has more than doubled within the last six years, two-and-one-half million leave the educational system without adequate vocational training; it is estimated that 750,000 untrained youth enter the unemployment pool annually.

Community colleges and other existing programs must be strengthened and extended.

— *Expansion of educational rights of the handicapped* must be assured. Of our six million school-age children, only three million are now receiving the attention they need. Recent federal court decisions have guaranteed the handicapped their right to an education. Since such education costs five to six times that of nonhandicapped children, increased federal expenditure is necessary in this sphere.

— Imaginative reforms to strengthen colleges and universities in times of financial difficulties. Basic tax reform proposals should give proper consideration to the role of private philanthropy in education.

F. HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE

Our present health care system is in need of drastic reorganization. Despite per capita and absolute expenditures on health care that are largest in the world, our nation still lacks a workable, efficient and fair system of health care.

First, we need a *national health insurance program,* financed by general tax revenues and employer-employee shared payroll taxes, which is universal and mandatory. Such a program must reduce barriers to preventive care, provide for uniform standards and reforms in the health care delivery system, and assure freedom of choice in the selection of physicians and treatment centers.

We must shift our emphasis in both private and public health care away from hospitalization and acute-care services to *preventive medicine* and the *early detection* of the major cripplers and killers of the American people.

Our major cripplers and killers are cancer, heart disease, stroke, respiratory diseases, hypertension, and six others of decreasing incidence within the population. Almost every one of these afflictions can be prevented, to a degree, by regular physical examinations and routine medical care.

Another major problem is to *better utilize the health personnel avialable to us.* Registered nurses, physicians' assistants, and other highly skilled para-professionals should be utilized under the supervision of physicians to provide diagnostic and preventive service.

A third major thrust should be to *improve the delivery of health care and to bring care within the reach — as well as the means — of all our people.* In the county where I live, there is not a doctor, dentist, pharmacist or hospital bed. The National Health Service Corporation has designated almost three hundred areas of similar shortages across the country. Even yearly hospital services are unavailable to remote indigent people without transportation. Our national needs require redirecting medical education toward primary care as one means to correct the geographic and professional maldistribution of services and perosnnel. We must also insure more medical education for students from low-income and minority families so that they may take their rightful place in medicine.

We must also *reorganize the physical plant of our health care delivery system.* We need to initiate effective coordination between our physical facilities — building, expanding, modernizing, relocating and converting them as need in order to provide the best possible medical care at reasonable cost.

We must *restructure our priorities* in the kinds of health care we offer. If is ironic that although our advanced medical technology is unsurpassed, our ability to deliver primary and preventive medical care to all of our citizens is very poor. We must shift our emphasis away from limited-application, technology-intensive programs to broad-based delivery or primary care for every citizen.

We must do more to quarantee 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.* Nationwide efforts in this area must continue until our working citizens are safe in thier jobs.

We should seek strong and effective legislation to promote mine safety and to protect mine workers against the black lung disease so frequently associated with mine work.

G. CRIME CONTROL

While the prevention of crime is essentially a state and local responsibility, the federal government has a significant role to play in the reduction of crime. Federal efforts should proceed along several lines:

First, we should *reform our judicial* system to ensure that *swift, firm and predictable punishment follows a criminal conviction.* I believe that crime is best deterred by the certainty of swift justice.

Second, the federal government can provide a model for the states by *revising our system of sentencing, eliminating much of the discretion* given to judges and probation officers, insuring *greater certainty in sentencing and confinement,* and insuring a higher percentage of serious criminals being imprisoned.

Third, we should place reasonable restrictions on the purchase of handguns, including the prohibition of ownership by persons with certain criminal backgrounds.

Fourth, we should *upgrade the rehabilitation programs* available to criminals while in prison.

Fifth, there is a need for a *coordinated, concerted attack on drug traffic and organized criminal activity.*

Sixth, we should provide *federal assistance to the crime prevention programs of local governments with a minimum of federal regulations.*

Finally, we must *step-up the attack on unemployment,* the root cause of much of our urban crime, through the programs I have mentioned previously.

H. TRANSPORTATION

America has the world's most extensive transportation system. Since the beginning of our nation's history, the

Federal government has invested substantially in the development of that system, so that today there are more than 915,000 miles of Federal-aid highways, 325,000 miles of railroad tracks, 12,750 airports and 25, 000 miles of commerically navigable waters. Federally-supported mass transit systems are in place in many of the nation's major cities. 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 chief impediments to more effective utilization of the existing system are physical deterioration and outmoded regulations. Examples of both problems abound in all modes of transportation: Over the last seven years nine major Northeastern railroads have gone bankrupt.

Most of the Nation's basic highway and street system has been similarly permitted to deteriorate. Although the problem of deferred maintenance is less pervasive, disturbing parallels with railroads can be found and the long-term outlook is far from promising given current trends.

Although the deterioration of urban public transportation services has been slowed since the passage of the Federal Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, and the subsequent amendments to it in 1970 and 1974, the gap between transit capital needs and available funding, as identified by the U. S. Department of Transportation, has grown to over $6 billion.

Moreover, the federal government often has encouraged one mode of transportation to the disadvantage of another. No coordinated transportation policy exists. While the National 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 Nations's first transportation priority.*

While the private sector should be encouraged to undertake this rehabilitation work directly with privately raised capital, 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. In certain program areas, such as highways, this will involve substantially reordering current program priorities to stress rehabilitation work. In yet other areas, such as public transportation, this will require reinforcing current program trends with increased investment levels.

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 restirctive limits on the use of mass transit funds by localities so that greater amounts can be used as operating subsidies. We should oppose the Administration's efforts to reduce federal operating subsidies.

Priority attention should also be given to *restructuring the nation's antiquated system of regulating transportaion.* The present patch-work scheme of rail, truck, and airline regulation at the federal level needlessly costs consumers billions of dollars every year. However valid the original purpose of promoting a fledgling industry and protecting the public from the tyranny of monopoly or the chaos of predatory competition, the present system has, more often than not, tended to discourage desirable competition.

I. HOUSING

The following agenda on housing is aimed at putting to work hundreds of thousands of unemployed construction workers and fulfilling our national commitment to build 2 million housing units per year:

(1) *direct federal subsidies and low interest loans* to encourage the construction of *low and middle class housing.*

(2) *expansion* of the highly successful *Section 202 housing program for the elderly,* which utilizes direct federal subsidies.

(3) greatly increased emphasis on the *rehabilitation* of existing housing to rebuild our neighborhoods; certain of our publicly created jobs could be used to assist such rehabilitation. It is time for urban conservation instead of urban destruction.

(4) greater attention to the role of local communities under the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974.

(5) greater effort to *direct mortgage money into the financing of private housing.*

(6) *prohibiting the practice of red-lining by federally sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA,* which has had the effect of depriving certain areas of the necessary mortgage funds to upgrade themselves.

(7) encouraging more loans for housing and rehabilitation to the poor.

(8) providing for a steady source of *credit at low interest* rates to stabilize the housing industry.

J. AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AMERICA

The Republican agriculture policy has whip-sawed the consumer with higher prices and the farmers with declining profits, with speculators and middlemen as the only beneficiaries. Presidents Nixon and Ford have brought about the anomalous situation of family farmers going bankrupt to produce food and fiber American consumers cannot afford to buy. As a farmer, I understand the difficulties which the American farmer has confronted with Secretary Butz and Republican agricultural policy.

It is time that we developed a *coherent, predictable, stable, coordinated food and fiber policy.* This policy should:

– insure *stable prices to the consumer* and a *fair profit for farmers;*

– *increase opportunities in the world market* for our agricultural commodities through an innovative, aggressive foreign sales program;

— guarantee an *abundant supply of agricultural goods* and *avoid periodic shortages;*
— reduce the tremendous increase in the price of farm goods from the farmer to the consumer (which is not passed along to the farmer in the form of profit) by studying ways to *avoid excessive profits made by middlemen and processors;*
— create a *predicatable, stable, reasonable small food reserve, with up to a two-month supply,* permitting farmers to retain control of one-half of these reserves, in order to prevent government dumping during times of moderate price increases;
— insure *coordination of the policies* of the many federal agencies and bureaus, in addition to the Department of Agriculture, which affect the farmer;
— *close the revolving door* that now exists *between the boards of the grain inspection companies and the processors* that supply them with their grain, since both the farmer and the consumer pay when regulatory agencies fail to do their job;
— guarantee *adequate price supports and a parity level* that *assures farmers a reasonable return* on their investments;
— farmers must be given the ability to transport their produce to market. In Illinois alone, 50 million bushels of corn rotted in the ground last year because of an inability to transport the crop to market.

K. ENERGY

It is time for strong leadership and planning in energy. Yet none exists in the Executive Branch. One of the greatest failures of national leadership is the failure to convince the American people of the urgency of our energy problems. In the White House it is business as usual.

Our national policy for energy must include a combination of *energy conservation and energy development, together with price protection for the consumer.*

The price of all domestic oil should be kept below that of O.P.E.C. oil. There is *no need to, and I oppose efforts to, deregulate the price of old oil.* For natural gas, we should deregulate the price of only that natural gas not currently under existing contract (less that 5%) for a period of five years. At the end of the period of time, we should evaluate this program to see if it increases production and keeps gas-related products at prices the American people can afford.

Imports of oil from foreign countries should be kept at manageable levels. Increasing amounts of oil from remaining domestic and foreign sources should be channeled into *permanent storage* facilities until we have accumulated at least an *additional 30-day reserve supply.* We should *place the importation of oil under government authority* to allow strict control of purchases and the auctioning of purchase orders.

To insure the maximum protection of the American consumer during the coming years of increasing energy shortages, our anti-trust laws must be effectively and rigidly enforced. Moreover, maximum disclosure of data on reserve supplies and production must be required.

I support restrictions on the right of a single company to own all phases of production and distribution of oil. However, it may not laways be in the consumer's interest to limit a company to one single phase of production. Such a restriction, for example, might make it illegal for the same company to explore for oil and then extract that oil from the ground once discovered.

I 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. For example, fuel oil and some propane are produced from crude oil. Their production clearly cannot be separated until after extraction and refining take place. It may not be beneficial to the consumer to separate control of these tow competing energy sources.

It is time that we had *a nationwide program of energy conservation.* The potential for dramatic energy conservation remains untapped. Our energy waste in transportation is 85%; in generating electricity it is 65%. Overall, 50% of our energy is wasted. The federal government itself must set an example for energy conservation and must insure that its own regulations do not encourage energy waste.

We need to *encourage mass transit* as a means of energy conservation; *strict fuel efficiency standards* and ratings must be established for motor vehicles; rigid enforcement of energy-saving *speed limits* is essential; *efficiency standards and better labeling* for electric appliances are a prerequisite. Moreover, *mandatory improvements in building insulation* must be established.

To help conserve our dwindling energy supplies, unnecessary electrical power plant construction should be stopped and advertising at the consumer's expense to encourage increased electric consumption should be restricted. *Rate structures,* which discourage total consumption, and peak power demand, *which give greater protection to the average consumer, should be established.*

We must *substantially shift our efforts to increase our production of coal,* of which we have a 200-year supply, *without* at the same time *destroying the surface of our lands through uncontrolled strip mining.* At the time, we must make a major research and development thrust to greatly increase the use of solar energy.

While it is unrealistic, given present Administration policies, to become energy independent by 1986, we should attempt to be free from possible blackmail or economic disaster which might be caused by another boycott. Our reserves should be developed imports set at manageable levels, standby rationing procedures evolved and authorized, and aggressive economic reprisals available to any boycotting oil supplier.

With proper national planning and determined execution of long -range goals, energy production and conservation can be increased.

(1) *Environmental Protection*

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.

As Governor, I was proud to be considered by conservation groups as the best friend of the conservationists to ever sit as Georgia's Governor.

The Democratic Party should:

— insure that the *Army Corps of Engineers stops building unnecessary dams and public works projects harmful to the environment* and that the Soil Conservation Service *ends uncalled for channelization* of our country's rivers and streams.

— *hold fast against efforts to lower clean air requirements of the Clean Air Act.* I support strict enforcement of the nondegradation clause of the Clean Air Act.

— *encourage the development of rapid transit systems* which will help alleviate somewhat our continued and increased dependence on the automobile.

— insist on *strict enforcement of anti-water pollution laws* to protect our oceans, lakes, rivers, and streams from unneeded and harmful commercial pollution, and oppose efforts to weaken the federal Water Pollution Control Act.

— *protect against the noise pollution* with which our advanced technology challenges us. I *opposed* development of the *SST* on this basis, and I also *opposed* granting *landing rights to the Concorde.*

— *assist coastal states which bear the economic and environmental impact associated with the development of the Outer Continental Shelf.* Federal officials should accept the states' recommendations regarding lease sales and development plans unless those recommendations seriously conflict with national security.

— *support the need for better land-use planning.* I favor giving planning assistance to the states if firm assurances are given by the states that these plans will be implemented and will protect critical environmental areas.

— support efforts to place *reasonable limits on strip mining.* We must require reclamation of land as a condition for strip mining.

— *encourage solid waste disposal.* We must reduce the volume of waste created, give grants to states to improve collection service, and expand research in the solid waste disposal area.

M. CIVIL RIGHTS AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

I have long advocated eliminating discrimination against blacks, other minorities, and women.

I believe that the various Civil Rights Acts, including the Voting Rights Act, have had a tremendously positive effect on the South and the nation. They have opened up our society for the benefit of all. The guaranties of equal participation in the political process, provided in the Voting Rights Act, should be extended to all parts of the nation where minority representation and participation are inadequate without in any way slackening enforcement in those areas already covered by the Act.

I also *support postcard registration* for voting to broaden the opportunities for participation in our political process.

I strongly support *federal legislation to prohibit the practice of red-lining* by federally-sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA. I believe that our platform should reflect a *strong commitment to enforcement of the Open House Act of 1968 and the Community Development Act of 1974.* Moreover, we should *enable the Equal Employment Commission to function more effectively* and expeditiously in employment discrimination complaints. Its backlog is a major problem in enforcing laws guaranteeing nondiscrimination in employment.

I am a strong supporter of the Equal Rights Amendment (ERA). But more assertive steps are necessary to end discrimination against women. Today, in spite of the Equal Pay Act of 1963, the earnings gap between men and women is great. Full-time working women earn sixty cents for every dollar earned by full-time working men. I support actions necessary to close this gap. I also support the need for flexible hours for full-time employees and the additional employment of part-time persons, both of which will greatly aid women in their access to the market place.

Women represent over 40% of our work force — a percentage which is increasing every year. *We need to provide high quality, accessible child-care facilities so that mothers who wish to work can do so.* In addition, mothers who wish to enter or rejoin the work force after a long period of absence should be given access to counseling and training programs to help them resume their careers. In this way, we can move toward meeting two of our national goals: providing a job for every American who wants to work and ending discrimination against women.

Moreover, it is time that women were appointed to high level positions in American education and to the boards of important agencies and as heads of important government departments.

In addition, we must assure that

(a) *laws prohibiting sex discrimination in credit, employment, advancement, education, housing and other endeavors are strengthened and strictly enforced;*

(b) strong efforts are made to pass federal legislation and guidelines to *eliminate sex discrimination in health and disability insurance plans;*

(c) *social security laws are revised to eliminate sex-related discrimination;*

(d) *women have equal access to health care systems and voluntary family planning programs;*

(e) *adequate childcare* is provided for all parents who desire to use it;

(f) *existing rape laws are reformed* and the National Rape Prevention and Control Act is passed.

The dreams, hopes and problems of a complex society demand the talent, imagination and dedication of all its citizens — women and men, black, brown, and white. As partners, we can provide the best leadership available to this country.

N. CONSUMER PROTECTION

The consumer in America is too often mistreated or ignored. It is time to reverse this trend.

Ten to fifteen percent of the consumer's purchasing power is wasted because consumers are unable to obtain adequate information. Twenty percent of deaths and injuries related to household consumer products involve unsafe products. Between one-third and one-half of all consumers have billing disputes with those from whom they buy goods or services. For every dollar spent on auto

insurance premiums, it has been estimated that only 42¢ ever gets back to an individual who gets hurt. The consumer has no effective voice within the Executive Branch of government.

Major reforms are necessary to protect the consumers of this country.

First, we must institutionalize the consumer's role through the *creation of a Consumer Protection Agency.* This agency would serve as a strong voice in government hearings and legislation, would insure that the consumer's interest is considered, and would help assure that government speaks for consumers rather than for the vested interests.

Second, we should establish a strong *nationwide program of consumer education* to give the consumer the knowledge to protect himself in the market place. In Georgia, we set up a program in which state field workers travelled across the state training social workers and teachers in the basics of consumer law and protection. We established a toll free Wats line to help the citizens of our state who had consumer complaints and who needed information. A special program was developed for training prisoners in economic and consumer management.

Third, we should make class actions by consumers more easily available to enable them to enforce consumer laws and to give them standing before agencies and courts.

Fourth, we must *vigorously enforce the anti-trust laws.*

Fifth, to guarantee further protection to the consumer, we should work toward:

– *quality standards, where feasible, for food and manufactured items;*

– *warranty standards* to guarantee that consumers are not cheated by shoddy or defective merchandise;

– full product labeling of relevant information affecting price and quality and price-per-unit labeling;

– strict truth-in-advertising measures to require that manufacturers are able to substantiate product performance claims.

Sixth, *consumers must achieve greater protection against dangerous products.* The 1970 National Commission on Product Safety stated that accidents in American homes associated with consumer products accounted for 30,000 deaths a year. In order to reduce these horrifying statistics, I recommend:

– strong enforcement of existing laws;

– enforcement of stringent flammability standards for clothing;

– adequate research programs to anticipate potential hazards;

– additional automobile safety research;

– *expanded pre-market testing* for all new chemicals to elicit their general characteristics and environmental and health effects.

If our government is truly to be a government of the people, it must also be a government which protects the rights of the consumer.

O. SENIOR CITIZENS

The condition of our senior citizens is a national tragedy. They are twice as likely as the rest of the population to be poor. They spend 50% more of their income on housing than do other Americans. 1.6 million elderly Americans live in houses without basic plumbing. In spite of Medicare, only 65% of the medical bills of old people are covered by government health programs.

Senior citizens need adequate income, housing, health care, and transportation. More important, they need to feel and be wanted and to be assisted by a comprehensive program designed specifically for their benefit.

I have proposed that the Social Security system be strengthened through an increase in the maximum earnings base and an increase in benefits in proportion to earnings before retirement. I likewise favor strengthening and broadening the laws against age discrimination and discouraging the trend by employers toward early forced retirement.

To make the elderly less subject to the financial burden caused by illness, I support a comprehensive, universal national health care program with interim relief until the system is fully implemented through expansion of Medicare coverage.

To provide better housing construction for the elderly, we must rapidly expand housing construction for the elderly under Section 202 of the Housing Act; and we must strengthen the protection the elderly need against displacement by landlords seeking to convert rental housing into condominiums and cooperatives.

Since our elderly often lack mobility, we should encourage public transportation systems receiving federal funds to provide reduced fare programs for the elderly.

We must do much more to make the elderly feel wanted and to take advantage of their experience, which is a true national asset. Therefore, we should consider the establishment of a national senior citizens' service corps and broaden the use by senior citizens of senior citizens multi-purpose centers.

We need to protect American workers against the uncertainties presented by existing pension laws. The Pension Reform Act of 1974 was a good beginning, but there is much that remains to be done. We need strict enforcement of the laws that guarantee the financial integrity of pension funds and strict accountability for those who administer those funds. And we need to minimize the excessive paper work which often slows the distribution of benefits.

I know from the personal experience in my own family, when my mother served as a Peace Corps volunteer at age 68, the tremendous contribution that older Americans can make to themselves and to the world if they are treated with dignity and respect and are given the opportunity to serve. To those ends, this Party and I will always be dedicated.

3. *Government Reorganization and Budget Reform*

The basic difficulty facing American government today cuts across all the other campaign issues. The proliferation of programs and agencies, particularly in the past ten years, has inevitably created duplications, waste and inefficiency. There are over 83 federal housing programs, 228 federal health programs, and over 1,200 assorted commissions, councils, boards, committees, and the like.

We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision and *reorganization of the federal bureaucracy,* to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its services. We must establish mechanisms to set our priorities more systematically and to weigh our spending decisions more carefully. The luxury of multiple agencies functioning within one policy area, often at cross purposes, is no longer available to us.

The reform I am seeking is *not* a retreat; it is a marshalling of our resources to meet the challenges of the last quarter of this Century. The problem is not that program goals are unworthy; it is not that our public servants are unfit. What is at fault is the unwieldy structure and frequently inefficient operation of the government: the layers of administration, the plethora of agencies, the proliferation of paperwork. If we are to succeed in other substantive policy areas, government must cease to be an obstacle to our efforts.

We have a finite amount of resources. They must not be squandered by inefficiency. Government cannot truly serve the people if it cannot operate effectively itself. Reorganization is not a dry exercise of moving around boxes in an organization chart. It is a creative venture toward the better direction of the energies and resources of our government.

The first step is to reshape the way we make federal spending decisions.

First, the federal government should be committed to *requiring zero-base budgeting by all federal agencies.* Each program, other than income support programs, such as Social Security, should be required to justify both its continued existence and its level of funding. We need to continue and expand programs that work and to discontinue those that do not. Without such a comprehensive review, it will be difficult to assess priorities and impossible to redirect expenditures away from areas showing relatively less success. Zero-base budgeting was one of my most important policy innovations in Georgia, and it has been adopted successfully in Illinois, New Jersey and New Mexico. It can work in the federal government.

Second, we must commit ourselves to a greater reliance upon *long-term planning budgets.* I proposed in my Economic Position Paper that we adopt a three year rolling budget technique to facilitate careful, long-term planning and budgeting. Too many of our spending decisions are focused just beyond our noses on next year's appropriations. "Uncontrollable" spending is only uncontrollable in the short run; spending can be controlled if the planning system builds in more lead time.

Third, reforming the budget process will not be enough unless we are also committed to insuring that programs are carried out with efficiency. Improving government's performance will require action on several levels. The Democratic Party should commit itself to undertaking the basic structural reforms necessary to streamline federal operations and to make the government efficient once again. The *number of federal agencies should be reduced to no more than 200.* Other management tools will be required to achieve an acceptable level of performance. We need *increased program evaluation.* Many programs fail to define with any specificity what they intend to accomplish. Without that specification, evaluation by objective is impossible.

In Georgia, we applied rigorous performance standards and performance auditing. Such standards, which are working in state capitols around the nation and in successful businesses, should be imposed upon federal departments and agencies.

Finally, the federal government is ill-equipped to deal with a growing number of problems that transcend departmental jurisdictions. For example, foreign and domestic issues are becoming more interrelated; domestic prosperity and international relations are affected by our foreign agricultural policy, by international raw materials and oil policies, and by our export policies, among others. We must *develop a policy making machinery that transcends narrow perspectives,* that protects the vital interests of the United States, and that provides our citizens and the world with policies that are rational, consistent, and predictable.

Our first priority must be to build a well-managed structure of government – one that is efficient, economical, and compassionate and with systematically established priorities and predictable policies. Government must again become an effective instrument for achieving justice and meeting our critical national needs.

4. *Foreign Affairs*

In the past few years the world has changed greatly and the United States has learned several lessons. One is that we cannot and should not try to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own security is endangered.

We have learned that we must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy.

We have learned the hard way how important it is during times of international stress to keep close ties with our allies and friends and to strive for multilateral agreements and solutions to critical problems.

Another lesson we have learned is that we cannot impose democracy on another country by force. We cannot buy friends, and it is obvious that other nations resent it if we try. Our interests lie in protecting our national security, in preventing war, in peacefully promoting the principles of human freedom and democracy, and in exemplifying in our foreign policy the true character and attitudes of the American people.

Finally, we have learned that every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in our dealings with other nations, such as Cambodia, Vietnam, and Chile, the American people have been excluded from the process of evolving and consummating our foreign policy. Unnecessary secrecy surrounds the inner workings of our own government. Because we have let our foreign policy be made for us, we lost lost something crucial and precious in the way we talk and the way we act toward other peoples of the world.

In the future we must turn our attention increasingly towards the common problems of food, energy, environment, scarce resources, and trade. A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of

the world suffer mass starvation or when there are no established arrangements to deal with population growth, energy, or environmental quality. Better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

Our policies toward the developing countries need revisions. For years, we have either ignored them or treated them as pawns in the big power chess game. Both approaches were deeply offensive to their people. Our program of *international aid* to these nations should be redirected so that it *meets the human needs of the greatest number of people.* This means an emphasis on food, jobs, education, and public health, including access to family planning. In our trade relations with these nations, we should join commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar.

We must *more closely coordinate our policy with our friends,* countries like the democratic states of Europe, North America and Japan – those countries which share with us common goals and aspirations. Our continued propsperity and welfare depend upon increased coordination of our policies.

The policy of East-West detente is under attack today because of the way it has been exploited by the Soviet Union. The American people were told detente would mean a "generation of peace," at no risk to the nation's vital interests. Yet, in places like Syria or Angola, in activities like offensive missile development, the Soviets seem to be taking advantage of the new relationship to expand their power and influence and to increase the risk of conflict.

I support the objectives of detente, but I cannot go along with the way it has been handled by Presidents Nixon and Ford. The Secretary of State has tied its success too closely to his personal reputation. As a result, he is giving up too much and asking for too little. He is trumpeting achievements on paper while failing to insist on them in practice.

The relationship of detente is one of both cooperation and competition, of new kinds of contacts in some areas along with continued hostility in others. In the troubled history of our relationships with the Soviet Union, this is where we have arrived. The benefits of detente must accrue to both sides, or they are worthless. Their mutual advantage must be apparent, or the American people will not support the policy.

To the Soviets, detente is an opportunity to continue the process of world revolution without running the threat of nuclear war. They have said so quite openly as recently as a month ago at their 25th Party Congress. To the Soviet Union, with our acquiescence, detente is surface tranquility in Europe within boundaries redefined to its benefit, together with support for wars of national liberation elsewhere. It is having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of the Accords. This is not the road to peace but the bitter deception of the American people.

But while detente must become more reciprocal, I reject the strident and bellicose voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the cold war with the Soviet Union. I believe the American people want to look to the future. They have seen the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam and have drawn appropriate lessons for tomorrow. They seek new vistas, not a reptition of old rhetoric and old mistakes.

It is in our interest to try to make detente broader and more reciprocal. Detente can be an instrument for long-term peaceful change within the Communist system, as well as in the rest of the world. We should make it clear that detente requires that the Soviets, as well as the United States, refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have.

The core of detente is the reduction of arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings on 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.

Our vision must be of a more pluralistic world and not of a communist monolith. We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interest of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world.

We should remember that Eastern Europe is not an area of stability, and it will not become such until the Eastern European countries regain their independence and become part of a larger cooperative European framework. I am concerned over the long-range prospects for Rumanian and Yugoslavian independence, and I deplore the recent infliction upon Poland of a constitution that ratifies its status as a Soviet satellite. We must reiterate to the Soviets that an enduring American-Soviet detente cannot ignore the legitimate aspirations of other nations. We must likewise insist that the Soviet Union and other countries recognize the human rights of all citizens who live within their boundaries, whether they be blacks in Rhodesia, Asians in Uganda, or Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our relations with China are important to world peace, and they directly affect the world balance. The United States has a great stake in a nationally independent, secure, and friendly China. I believe that we should explore more actively the possibility of widening American-Chinese trade relations and of further consolidating our political relationships.

The Middle East is a key testing area for our capacity to construct a more cooperative international system. I believe deeply that the foundation of our Middle East policy must be insuring the safety and security of Israel. This country should never attempt to impose a settlement in Israel, nor should we force Israel to make territorial concessions which are detrimental to her security. We should attempt to promote direct negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Israel must be allowed to live within defensible borders. As President, I would never force Israel to give up control of the Golan Heights to the Syrians, nor would I recognize the Palestinian Liberation Organization or any other group purporting to represent the Palestinians when those organizations refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist in peace. The negotiations that will lead to permanent peace can only proceed on the basis of a *clear and absolute*

American commitment to insure Israel's security and survival as a Jewish State.

In the future we should make multilateral diplomacy a major part of our efforts so that other countries know the importance the United States attaches to international organizations. We should make a major effort at reforming and restructuring the U. N. systems. The intensity of interrelated problems is rapidly increasing, and it is likely that in the future the issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems that have dominated international relations since 1945.

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 B-1 bomber is an example of a proposed system which should not be funded and would be wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. We have an Admiral for every seventeen ships. The Chief of Naval Operations has more captains and commanders on his own personal staff than serve in all the ships at sea.

The Pentagon bureaucracy is wasteful and bloated. We have more generals and admirals today than we did during World War II commanding a much smaller fighting force. We can thin our troops in Asia and close some unnecessary bases abroad.

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. I am not afraid of hard bargaining with the Soviet Union. Hard bargaining will strengthen support for the agreements that can be reached and will show that we, as well as they, can gain from detente. We can increase the possibility that the fear of war and the burden of arms may be lifted from the shoulders of humanity by the nations that have done the most to place it there.

As I mentioned in detail at the United Nations, we need *firm and imaginative international action to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons* and to place greater safeguards on the use of nuclear energy. The Democratic Party should put itself squarely on record as favoring a comprehensive test ban treaty prohibiting all nuclear explosives for a period of five years.

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.

Finally, I think there are certain basic principles which should guide whatever is done in foreign lands in the name of this country. Our policies should be open and honest, shaped with the participation of Congress from the outset. Our policies should treat the people of other nations as individuals with the same dignity and respect we demand for ourselves. It must be the responsibility of the President to restore the moral authority of this country in its conduct of foreign policy. We should work for peace and the control of arms in everything we do. We should support the humanitarian aspirations of the world's peoples.

And our policies should be aimed at building a just and peaceful world order in which every nation can have a constructive role.

5. *Conclusion*

The proposals I have suggested are likely to remain simply proposals unless we have a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. It is time to put petty differences aside and to unite as a Party to achieve these goals. Together we can lead this nation to a New Beginning as the United States starts its second two hundred years. Together we can have an open, compassionate, and effective government which will reflect the best qualities of the American people.

RG DD.67

2

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER

~~BEFORE AN AUDIENCE OF~~ ON

Small Business

~~###~~ BIRMINGHAM, ALABAMA

September 13, 1976

This morning, I particularly want to talk about a subject that's important to me. And that is the small businessman in our nation. It is an extremely great honor for me to have John Sparkman here with us—a great Senator, a great leader, a candidate of our own party in 1952 for Vice President, and this man has also, as you know, been a leader in the Senate, as a chairman of the Small Business Committee. He's now gone to the Foreign Affairs Committee, but his leadership in this field makes it extremely valuable for me to have him on the platform with me.

We haven't had a farmer in the White House since Thomas Jefferson. We haven't had a small businessman in the White House since Harry Truman. And so we're going to bring a lot of good things to the White House after this election.

I think it's good to point out my own background—very briefly—to lay the groundwork for my credentials in speaking on this subject.

I came home from the Navy in the winter of 1953. I moved into the government housing project to live. I started a small business, a continuation of what my father had done, selling fertilizer. We reorganized, and my mother and I became partners together. The first year was 1954. Those of you who are farmers remember 1954. It was the worst drought year the South has ever seen in recorded history. We had a crop failure. And, although I sold about 3,000 tons of fertilizer and should have made about $9,000 gross profit, my profit was less than $300. I didn't make enough money to pay my house rent in the government housing project.

The next year my wife went to work. That made two of us in the business. In the third year, I hired my first employee. But I had to struggle then, as a professional naval officer, to learn about accounts receivable, to learn about balancing budgets, to learn about payroll, and to learn about government red tape and paperwork which at that time was practically nothing compared to what it is now.

In a few years, I was still struggling. And I went to the Small Business Administration for a loan to build an office building which I needed, and to build a cotton gin, and to make an investment in better handling equipment for peanuts. And at that time I was proud of the Small Business Administration. It was honest, it was open, it was well organized, it had a very close, very intimate relationship with the private lending institutions of our area. I believe that 90% of my loan came from the local bank. But the SBA guaranteed the loan and put up 10% of the money.

Later, year by year, top business executives, on a volunteer basis, would come down to Plains, and they would go through Carter's warehouse. I opened my books to them. And they said, "Jimmy, this is something I think you'd better watch. Here's an area where you can save money. This is something that you ought to quit doing."

And I felt that I had a partnership between those who knew about business and those who were willing to lend me the money and myself as an embryonic businessman. That's all changed now.

We don't have a Small Business Administration of which we can be truly proud. In the last few years we've had I don't know how many indictments and twenty convictions in the Small Business Administration. And the organizational structure of the agency is deteriorated along with a lot of other aspects of government.

This Republican administration has given us a lot of new things. The first $200 billion budget. The first $300 billion budget. The first $400 billion budget. We're now spending over a billion dollars a day and our deficit is a billion dollars a week.

In the last eight years we've seen the number of bankruptcies more than double. From 15,000 in 1969 to over 30,000 this past year. We've seen interest rates go up 50%. We've seen unemployment go up more than 100%. We've seen the deficits, the unbalanced budgets, ~~increase~~ grossly. Harry Truman for seven years

huge

and

128

had an average surplus of over $2 billion. Johnson/Kennedy (including the deficit of the Vietnam war) had an average deficit of less than $7 billion. Under Nixon and Ford, this Republican administration, the average deficit has been more than $24 billion a year. And the last two deficits, recommended by the President, have averaged over $50 billion a year. This, as I said earlier, is a billion dollars every week. We go further in debt. This is the kind of improper management that really grates on the consciousness of a businessman.

Now, my professional training is in engineering, science; my career training has been in planning, in managing a business, in running a farm. I produce certified seed on my farm—mostly peanuts. And I process peanuts now, starting this past year, for the market. I know what it means to meet a payroll. I know what it means not to waste my own money. I know what it means to have balanced budgets. I know what it means, as a governor, not to waste the taxpayers' money.

I have never known an unbalanced budget—in my business, on my farm, as governor of Georgia. And I've set a goal for myself, which I intend to meet: that before my administration is over, the budget of the United States will be balanced.

I've learned some other things. Whenever there is a choice between government performing functions, and the private sector performing the functions, I believe in the private sector having the responsibility. Whenever there is a choice between the federal government doing something or the state and local governments doing the same function, I believe it's best to place the responsibility and the authority as near as possible to the individual private citizen.

I believe in a maximum openness in government. My government is your government. And whenever it is wrapped in secrecy, and the people are excluded from the process of making decisions, that's when we make our serious mistakes in foreign affairs, as Senator Sparkman so well knows, and in domestic affairs. You can go back the last number of years; whenever we've had a serious mistake it has been because the American people have not been part of the process of making the decisions and carrying them out. So, maximum openness in government and a maximum personal privacy of our citizens is a good commitment to which we need to return. We need to have confidence in ourselves. Our nation's strong—economically—the strongest nation on earth. Richard Nixon didn't hurt our system of government. Watergate didn't hurt our system of government. The Vienamese-Cambodian war didn't hurt our system of government. The CIA revelations haven't hurt our system of government. Even the gross mismanagement of programs like the Medicaid programs and SBA haven't hurt our system of government. It's still a basis on which we can predicate answers to complicated questions, bind ourselves together and face the future with confidence. We ought to remember that. And the greatest thing which we have and which we can depend on in the future is the American people. We still have within us the same intelligence, the same ability, the same patriotism, the same sense of brotherhood, the same commitment to the work ethic, the same belief in personal freedom, the same high moral character that we've always had.

And that's a tremendous resource that's waiting to be tapped. And next January it's going to be tapped again. And you can depend on that.

Now, what can we do specifically to help small businessmen and women? We've got a lot more women in this country who have now decided to go into their own professional careers. Not just in education, but in medicine, law, and also in business. So what can we do to help them? First of all, we need to have more private investment participation in loans for the new starting business. This has gone backwards in recent years. We need to have more equity capital and not debt financing. The trend here has been absolutely terrible. We've gone more and more to a debt financing of business establishments and business expansion instead of letting business finance their own improvements with equity. We need to have more top business executives volunteer to work in government. Now, when I was elected governor, we reorganized the structure of government. We put in good electronic data processing, good personnel management, good transportation systems. We cut down red tape, eliminated paperwork as much as we could. And the ones on whom I called to help me with that were the top business executives. I have told you already how they came into my own small business in Plains to give me advice. That's an important resource that our country ought to tap.

I might add one other thing. It's not fair to blame the business community for the mistakes that government makes. The business community is as honest as any farmer or any preacher. If we can understand that the government treat us fairly, now if there is an excusing by government of the violation of the law of business, quite often this grows on itself. It ought to be competitive. If business becomes involved in illegalities, and improprieties of government. But business is basically honest. More so than they're given credit for. And one thing a President can do is to help restore the stature and the approval and the public support and the confidence in the business community.

It's a cheap shot when elected public officials blame the business community for the economic, social and political problems of our country.

Another thing that we must do is to increase the chance for small businesses to compete for government contracts. The Republican administration has paid lip service to small businesses and big service to

big business, and that's got to be changed too in the next administration.

We need to increase the opportunity for sales of products produced in small business. Most very large businesses have their own built-in organization—legal staff, lobbyists, overseas sales mechanisms and outlets. But small businesspersons, like myself—I'm sure most of you are bigger than I am in business—have a very difficult time understanding how to sell our products overseas. It's a tremendous market. We now export, for instance, in agriculture alone, $24 billion of our products every year. When I was governor of Georgia, I joined in a hot competition with Governor Wallace and Governor West in South Carolina and Governor Askew in Florida because in the Southeast one of the major responsibilities on the shoulders of a governor is to increase job opportunities by bringing in new industry and by selling the products we produce. While I was governor, we established and we maintained trade offices all over the world. We now have full-time trade offices just for Georgia, in places like Sao Paulo, Brazil; Toronto, Canada; Bonn, Germany; Brussels, Belgium; two in Japan, Great Britain, and so forth. Just to have a focal point in foreign countries so that a businessperson, large or small, can make arrangements there to make a trip to Great Britain or a trip to Common Market countries, or a trip to South America, or a trip to Japan, and have the arrangements made to meet with the top leaders to sell products there and to get increased investments in our state.

When I went to these foreign countries, like for instance Brazil, a tremendous potential market for our products, there would be hot competition. The Japanese, the Germans, the Chinese and small places like Bulgaria, the French and others would be there. And they would have government, business, labor, and agriculture representatives in a trade mission and they would sit down with the leaders in Brazil and say, these are the products we have to offer, this is the delivery date that we can meet, this is the quality of our products, this is the cost of them, this is the interest rate we'll charge, this is the repayment schedule. And, if they could offer a good package, they'd sign a contract right there. I went down with business and labor and agriculture leaders of Georgia. And when I tried to get an answer from Washington, on a specific trade deal, I never could find which department to go to. It's absolutely impossible. Is it Agriculture? Is it Commerce? Is it Treasury? Is it State? Is it Defense? Nobody knows. We need to have the same kind of commitment to overseas trade to put our people back to work on a nationwide basis as the southern states have done in the last number of years to overcome the aftermath of the war between the states a hundred years ago.

The world is waiting for good, top quality products that our nation can produce. But quite often they wait in vain because of the bureaucratic mess that we have in Washington, and that needs to be straightened out as well.

I just want to mention a couple of other things that are specific. We need to have tough enforcement of the antitrust laws. Our system of private enterprise must be preserved. And when the government does anything to lessen competition it hurts us all. It hurts the small businessman, it hurts big business, and particularly it hurts consumers. Tough enforcement of the antitrust laws is mandatory. Now, the Republican administration has stood in the way of that enforcement. Mr. McLaren, under President Nixon, resigned and recently the top Assistant Attorney General under this administration has also quit in disgust because of a lack of enforcement or commitment to tighter antitrust policies that have been proposed to the Congress. We need to break up the sweetheart arrangement between regulatory agencies and industries being regulated. Regulation on business is almost unbelievable. In 1975 alone, the 82 regulatory agencies in Washington put out 45,000 pages of regulations. Now, a big business organization can take care of that, perhaps, because they can have a superb full-time CPA staff and secretarial pools and attorneys. But a small businessman can't deal with those regulations without a great deal of hardship and many obstacles placed in his or her way to success. The tax laws are a disgrace to the human race and they have got to be reformed completely to give us a fair deal from our own government. Quite often businesses will take an action that's contrary to their long-term best interest just to get a one-year credit under the tax laws. I happen to be mainly a farmer and in the processing of farm products. But a very wealthy city dweller—a lawyer, a doctor and so forth—who wants to have a deliberate loss to benefit from tax shelters can come in and buy the farm next to mine, deliberately lose the investment, make a great ~~deal of profit~~ off of it, and provide unwanted competition with the rest of us. As you know, the same thing applies under the tax shelter programs, in the area of oil drilling or any other aspect of our lives. So the tax program has got to be revised to remove this unwanted intrusion into the business community, and the decision-making process.

We also need tough, competent, businesslike management of the government itself. We now have over 2,900 agencies, departments, bureaus, commissions in Washington. They need to be cut back drastically to make sure we eliminate confusion, overlapping and waste. We need to install also zero-based budgeting which means that every year you reassess every program in the executive budget. You eliminate obsolete programs, you reveal and eliminate overlapping in the agencies and you establish priorities that spend your next year's money where the money's needed to be

spent next year—not where it was supposed to be spent 50 years ago. And we need a sunset law to review every major department, regulatory agencies included, at least every five years—initiated by the Senate and the House. So, zero-based budgeting; tough, competent management; sunset laws by the Congress will help weed out those obsolescent agencies that create most of the unnecessary paperwork and red tape. That's going to come next year, as well.

The last point I want to mention is this: We need to have more cooperation among the different entities in our society. Between governments at all levels—business, industry, labor, agriculture, education and science, and others. There is no way now to tell what the government is going to do next. I don't favor the government planning for the private sector in our society. But the government ought to let us know what the government is going to do next, so that we can make our plans accordingly. Now, I need to know 15 months ahead of time what agriculture policies are going to be in existence. On acreage allotments, target prices, reserve supplies, exports, imports, I don't have the slightest idea what Mr. Butz is going to do next. That's typical of the kind of administration we've got in Washington and, although I've got a lot of priorities when I get to the White House, I think the first one is going to be to send Mr. Butz back where he came from and have a good agriculture policy. So, farmers and business people of our country don't want a handout. We believe in work. We don't believe in welfare. We want to be sure we have a competitive area in which to operate.

We don't want special favors. We want some predictability about it. We do not want to have the rug pulled out from under our feet after we make a commitment that can't be reversed. Now, cooperation ought to extend between the White House and the Congress. I believe that I can cooperate as President with Democratic and Republican congressional leaders. This has been done in the past. There's a constitutional delineation of responsibility. It's time for the White House and the Congress to cooperate for a change, with mutual respect for a change. I know that the Congress is inherently incapable of leadership. You can't expect 535 different people to lead this country. Our founding fathers never thought that that would happen. No matter how strong the individual members of Congress are, there's only one person that can speak with a clear voice to the American people. There's only one person that can set a standard of ethics and morality and commitment. There's only one person that can call on the American people to make a sacrifice when necessary and explain the purpose of that sacrifice. There's only one person that can answer complicated questions or propose bold programs to deal with our needs. There's only one person that can insure cooperation and unity within our complicated nation. There's only one person that can harness the tremendous resources of our country to support a strong defense and understandable foreign policy.

And that person is the President. In the absence of that leadership, there is no leadership. We have no leadership now. Our country is drifting. I can't recall a single thing that our incumbent President has done in the two-year period that indicates a capability for leadership.

Our nation cries out for clear statements of where we are, and where we hope to be. And this depends upon a close relationship between the White House and Congress, and also between the President and the people. Now, I've run my campaign that way all my political life. I started out 21 months ago without any built-in organization. I didn't have very much money. I came from the small town of Plains, not a major media center. Plains was not a major media center at that time. I didn't hold public office; not many people knew who I was. But I and my family and a few other supporters began going from one front living room to another—only four or five people would come in—and from one labor hall to another. Maybe 10 or 12 people would come. We went to farmers' markets, to livestock sale barns, county courthouses, city halls, shopping centers, factory shift lines, barbershops, beauty parlors, restaurants, shaking hands, talking a little bit, listening more. And we built up an organizational structure, quite often with people who had never before been involved in politics. It's a close relationship between me and the people of our nation.

And I feel secure in my political campaign and even with the prospect of the awesome responsibility of President, because of that relationship with the people. I don't know all the answers. I'm just an average American like you. I got involved in politics almost by accident. But I enjoy the public service.

But I believe the fact that I have been an engineer and a scientist and a farmer and a businessman and a local school board member, state senator, a governor, and have campaigned throughout the country, will stand me in good stead if I get to the White House.

But the greatest source of confidence and strength that I have is the fact that the people with their experience and intelligence, with their commitment to our country, with their high moral character, is where I get my support and my advice and my counsel and my criticism. If I can keep that close relationship, and tap that tremendous resource—it's what our nation is—then I think I can have a good administration next year.

I owe special interests nothing. I owe the people everything. And I'm going to keep it that way. If you think it's time for a change in Washington, I hope you'll help me. I think it's time for a change for the better.

Thank you very much.

Proofread over Phone W Betty 9/23

124-1

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON

Neighborhoods

AT BROOKLYN COLLEGE, NEW YORK, N.Y.

September 6, 1976

I come from a different part of the country, but I feel very much at home here.

A healthy city neighborhood, like the one that means so much to you, is not so very different from the small town in Georgia where I grew up.

People know each other. They look after each other's children. The local policeman is somebody's cousin, and he has a name. You recognize your neighbors and you know the butcher where you shop. There's a place of worship on one corner and perhaps a club or restaurant on the next.

Both a neighborhood and a small town have their own special character, their own distinctive life. I don't come from Americus, or Vienna, or Cordele. I come from Plains. You come from Flatbush—and not Sunnyside or Bay Ridge or Brooklyn Heights.

We feel most at home where our roots run deep.

That describes my home town of Plains. It also describes your neighborhood, and the many other diverse neighborhoods of the older cities of America.

It is time for us to recognize that neighborhoods are more than sections of the city, bricks and mortar, plots of land. They are people, and families, and homes.

Neighborhoods and families are the living fiber that holds our society together. Until we place them at the very top of our national policy, our hopes for the nation, and our goals for our private lives, will not be attained.

But, for too many years, urban policy has been an enemy of the neighborhoods—and of the families, too.

We have sent in bulldozers and called it urban renewal. I have never seen a freeway going through a golf course, but I have seen too many freeways cut through the heart of a living neighborhood.

For too many years, the government has not given neighborhoods the only thing they need—a chance to make it on their own.

No government that cared about our neighborhoods would stack the tax deck against them. A landlord can let a building run down and make a good living on the tax breaks. But, when a homeowner spends a little hard-earned money fixing up his house, the assessor raises his taxes.

No government that cared about neighborhoods would make it impossible for you to own your own home. For seventy years, beginning at the turn of the century, more and more families bought homes of their own. By 1969, we had accomplished what no other society had ever achieved. More than half the families in this country could afford their own homes.

But what took seventy years to accomplish has been undone in only eight. Between 1969 and 1976, Republican tight money and the Republican recession reduced the percentage of families who can afford their own homes from more than 50 to only 32.

No government that cared about neighborhoods would let their lifeblood drain away through redlining. Redlining is discrimination on geographical grounds. The banks draw a line around a neighborhood and say it has to die. Redlining means that your children can't get mortgages. It means your brothers and sisters can't find jobs. It means that the government does not care what happens to you or your children.

No government that cared about the neighborhoods would become a major slumlord. In many neighborhoods, you look down the street, past rows of family houses. When you see a vacant lot or a boarded-up house, chances are the government is the owner. The federal government is now the largest homeowner in the country. But almost no one lives in its houses.

If we are to save our cities, we must revitalize our neighborhoods first. If we are to save our country, we must give our families and neighborhoods a chance.

If I am elected, that is what we will do.

For eight long years, it is what the Republicans have failed to do.

Just one year ago, the Republicans gave us their philosophy of city life. They essentially told the largest, the greatest city in our country—your city—to drop dead.

They had been telling us that by their actions all along.

I remember when the FHA was a wonderful thing. It made an enormous difference to the families of this country—especially the young families buying their first home. For a small down payment, a family could get a mortgage which the government would insure. It was efficient and compassionate at the same time. The fund even turned a small profit.

Under the Republicans, FHA has become a monitor.

Just yesterday, the General Accounting Office released its latest investigation of the FHA. It showed that the FHA doesn't care any more about getting fam-

ilies started in their homes. It doesn't care about revitalizing neighborhoods. It doesn't even care about efficiency. Under the Republicans, its administration has become so sloppy and corrupt that last year alone it lost **six hundred million dollars.**

And the FHA is only a symbol of the scandalous failures of the Department of Housing and Urban Development. More than five hundred HUD officials have been indicted, and more than two hundred convicted so far, on charges of corruption and bribery in administering the department's programs.

Under the Republicans, the FHA and HUD have actually become threats to the health of our neighborhoods.

Another threat is crime. We have heard a lot from the Republicans in the last eight years about crime in the streets.

From my experience, there is nothing that stops crime as effectively as a healthy neighborhood or town. The people know each other, the police are local residents, and there is cooperation between community and police.

The Republican record is remarkable. On programs like the FHA and LEAA, their mismanagement has wasted millions of our dollars. Never has an administration wasted so much money to do so little good.

But, when it comes to the small, practical steps that could make an enormous difference, the Republicans have cut back.

The Neighborhood Housing Services, for example, are an efficient, proven way to stabilize neighborhoods, through a partnership between families, banks, and the government. But the Republicans **invest** only three percent as much in NHS as they **waste** through mismanagement in the FHA.

And now—after the record of the last eight years—the Republicans have suddenly rediscovered the neighborhoods. You will not hear about cities dropping dead between now and November. This summer, the Republicans appointed a special Task Force on Neighborhood Policy. They think three months' devotion will make us forget the years that went before.

They may fool the bears of Yellowstone Park that way. But they cannot fool the people of our neighborhoods.

We need more than election-year enthusiasm. We need a new neighborhood policy which strengthens the many strands that hold our people together.

There are two Latin words that help explain what we need. The Romans used the word "urbs" to describe the actual place where people lived. The urbs were the city. But they also used the word "civitas." That meant the whole network of voluntary, informal bonds —family, organization, religion, affection—which held the city together and made society truly human.

We have to restore both the urbs and the civitas in this country, instead of attacking them both. We must have a partnership—between a government which knows its limits, a private sector which is encouraged to do the right things, and the people, in their families, and neighborhoods, and voluntary organizations.

If we can have a partnership, we can correct the worst lesson of the Republican years—the idea that, whenever we want to help people, we can only succeed in wasting money. Our neighborhoods and families can succeed in solving problems where government will always fail. Strong neighborhoods and families can help the government use its money efficiently, for a change.

Let me give you an example. Here, in New York, there are many thousands of homeless children. It costs $25,000 each year to keep one of them in a public institution. But, when a child is in a foster home, it costs the public only $5,000 a year. And there is no doubt about which is better for the child, and the community, and the family.

The only way we will ever put the government back in its place is to restore the family and the neighborhood to their proper places.

There are other elements of our neighborhood policy. We need to reclaim the thousands of abandoned houses the FHA has left throughout the cities. And we need to clean up the FHA and HUD.

The Neighborhood Housing Services program should be made available to neighborhoods where it can make a difference.

New highways should not destroy stable neighborhoods, and the people of each locality should have a much greater voice in determining where a highway will be placed.

Urban homesteading is an efficient, sensible way to encourage people to restore their own neighborhoods.

We need a national law against redlining, and federal regulatory officials who understand that banks are chartered to serve their communities.

We need honest officials in HUD.

We must make homes available to our people again —in our urban neighborhoods as well as in the suburbs. Tight money, shrinking paychecks, and a stagnant housing industry are some of the saddest products of the Republicans' disastrous economic record.

Some of these steps must be taken in Washington.

But the most important thing Washington can do is to enable families and neighborhoods to take steps of their own.

I have said before that, in every policy I support, in every decision I would make as President, I would carefully consider the impact on the American family. Our neighborhoods are extensions of our families, and policies that strengthen one will strengthen the other.

We need a government that thinks about the family and the neighborhood, and cares about the family and the neighborhood, and makes its every decision with the intent of strengthening the family and the neighborhood.

With your help, we can rebuild our neighborhoods and our families, and give ourselves a country, and a government, we can be proud of once again.