

The original documents are located in Box 40, folder “Talk Show Transcripts - Democrats (3)” of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC NEWS RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS' ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

I S S U E S A N D A N S W E R S

SUNDAY, JUNE 6, 1976

GUESTS:

GOVERNOR EDMUND BROWN Jr (D. Cal.)

JIMMY CARTER (D. Ga.)

SENATOR FRANK CHURCH (D. Id.)

REPRESENTATIVE MORRIS UDALL (D. Ariz.)

GOVERNOR GEORGE WALLACE (D. Ala.)

INTERVIEWED BY:

Bob Clark ISSUES AND ANSWERS Chief Correspondent

Don Farmer - ABC News Correspondent

Roger Peterson - ABC News Correspondent

Sam Donaldson - ABC News Correspondent

- - -

- - -

This is a rush transcript for the press. Any questions regarding accuracy should be referred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS

- - -



MR. CLARK: Welcome, all of you, to ISSUES AND ANSWERS. We are going to begin here in California with Governor Jerry Brown, the youngest, at the age of 38, and the newest of the Democratic candidates. Though he got in late, he has won two primaries in Maryland and Nevada and was given credit for the victory of the uncommitted delegates last week in Rhode Island and he is a heavy favorite in Tuesday's primary here in California.

Governor, as this primary season draws to a close we would like to have you begin by telling us what single issue or problem you found voters most concerned with and what you would do about it if you became President.

GOVERNOR BROWN: Well, the central issue in America today is the fact that most people stop listening to political leaders. The rhetoric and the talk coming out of Washington just doesn't ring a chord of truth in people's ears, and then, when you add it to the scandals that every morning's newspaper brings home, it is obvious ~~to me~~ that when we look ahead to see the great challenge and sacrifice, that the American people are going to be called upon, those in Washington right now lack the credibility to summon the American people to the level of commitment required and I think the best way to change that is to bring in a new generation of leadership and literally throw the rascals out.

I think the wining, the dining, the inflated salaries that surround the Chief Executive and his minions in Washington, I think it turns people off and I think it turns people off in a very fundamental way. Those in Washington have lost contact with the people that sent them there and have to pay the freight for their activities.

MR. CLARK: Governor, you, Jimmy Carter and George Wallace are all regarded as anti-Washington candidates. You have campaigned in varying degrees against the evils of big government. You have goaded Carter about his plan to reorganize the government, and said you doubt whether he even has one.

Do you have any plans --

GOVERNOR BROWN: I don't think he does have a plan, and I think his statement, it reminds me of the secret plan that we heard about Vietnam - it doesn't exist. And if it did exist, I challenge Jimmy Carter on this program, before he gets off, to tell us what his plan to reorganize the federal government is.

He has made it the centerpiece. That is his whole campaign. And if it is, I would like to know before Tuesday's election, not after he gets in the White House.

MR. CLARK: Governor, my question, as an anti-Washington candidate yourself do you have a plan that --

GOVERNOR BROWN: I am a pro-America candidate; I am not anti-anything.

MR. CLARK: Do you have a plan, specific or otherwise, to reorganize the government, to reduce the size of the government and the federal payroll?

GOVERNOR BROWN: Reducing the size and reorganizing are two different things. We had a highway department in California, we still do, and I reduced it from 16,000 people to 13,500. The law enforcement administration office here, I reduced it by over 300 percent. So it is not a question of reorganizing. In fact, when you reorganize, often you just create a bureaucratic shuffle, and that is what the Carter plan is. If you want to cut things you just say No; that is all. It is that simple. And there is no candidate or no governor who has said "No" more often than I have to more crazy ideas that are presented to me.

MR. CLARK: Governor, if you became President, you would be dealing with a federal payroll of something like 1.9 million civilian employees. Now you have just told us how you reduced the California state payroll. How much could you reduce the federal payroll?

GOVERNOR BROWN: Well, I gave you a couple of offices I have reduced. Overall the level has remained even. We haven't added any more; we haven't dropped anybody overall of our 200,000 employees with the exception of 2,000 in higher education. If you are looking at the federal government, I can't tell you whether you are going to get dramatic savings because that isn't the way it works. What you have to do is say no to new programs and shift priorities.

MR. CLARK: Well, what are the number of employees you think you could do away with in Washington?

GOVERNOR BROWN: I really couldn't because I don't think that is the issue. It is a question of where they are. We might even add employees. Are you going to put them in the Pentagon, the B-1 bombers? Are you going to put them to building houses or roads or rapid transit? For one thing, if I am President, I am going to start a public service corps to get the young people off the streets in some kind of disciplined good work, bringing together men and women, people from diverse backgrounds, like Roosevelt had in the CCC and Jack Kennedy had in the Peace Corps, so that will add a number of people, but that kind of a program I think is good and would give people an opportunity from high school and to whatever happens next an opportunity to serve their country and get a paycheck every week.

MR. CLARK: Governor, Hubert Humphrey, who some people think will be back in the presidential race, challenged those candidates who were campaigning against big government this week to tell specifically what services they would eliminate. Now, I haven't yet heard you say --

GOVERNOR BROWN: I will tell you what I would eliminate. The law enforcement administration I think has been the greatest boondoggle we have ever had. They have spent \$2 billion saying they are preventing crime and the crime rate has gone up. So that's No. 1.

MR. CLARK: You talk about the Law Enforcement Establishment -- Administration --

GOVERNOR BROWN: LEAA, yes.

MR. CLARK: But as a specific program?

GOVERNOR BROWN: That is a specific program that purports to reduce crime, but all it does is give money to planners, buy walkie-talkies and a lot of nonsense equipment that doesn't make the streets any safer. That is just one.

MR. CLARK: Could you give us another specific example of a federal service to the taxpayers that you would do away with if you got into the White House?

GOVERNOR BROWN: No. I think you are mixing the programs of Jimmy Carter and my proposals.

MR. CLARK: I am trying to express Senator Humphrey's challenge to the contenders.

GOVERNOR BROWN: I have not offered a reorganization plan. I have not told people that the federal budget will go down. The federal budget, because of inflation, goes up and what I have tried to do in California is the same thing I would do in Washington. That is, question, challenge relentlessly every new proposal on the table.

At the same time, shift from undue reliance on strategic weapons systems to rebuilding the cities of this country. That is what I think is the first priority and putting people to work. At the same time I would try to decentralize the responsibility from Washington to the states and the local communities.

If you are asking me, is the public sector going to go down, my answer to you is no. It is not going to go down if Reagan is elected, if Carter is elected, or anybody else is elected because of the nature of our mixed private/public sector.

What I have said is that I will scrutinize new programs in a way that if they don't make sense I will block them.

Secondly, I will eliminate those things that don't make any sense like the LEAA program, and there are others; there are some programs in the Commerce Department that I think we can eliminate. There is a lot of confusion in highways and education. We have so many different programs I would consolidate them into revenue-sharing and give the money to the local communities.

MR. CLARK: And Governor, the last time we had most of the Democratic candidates on this program we talked about nuclear policy. You were not yet in the race. There has been a conflict of opinion in Washington over whether the United States should ever use tactical nuclear weapons in a limited nuclear war, if there is such a thing. Can you give us your feelings on this, and on the theory of massive retaliation as opposed to using small nuclear weapons?

GOVERNOR BROWN: Well, my own particular view is that the defense of this country is going to depend on two things: First of all, on the political will and the patriotism of those at home. It is not enough for Ford, Reagan and people in that generation to talk about defending the country. It is young men that are asked to go out and fight or stay home and fight, if that is where the challenge is. So unless we restore candor and a full employment economy and a level of patriotism and solidarity, forget national defense, because in the final analysis, it comes down to the individual soldier.

Secondly, the thing that is going to determine how strong we are is the conventional military capacity. That is the individual soldier or sailor or Air Force man, and the motivation, the equipment and the training. And right now in America I don't think that is high enough. That is where I would put my stress. And the whole idea that this fancy weaponry designed by the geniuses and the experts will save America is not true. It is the individual that makes the difference.

We are fighting brushfire wars or guerrilla warfare, and that is the individual.

We lost in Vietnam not because we didn't have enough fancy hardware, but because we didn't have the political will, and we were in the wrong place at the wrong time, and the people there really did want to defend themselves.

MR. CLARK: Governor, we want to save a moment to talk about New Jersey, where the uncommitted slate is committed, has endorsed both you and Senator Humphrey. Have you coordinated your plans there with Senator Humphrey?

GOVERNOR BROWN: I wish we had, but the uncommitted slate has at least 30 members for me, it's growing all the time. I am going there tonight on the midnight flier, and I asked the people in New Jersey to vote the uncommitted slate. That is an opportunity to keep this election open and give my candidacy a chance.

MR. CLARK: I heard a report that you talked with Senator Humphrey a couple days ago before making this decision to go back into New Jersey. Is that true?

GOVERNOR BROWN: I talked with Senator Humphrey, Senator Jackson, I am talking with you. I will talk with every

candidate I can.

MR. CLARK: Does that amount to coordinating a Stop-Carter campaign at this point?

GOVERNOR BROWN: I have a "Start America" campaign, to further my campaign effort, and that entails stopping Carter, obviously.

MR. CLARK: Then why the consultation with Senator Humphrey?

GOVERNOR BROWN: Why the consultation with Jackson? He has got a couple hundred delegates. Why the consultation with all the other candidates? In fact, we are even beginning to talk to Carter delegates, because I think some of their support may be a lot softer than even he thinks. But New Jersey is critical because Carter is on the ballot and there is an uncommitted slate, and I need more delegates. If the people of this country want a change, if they want someone in Washington that will challenge the assumptions on which the mistakes of the last ten years were made and they want somebody to go down there and clean house, I am the one to do it.

When I was governor, I had everyone who came to work for me take a 10 percent pay cut. I imposed a very tight reform act, and I think Congress and the President and all the rest of them need that same kind of treatment.

MR. CLARK: Thank you very much for being with us.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

MR. DONALDSON: Welcome to ISSUES AND ANSWERS, Governor Carter. You said next fall you think the dominant issue in the election will be foreign policy, so I would like to begin by asking you some questions in that area.

Where do you think the potential for war is the greatest in the world today, and if you were President, how would you avoid it?

MR. CARTER: I think the greatest potential now is in the Middle East. It is the most intense potential opposition between Israel and her surrounding neighbors, because they have refused to live up to United Nations Resolution 242, which requires the Arab countries to deal with Israel on an equal basis, to stop their insistence upon belligerent opposition against Israel, and this requires I think a very consistent, very clear statement of our own complete commitment to Israel, so that the rest of the world can know it. Whenever we equivocate about our position or let it be doubtful, it strengthens the inclination to start additional wars there or minor or major. And also I think scares the Israeli people into not being willing to negotiate as freely as they would otherwise. So a persistent commitment on our part to Israel would be the best approach to that situation; also, the maintenance of adequate naval reserves in the eastern Mediterranean.

once that eventuality occurs.

MR. DONALDSON: Well, is that saying that we shall go back to something like the old Dulles policy of massive retaliation? That is, once one "nuc" goes off, all of them go off?

MR. CARTER: I think we ought to be prepared to recognize that that is the most likely prospect. That once a nuclear war starts, either with the several hundred atomic weapons we have in South Korea, to several thousand nuclear weapons we have in Europe, or the several thousand nuclear weapons we have in this country, and equivalent numbers on the Soviet side, that once that starts a very good likelihood is that it would be an all-out nuclear war. I think that is thing we ought to recognize, yes.

MR. DONALDSON: Do you think we ought to try to perfect some sort of first-strike capability? That is, the ability to hit the Soviet Union with our missiles first?

MR. CARTER: Well, we have that capability now, but I don't believe anybody would claim that we can hit the Soviet Union so hard with a first-strike that they can't retaliate and wipe out major portions of our own country and kill literally millions of people. Neither can the Soviet Union hit us hard enough to avoid retaliation against them by us. We have got atomic weapons on submarines that are almost impervious to detection or destruction, and of course those atomic weapons are always ready for launching against the Soviet Union, even if our land-based missiles should be incapacitated by a first strike.

So first-strike doesn't mean that you are going to be protected from a retaliation under any circumstances, on either side.

MR. DONALDSON: I thought the argument was along the lines of hardening silos, perfecting the accuracy of our warheads, perfecting the MIRV ability, "the Marving of the MIRVS," so to speak, so that the other side would be afraid that we would strike first?

MR. CARTER: Well, I think that the thing that has kept us in an uneasy nuclear peace for the last 25 or e years has been the sure knowledge, first of all, that a first-strike capability doesn't prevent retaliation. Secondly, that limited nuclear war is highly unlikely, certainly possible but unlikely, and with each nation believing that if there should be an irresolvable difference between us, that we should not solve it with nuclear attacks. And that has kept us away from the holocaust or destruction of major parts of the world because of nuclear weapons.

MR. DONALDSON: Governor, what sort of vital interests of the United States do you think, if you were President, would require you to make the decision to actually go to war with the Soviet Union?

MR. CARTER: Well, I wouldn't think that anything short of the safety itself of this country, and existence of our country as a free nation. Of course, there are limited wars that have been fought. I would like to avoid them.

I would never again get militarily involved in the internal affairs of another country unless our own security was directly threatened.

I think one of the major things for us to remember is the foreign policy is a matter of common sense and sound judgment. There is no secret about it. Every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in foreign affairs with the Vietnamese and Cambodian wars, with the war, or potential involvement in the African areas, in the Middle East, it has been because the American people have been excluded from the process and we have lost the sound common sense and good judgment and high moral character of the American people so I think the more open we are in evolution of our foreign policy the best chance we have to let our country exemplify what the American people are and therefore avoid an unnecessary war.

I believe again we ought to have a maximum interrelationship between the people of this country and the people of the Soviet Union. Trade, communications, but not yield on tough negotiations and also the strength in the Free World, our own natural friends and allies whom I think have been neglected too much by Mr. Kissinger.

MR. DONALDSON: We have just a couple minutes left and I have to ask some political questions. You have run your campaign on what you say is integrity. Your opponents say you are fuzzy, and you are vague, and that you are wishy-washy. Would you think that next Tuesday's outcome in the major three states might be a referendum on which side is right.

MR. CARTER: 'I think we can substantially agree it would. I know last week when we had six primaries, the most we have ever had in one day, I got 60 percent of all the votes cast and I think 75 percent of all the delegates at stake. I can't ever predict what is going to happen next, but I think we are fairly good shape in New Jersey and in Ohio and in California. And I think at least to some degree it would be a referendum on my ability as a campaigner, and also my future reputation with the voters facing the general elections



MR. DONALDSON: Are you prepared to argue with the thesis that if you do win rather decisively in Ohio and do well in New Jersey that you are going to be the nominee, that the anti-Carter people won't be able to stop you? Would you argue against that?

MR. CARTER: That sounds like a beautiful scenario for the next few months, but I don't think it would be advisable for me to take anything for granted. I wouldn't take a single delegate for granted and I certainly will work just as hard in the months between the primaries and the convention as I have worked in the last 16 months.

MR. DONALDSON: But isn't it just false modesty now, Governor? You claim to have between 1200 and 1300 delegates at the end of the night next Tuesday.

MR. CARTER: We will have about 1200, yes.

MR. DONALDSON: Can anyone in that position be stopped? Ten seconds.

MR. CARTER: I wouldn't say stopped. I don't intend to be stopped. But if I am stopped, it won't be because I have been over-confident; it won't be because I have been too proud to go and ask people to help me, because I need a lot of help, still. Nothing is for sure in politics. And I would like to be the nominee, and that depends on a decision by the voters, as it always has.

MR. DONALDSON: Thank you very much, Governor Carter, for being our guest today on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

MR. CARTER: I have enjoyed it.

- - -

MR. CLARK: Governor, you are the dean of the Presidential candidates. You have been through four Presidential primary campaigns. What has been in your view the critical issue this time, the one that has most concerned the voters and has decided the primaries?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: I think basically what all of them are talking about now, that I started talking about in the beginning in national campaigns, was that the government of the nation, that is in Washington, has taken too much liberty with the affairs of people back home, which is very costly and inflationary, and also the matter of national defense in our nation in my judgment is one of the No. 1 issues that face the American people today.

MR. CLARK: You have been campaigning against the "pointy-headed bureaucrats in Washington" since 1964. Has Jimmy Carter taken over your campaign against Washington and big government? Is he carrying your banner to victory?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: I think that most of those running, Republican and Democratic, are all saying about the same thing,

in some different context. I came to California here, and find people are very disturbed about the fact that they are busing their children or fixing to start, and busing school teachers. Well, we have been concerned about interference in local affairs such as this a long time, but I knew some day that those running for public office would begin to say what I have always said and what I shall continue to say, and what I hope the people of New Jersey, Ohio and California will reflect or remember in voting on this coming Tuesday, and I hope they will support me, because the more votes I get, the more delegates I acquire, the better chance and opportunity there is to have a platform in the Democratic Convention that will be one that will be inducive to that average citizen wanting to vote for the Democratic Party, unlike what happened in 1972.

MR. CLARK: You surprised some people with your support of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full-Employment Bill, under which the government would provide jobs for everybody as an employer of last resort.

GOVERNOR WALLACE: I think that is a mistake about surprise that I supported it. I said I supported some of the concepts in the sense of full employment in the country of health care, but the Hubert Humphrey -- Humphrey-Hawkins Bill is a complete blueprint for socialization of the entire American economy and government, and is something that would make us another England, another Sweden; and in my judgment, it should never become the law.

MR. CLARK: Governor, what would you do about the unemployment problem in this country?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: Well, of course, there is no individual who will become President who is going to be able to determine and make all these decisions, is a genius to the point of solving every problem. The ones that have those solutions, I wish I could find them. But government is going to have to leave the private sector alone in some instances. I don't mean in the matter of Antitrust Act enforcement and matters of that sort, but to get off of peoples' backs, reduce the average citizen's taxes, and reform the tax structure so we will have more consumer confidence, which will aid employment. The multinationals that have gone out of this country over the great number of years for unemployment at slave wages, stop giving them the inducements to leave California under those circumstances, in Ohio and New Jersey and other states and we will have more jobs.

But one reason that our government has not provided some of the answers is that they have been too busy socially experimenting with peoples' children and with their local institutions. And the main solution to the matter of employment must come from the private sector.

The government cannot hire anyone except the tax people, and take money away from them.

So what I am saying is release some of the regulations on small businesses and otherwise, reform the tax structure which would help consumer confidence, reduce taxes on that average citizen, and place some of those where they ought to be. And in my judgment, that would do more in the long run to help the matter of unemployment and inflation of anything I know.

MR. CLARK: We will take a break here and be back in just a moment with more of ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

MR. CLARK: Governor, what will you do with those 200 or so delegates that you will take into the Democratic Convention? Can you or would you try to deliver them to anyone else?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: Well, Bob, of course, Mr. Clark, I first, of course, am a candidate for the nomination, but short of that my intent over the years has been to help bring the party back to a position that would be accepted by the great mass of people in our country, and again become the party of the people like it used to be, instead of the party of the left wing exotic noisemakers as it did in 1972, and therefore that is my prime interest of the direction of the country. Because I think the direction is wrong and it must be reversed and stopped and I believe the people themselves are ready for that. So the delegates that I have at this convention, and the more that I acquire in these three fine states of New Jersey, Ohio and California, will mean that we are going to get more in that direction, a direction of getting away from something for nothing which there is not and never has been; some of the basic moralities that used, in my judgment, were as valid today -- are as valid today as they were a hundred years ago.

And I have a very much of an investment in this matter, a personal investment, and otherwise, and that is my intent.

I first want to be the nominee; second, short of being thenominee, I want a nominee of the party and a party platform that pays attention to that average citizen in the middle class group, the small businessmen and women and the farmers and working people in this country who hold it together, who produce the wealth and make America great, and get away from paying attention to all these theoreticians in Washington who are trying to impose their will on people and write guidelines for their schools and their unions and their businesses and get off of people's back and out of their pocketbook and let some things work naturally.

That is my intent over the years, that will continue to be my intent with those delegates when I go to the Convention.

MR. CLARK: Governor, you say you do hope to play a role in the selection of the nominee as well as the platform. Who among the surviving candidates best represent the views of George Wallace?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: Well, at the present time I am not sure about that. I would have to study and think about what they are all saying. They are mostly saying what George Wallace has said a long time, maybe in a little different context, but for themoment I am a candidate and I may be a candidate from now on. It may be tied up in the convention. They may eventually turn to George Wallace. So I am a candidate first, and then, if the time comes that we have to

other

take the option we will face that at that time.

MR. CLARK: President Ford has revived the busing issue in the waning days of the campaign with his efforts to get the Justice Department to find a busing case to argue before the Supreme Court.

Do you think the busing issue is going to be resurrected in the general election campaign next fall?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: I believe it always will be an issue in the sense that people may accept it, but they don't like it and when I was in Massachusetts I sent him a telegram and said, "I hope that you will join in trying to stop busing through the Justice Department. I asked them to go into the federal courts. The very thing I have suggested now they are talking about. This asinine matter of shifting children in Los Angeles and in New Jersey and Ohio from town to town, district to district, across lines, is one of the silliest things that I have ever heard of.

The quota system in my judgment is something that is used in no other country in the world. It is a social issue and an economic issue, but let's have freedom of choice. Let people choose where they want to go, provide quality education, quality teachers, quality school buildings, and whatever you have to have to provide good education and let people choose for themselves and take the government out of choosing where people send their children. And a good vote for me in this state of California and others is going to impress those in the Democratic National Convention that the platform should pay attention to this social problem that faces the American people.

MR. CLARK: Governor, you have a term to finish as Governor of Alabama. Would you like to be Vice President?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: No, sir, I am not interested in that at all.

MR. CLARK: There are no circumstances that would induce you to trade some of those delegates for a vice presidential nomination?

GOVERNOR WALLACE: No, sir, I am not interested in trading delegates. I said a moment ago I have a pretty big investment in this whole matter, over the years, a personal investment, and otherwise, and I want to see the direction of the country changed.

First, I want to be the nominee. Short of being the nominee, I want to see the direction of the country changed and as far as looking for something else for myself, in my judgment that would be degrading and demeaning and I am not interested in that at all.

MR. CLARK: Thank you, Governor Wallace. We will be back in just a moment from Cleveland, Ohio.

* * * * *

MR. FARMER: This is Don Farmer in Cleveland.

Senator Frank Church was to have been with us live at this hour but, as you know, there was a disaster at the Grand Teton Dam in Idaho yesterday and so Senator Church has left his campaign here and returned to his home state.

Before he left, Church talked with correspondent Roger Peterson on tape and here now is that interview.

MR. PETERSON: Senator Church entered the primaries late, announcing March 18th. Since then he has won four out of five head to head contests with Jimmy Carter, the only candidate who can say that.

Senator, things seemed to be going along nicely until this week. You have a health problem --

SENATOR CHURCH: Strep throat in California and then suddenly a disaster in Idaho that takes me away from Ohio.

MR. PETERSON: What is this going to do to your campaign here?

SENATOR CHURCH: It is not going to help. I didn't have much time in Ohio and I have only limited money to spend in a very big state and reaching the people is the problem. Yet I had a feeling that things were going to come up for me in Ohio and then this terrible disaster in Idaho, of course, requires me to be home taking care of the people I represent.

MR. PETERSON: If this really hurts your chances here, what happens to the Church campaign?

What happens to the late-late strategy? Are you through or can you go on from here?

SENATOR CHURCH: No, I think in any case I will come out of the primaries having made a very good showing. Wherever I have been able to campaign and reach the people I have been able to win, excepting only in Rhode Island and then we had a kind of a Memorial Day weekend in which to campaign so it was difficult to reach enough people and there it was very close to a three-way split. So I come out with a very good series of wins and a respectable number of delegates to take the convention. If the convention is not an open and shut convention, if the frontrunner does not wrap it up in the first ballot or the second, then I think that that record will stand me in good stead at the convention.

MR. PETERSON: Well, why should the convention turn to you if they are deadlocked? Why not say to Congressman Udall, who has many more delegates than you do?

SENATOR CHURCH: It's not a question of delegates. The Democratic party has to find a winner, you know. It is not going to be easy to unseat an incumbent President, and the party is simply going to have to find someone who has

4
gone to the people and demonstrated that he can win in a series of primaries, and Congressman Udall has failed to do that. He has had plenty of opportunities. He has been up to bat many times, but he hasn't won in any state anywhere.

MR. PETERSON: You said that after Congressman Udall was defeated in South Dakota, in effect that he should get the message and step down. He hasn't. Is that going to hurt your chances here?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think that I have been able to draw from Democrats all the way across the spectrum, conservative Democrats, moderate Democrats, liberal Democrats, and if they will consolidate behind my candidacy here in Ohio the way they did in Nebraska and in Oregon, then I can win in Ohio.

The question is reaching enough of them in the limited time I have, and being unable, since I have had to campaign on a shoestring, to finance the kind of media campaign that is necessary in a large state. So we will just have to wait and see how it comes out. I will do the best I can.

MR. PETERSON: What do you expect to happen if the convention is not open and shut as you say, if Governor Carter is not able to lock it up? Are you going to try to campaign in the states that haven't chosen delegate; are you going to try to get uncommitted delegates? What will you do between Tuesday night and the convention?

SENATOR CHURCH: Oh, yes, certainly. We will go to work for uncommitted delegates and we have already begun to win uncommitted delegates our way. We will go into those states that have had caucuses, that will be choosing their final delegations at the state conventions; we will work there, and we have excellent prospects in a number of states, so I will keep adding to my delegate total and then I think that if the convention goes several ballots, the frontrunner strength will naturally begin to fade and the convention then must make a choice. It must either choose a candidate who has gone to the people and won, or turn to someone who has not gone to the people at all, and I think that if the convention does the latter, then there is a serious danger of a backlash developing against the Democrats because people would rightly feel that all of their votes and all of the primaries had been ignored by the party.

MR. PETERSON: That would split the party?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think if the party were to make that choice, the Republicans would jump upon that particular issue and it would be a difficult one for the party to confront.

MR. PETERSON: You are writing off Hubert Humphrey and Ted Kennedy?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think the convention is probably going to turn to somebody who has gone to the people and has

demonstrated that he can win.

5 Now, it is either going to be Mr. Carter or it is going to be some other candidate who has taken his case to the people.

MR. PETERSON: Governor Brown has taken his case to the people and he has won.

SENATOR CHURCH: Yes, Governor Brown would be one of those in contention at such a convention and I think that it could go to a number of ballots if it isn't decided in the first or the second ballot.

MR. PETERSON: What about the -- what is the issue here? What is the big difference between you and the other candidates? I have heard you stress your experience on the Hill. Is that the main thing?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think experience, when it comes to the most difficult office in the world and one with such infinite potential for good or for ill -- I learned that early, in the Vietnam War -- is terribly important, and I never have thought that the White House was a proper place for on-the-job training. I don't believe in instant presidents. At the same time, I recognize that there is an anti-Washington feeling, and the fact is that though I have been there for 20 years and I am fully conversant with the kinds of problems that will face the President, I have usually been on the outside working to open up the establishment. I have been the head of the investigation that disclosed the lawlessness in the CIA, the FBI, the Internal Revenue Service; I have investigated the role of the great multinational corporations and their impact in creating unemployment in this country, but the export of American jobs. I was an early opponent of the Vietnam War, so that I think that I have the qualifications to handle the presidency and the foreign policy expertise which is so essential and at the same time I am not truly a part of that establishment in Washington, which many people have come to resent.

MR. PETERSON: Are you saying in so many words that Governor Carter and Governor Brown are not qualified to be President?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think that that is a question that people must very seriously weigh when it comes to their final selection and it is a question which must be posed before the convention as well.

The White House just is not a good place for on-the-job training.

MR. PETERSON: But is the Senate a good place for on-the-job training for the presidency?

SENATOR CHURCH: Yes, I think it, particularly when I have had an experience of 20 years that extends across the whole spectrum of issues that Presidents must face. I have

been close enough to know what has gone wrong, close enough to know how I would cope with the big federal bureaucracy in an attempt to set things right.

MR. PETERSON: But you don't think you have been too close to Washington, as you mentioned earlier. This anti-Washington feeling in the country, how can you divorce yourself from Washington?

SENATOR CHURCH: I think my role there has been such as to commend me to the people as one who has had both the experience to do the job and yet the skepticism to face up to the establishment ^{and work against wrong doing} wherever I found it. That is a record, I thin, that combines both qualities that people are looking for and may account for the successes that I have had in the primaries up until now.

MR. PETERSON: Senator, we only have a bout a minute left. I am sorry we are so pressed for time and we have to leave, but the major issue here, unemployment, what would you do?

SENATOR CHURCH: Well, I would do far more than simply say, let's make the government the employer of last resort. What we have to do is to face the fact that billions of dollars of American money are being invested abroad and that is causing the export of American jobs in an alarming number.

MR. PETERSON: Can a President stop that?

SENATOR CHURCH: The President can stop that by calling on the Congress to change the present laws that give tax breaks for foreign earnings and give insurance for all risks assumed by big companies when they invest abroad. Those changes must be made before capital will come back again and create jobs in our own country.

MR. PETERSON: We are out of time, Senator Church. Thank you very much for being with us.

MR. FARMER: Congressman Morris Udall has survived more opponents and more primaries ^{than the other candidates} except Jimmy Carter. Udall has yet to win one of them, but still he does have more than 300 delegates, second to Carter in the number of delegates. Therefore, Usall believes he should be considered the party's alternative to Jimmy Carter if, in fact, the party wants an alternative.

Congressman, welcome to ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

I know that you want to respond to something Governor Carter said earlier on this program. The question to him was, under what circumstances might he consider the use of nuclear force and the Governor said having to do with the safety of this country.

MR. UDALL: He said that was the only situation in which the country would go to war.

You know it is customary to put down Washington these days, but you get a training in foreign policy serving in Washington.



The Germans, all of our NATO allies, the West Germans, the Japanese, have both refrained from obtaining nuclear weapons on the grounds that we would provide a nuclear umbrella; we would provide conventional forces and come to their aid.

I thought he was wrong and would greatly alarm our allies in Japan and NATO and Western Europe by suggesting we would only go to war in the defense of the United States. We have made some pretty solemn pledges that we would go to war, that the Germans, British and French could relax knowing we will come to their defense too.

MR. FARMER: Many times in this campaign, Congressman, you have differed with Mr. Carter on the issues and with Mr. Church in fact and some of the others.

Yet we don't seem to be feeling a response from the voters. At least I haven't noticed it, on the issues themselves.

How do you perceive the voters' interests in the issues, if any, this year?

MR. UDALL: I was alarmed the other day by this A. P. Roper poll, which suggests that most people were just voting on personalities and not on issues. I was really proud and pleased that of all the Democratic candidates, I was the only one who had a strong base of support because of my stand on issues.

Just the attempt this year has been very successful to just fuzz the issues, talk about love and harmony, and trust and brotherhood, which we all need, but not books on issues. I think this is a surface manifestation, however. I think people want leaders they can trust, but I think they also want some very fundamental actions, some change in this country and my campaign has been about a change -- I have tried to blend the issues and the personalities.

MR. FARMER: And yet a newspaper poll here in Ohio today rightly or wrongly, unscientifically perhaps shows you way behind. Three or four to one behind. What does that have to do, if it is true, with the issues, or perhaps with the voters' idea of what they want in a candidate this year?

MR. UDALL: Well, it shows to me the advantage of being a frontrunner. We have kind of had this stampede. I was about as well known as Carter six months ago and he won a couple of early primaries and had a flood of publicity and he is better known and I am not. But I don't believe this poll -- we closed the gap in Michigan. I came within a hair of beating him in Michigan. In fact, the final canvass may show we did beat him there. I think we are closing the gap here in Ohio. It is uphill, but I think I have a chance to beat him on Tuesday and, if I do, we have an open convention.

MR. FARMER: Let's talk about the issues for a minute here in Ohio. Obviously energy is important everywhere in the country. What is your stand on energy in terms of the oil companies? How does it differ from Jimmy Carter?

MR. UDALL: Well Carter, this is one of the fundamental issues he has had both ways. In Iowa -- you know, we are either going to break up oil companies or we are not. Either we are going to run them, or they are going to run us. This isn't some esoteric matter; it is a matter of price at the gas pump, the kind of utility rates that people in Ohio and California and New Jersey are paying. It is fundamental to our economic system.

I propose to break them up, and it is going to take a President who means business, like Theodore Roosevelt, and who is going to break them up for their good and for ours.

Carter said in Iowa, after being pushed to the wall on it, said that he was for divestiture. He goes down to Texas and says he is the only candidate who is not talking about divestiture.

And I know what the oil companies think. I know what the governor of Oklahoma, who has got a real passion for deregulation of natural gas thinks. They think he is going to be on their side on these issues.

It is very vital we do this. It is very vital to the working people of America that we do it.

MR. FARMER: Another big issue here, of course, is jobs, unemployment. You, versus Carter, on that one.

MR. UDALL: Well, I was one of the initial, original boosters of the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment Act. That is jobs for our teenagers that are out of work, that is jobs for the working families of America.

Finally, he was pressed and pressed and deliberately refused to endorse it, was quite plain in not endorsing it all of those months. We then had the flag about ethnic purity, and he comes along and says he has finally decided that the bill has been changed enough that he can endorse it, and he hardly mentioned it since. I mention it every speech. We are not going to get that kind of full employment policy unless you have got a President who has that No. 1 on the desk, who is going after it, is pounding the table, is working with the Congress to get it. I believe in it, and I don't think he has much commitment to it.

MR. FARMER: How about Defense spending, the Pentagon, all of that?

MR. UDALL: I am the only candidate, a survey showed in the New York Times a day or two ago, I am the only one consistent about cutting Defense. We are going to cut it \$10 or 15 billion; we are going to be just as safe when we get through, because we are going to get rid of some of these

systems that Governor Jerry Brown was talking about earlier.

Carter talked earlier about \$5 to 6 billion, but he never mentions it, he rarely brings it up, and only if pressed.

At one point he talked about a larger cut than that, and in a private interview, apparently he said he might have to increase the Defense budget. In fact, in Omaha, after talking about being against the B-1 bomber, he tells the people out at the Strategic Air Command he is going to keep it in R&D because he might even decide to build it when he is President.

MR. FARMER: Congressman, you have been saying these things for months now, five-six months, and yet today the Cleveland Plain Dealer, an important newspaper in this area, endorsed Carter, and they said things such as this: "Carter is the candidate of moderation and restraint."

The paper says, "His opponents make unrealistic promises" -- that's you; that you favor lavish spending programs.

What do you think about that kind of thing, coming two days before the Ohio primary?

MR. UDALL: Well, I had that in Michigan. The paper up there, the Mayor, Henry Ford and almost everyone, and we closed the gap. Because I think my message of change -- I am not for radical change, but I am for basic change, putting people back to work, breaking up oil companies, really getting national health insurance and not talking about it for another 30 years, and if that is change, okay, I am for it. Yeah, it will cost some money. We are going to get some of it out of Defense, we are going to have tax reform. We are going to save a lot of money on welfare and food stamps by putting people back to work, and we are going to get some money out of the Defense Department, too.

MR. FARMER: The paper also, the paper which endorsed Carter today calls him a "man of the people, not beholden to party bosses or to big labor."

Does that mean you are?

MR. UDALL: Well, Carter has it both ways. You know in Maryland, he thought it was just terrible that Jerry Brown was endorsed by the Governor and labor people, and these were "bosses."

When he got to Michigan, these were great civic leaders. When the mayor and Leonard Woodcock and some of the labor people endorsed him up there, these weren't bosses, these were great civic leaders.

I think I have had a broad based support in Michigan, in the rural farm areas, I carried precincts George Wallace carried; I had strong support in the Jewish community because of my stand on Israel. I think I have got a broad base, and I think I am a candidate of the people who has talked issues. Jimmy Carter hasn't talked issues.

MR. FARMER: Briefly, Congressman, where do you and

Frank Church differ, if at all here?

MR. UDALL: Well, there is a wide overlap on foreign policy, defense policy. Senator Church has been very good on that. He is much more pro-nuclear power than I am, and that issue out in California is very big, and I hope to get some votes out in California on that.

He has talked a pretty good game on abortion. I have been supporting the Supreme Court, and Senator Church seems to have some misgivings about how far we go in that area.

He is not for national health insurance. That is a big thing with me. I don't know. He doesn't want the government to play much of a role at all in national health insurance.

MR. FARMER: Congressman, people here have said that you have been conducting a smear campaign in your advertisements against Carter. Is that desperation because you are behind, or what is it?

MR. UDALL: Jimmy Carter is a good person. I haven't the slightest quarrel with him as an individual. I haven't cast the slightest doubt on his integrity or honesty. I have said that he owes this country some answers on issues. Is he as President going to be for breaking up oil companies or isn't he? Is he for the union shop or isn't he? That is an issue with run-away plants - Ohio, California jobs going to right-to-work states. He will not tell us that.

Now, I think he is negative. You ask him, where do you stand on this, Governor Carter, and he says no, I won't tell you. What is your tax reform? Won't tell you. What is your program for reorganizing the federal government? Won't tell you.

I think that is a pretty negative way to run a campaign. So I feel a heavy responsibility. I am the main alternative to Carter. To hit him hard on the issues, smoke him out, but do it in ways so this party can get back together again and haven't heard him at all. I haven't made any change at all on personality or integrity. I am not going to do that.

MR. FARMER: Very briefly, what does it mean if you win in Ohio and, conversely, what does it mean to the nomination if Carter wins here?

MR. UDALL: If he wins big in Ohio and New Jersey on Tuesday, it is probably all over. I don't say it is all over and I am going to continue my effort to have an open convention. If I win here in Ohio, if I do well in New Jersey, it means that convention can look at all the candidates that have been seen on this program this morning and at the convention can actually be a convention, the votes in Ohio and these other places, the votes in the states that have yet to pick delegates are going to count too. That is what is at stake here, and Ohio and New Jersey and California are going to decide this on Tuesday.

MR. FARMER: And how far are you behind right now?

MR. UDALL: I don't know. We closed the gap in Michigan from two and a half to one to a whisker and we are closing it here. I suspect we are behind, but we have 48 hours to do something about it, and I am going to be on the go every minute between now and Tuesday.

MR. FARMER: Congressman, thank you very much for being with us today on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS NBC RADIO
AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "NBC's MEET THE PRESS."

M E E T T H E P R E S S

Produced by Betty Cole Dukert

SUNDAY, JUNE 27, 1976

GUEST:

ROBERT S. STRAUSS, Chairman

Democratic National Committee

MODERATOR AND EXECUTIVE PRODUCER:

Bill Monroe - NBC News

PANEL:

Catherine Mackin - NBC News

David S. Broder - Washington Post

Alan Otten - Wall Street Journal

- - -

- - -

This is a rush transcript provided for the information and convenience of the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed. In case of doubt, please check with

MEET THE PRESS

- - -



MR. MONROE: Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is Robert Strauss, Chairman of the Democratic National Committee, a Texas lawyer and businessman, Mr. Strauss won the party chairman's post by a narrow vote after the Democratic election disaster of 1972. In the past four years he has reduced the Democratic party's debt and worked for internal compromises that would ease divisiveness within the party. Mr. Strauss will gavel the 1976 Democratic Convention to order in New York City two weeks from tomorrow.

We will have the first questions now from Catherine Mackin of NBC News.

MS. MACKIN: Mr. Strauss, ten days ago you came to the Platform Committee, the Democratic Platform Committee, when it was writing its platform; you congratulated them on the work they were doing and said you were hearing from people all over the country about how they were proceeding. Do you expect that Jimmy Carter will run on that platform?

MR. STRAUSS: I certainly do. Run and run well on it, Cathy.

MS. MACKIN: Did you have to get any kind of agreement from him that he would go along with all that is in the platform?

MR. STRAUSS: No, but we were in touch with Governor Carter as we were in touch with other candidates, Senator Jackson, Governor Wallace, Morris Udall and a number of others.

We were in touch with all the candidates and Governor Carter
I think
had the amount of input/he wanted. I also had input.

Let me ask you this:

MS. MACKIN: /The platform, according to Governor Dukakis,
who is Chairman of the drafting subcommittee -- Governor
Dukakis said that not counting national health insurance,
this platform would cost somewhere in the range of 27 to 30
billion dollars; it includes federalized welfare, income
maintenance, national health insurance, huge spending programs
like that. Is that the way you Democrats read the mood of
the country, in favor of big new spending programs?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, Cathie, I don't accept the premise
of your question to begin with and I don't think anyone has costed
this program out for one thing. The second thing I would tell
you is, this platform very clearly states that these are
goals for this nation and for this party and it doesn't set
out those goals with specific timetables. As a matter of fact, it
says we cannot accomplish all this at once. These should be our
goals. We should strive to provide good health care; we should
strive to provide jobs; we should strive to do these various
things and it doesn't say that shall be accomplished in the
first hundred days, or even the first four years, I might add.

MS. MACKIN: It does say, for instance, in the case of
national health insurance, that you would move quickly. In the
case of full employment that you would reduce it to 3 percent
in four years. The Congress estimates this would cost perhaps up

to \$50 billion. It is specific.

MR. STRAUSS: Let me also say with respect to national health insurance it doesn't say it should all be federally-financed and it talks about public and private financing and how we would arrive at it and all these effect costs, and with respect to these costs this, this is in comparison to what? I will tell you what you know, of course, as well or better than I, that probably a good national health care program for this nation would end up reducing the costs the citizens of / this nation pay for national health care, as well as improving that health care. That's what our goal is.

MS. MACKIN: Well, to repeat my question, do you think the mood of the country is in favor of big new spending programs?

MR. STRAUSS: I do not. I think the mood of the country is in favor of coming to grips with and solving some of the great problems facing this country. That is what we Democrats hope to do.

(Announcements)

* * * *

MR. BRODER: Mr. Strauss, you said two weeks ago, I believe, that you would, if you had anything to do with this fall campaign, make Mr. Ford's pardon of President Nixon an issue. Is that still your intention?

MR. STRAUSS: Mr. Broder, yes. I think this, that the

course and conduct and the decisions made by this President during the course of this presidency are proper subjects for the campaign; that pardon is one of them; Watergate is not.

MR. BRODER: Jimmy Carter, who I guess will have something to do with the Democratic campaign in the fall said on Wednesday or Thursday of this week that he would not make the pardon an issue because, as I recall, he was saying, when he, Mr. Ford, pardoned President Nixon, he was doing what he thought was right.

Do you find yourself at all embarrassed by being at odds with your candidate on the issue?

MR. STRAUSS: I don't feel at odds, Mr. Broder, with our candidate, at all. Governor Carter asked that I serve as Chairman of this party and take a major role in his campaign. I will do that.

I am delighted to do that, with great pride, and I think you will find Governor Carter and I are in accord on this campaign, will be in accord on the issues. Obviously he is going to run his campaign. You asked for my answer on that question; I gave it to you.

MR. BRODER: Are we going to have then a kind of a split level campaign in which Governor Carter will be taking the high level and you will be handling the kind of the belly punches?

MR. STRAUSS: I will say this: My record is such that I

don't believe I do very good at belly punching. I have been pretty forthright.

I say what I think and I try to keep it on a reasonably high level and I don't think that Governor Carter would permit me to run his campaign and be as active in it as I am going to be if he thought I was going to be in the low level. It would be contrary to everything he has done in the past 18 months to secure this nomination. It would be contrary, I might also add, to everything I have done as Chairman of this party in the past three and a half years.

MR. OTTEN: Mr. Chairman, what do you see as the effect of the /current scandals involving a number of Democratic Congressmen, sex scandals, expense accounts, cheating and the like?

Do you see the vote as deciding to turn the Democratic rascals out and replacing them with a lot of Republicans?

MR. STRAUSS: Mr. Otten, I think the effect of that depends upon how it is handled by the leadership, the Democratic leadership, and the leadership in general. I think they are moving quickly and I think they are moving strongly. I think they are moving well and I think any time you have alleged misconduct it is bad for the structure; it is bad for the people; it is bad for the Congress; it is bad for Republicans and Democrats alike. When you go about curing them, I think it allays the problem a great deal.

MR. OTTEN: A number of Republicans have been arguing that

the Democrats have been in control of Congress for most of the last couple of decades. Your good friend, John Connally, told Texas Republicans a few days ago that it was the inevitable corruption of power.

MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

MR. OTTEN: What is wrong with that argument? Isn't that a fair argument to make?

MR. STRAUSS: I think if I were a Republican, I would be doing just what President Ford, John Connally, and others are doing, run against the Democratic Congress. They don't really have much to run for. They are going to have to run against something and the Congress, we have control. I would remind you, the Democratic Congress has a good record. It is not an A-plus record; it is a good record. It is a record that can be defended and set forth positively and I don't worry about the Democratic Congress being the subject of their attack.

MR. OTTEN: Well, just to go on to that record and to go back to the point Ms. Mackin was making about the Democratic platform, the platform makes a number of specific pledges that the Democrats, with their very, very heavy control of Congress -- and I am not talking about bills that Mr. Ford vetoed, but bills that the Democrats haven't been able to pass, like tax reform -- right now the Senate is voting down every tax reform proposal and yet your platform proposes \$5 billion of revenue-raising. Why should the voters believe that you are



going to do any better than you have been able to do?

MR. STRAUSS: I think voters know, and those that don't know we are going to have to convince, Mr. Otten, of one thing; that to get good legislation you need really a two-pronged effort.

You need a strong executive who cares about good legislation and I think that is what Jimmy Carter is going to bring this nation.

Jimmy Carter cares. He has a conception of where this nation can go and how to get it there. He will work with that Congress and he will give it the kind of leadership, the drive, the lobbying that it needs, the kind of legislative drafting it needs.

That is the way you get good legislation. We haven't had that in the past eight years under this Republican Administration.

Jimmy Carter is a healer, a unifier, a worker-with, and a leader, and he will get that legislation.

MR. OTTEN: You don't feel that he will run into the same opposition among Democrats as well as Republicans that the Democratic leadership is running into right now, trying to pass/reform, health insurance, or some of these other planks in your platform?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I think he will have trouble passing his program. Of course he will and that is as it should be in this country. There isn't one branch. There is a legislative

and an executive branch but I think Jimmy Carter has the qualities. He has demonstrated those qualities of leading this country, of bringing people together, of getting things done and I think his vision of America is one that is the vision of all Americans. I think he will be the next President of the United States. I think he will substantially pass his program and there will be a Democratic Congress.

Mr. MONROE: Mr. Strauss, when you were Democratic party treasurer, going back five or six years ago, you accepted two gifts from the Ashland Oil Company totalling \$50,000 in cash. It turned out to be an illegal corporate contribution and there wasn't reported, identified, as to names of donors, as required by law. What ever happened to that \$50,000? Was it ever returned to Ashland?

MR. STRAUSS: \$50,000 was given to us, as I recall, in 1970. The \$50,000 went into our treasury and was spent on general operating expenses, which is what it was given for.

A portion of that money has been refunded. We have entered into an agreement for the refunding of the balance as we go along. It will be refunded.

MR. MONROE: All of the \$50,000 will be returned to Ashland?

MR. STRAUSS: Yes, that is my recollection. All of the \$50,000 will eventually be returned. I think we have paid --

I forget what the proportion of it is now.

MR. MONROE: Congress recently changed the statute of limitations affecting prosecution for campaign violations such as the acceptance of this money; changed it from five years to three years, which makes it harder to prosecute people who have been involved in campaign violations. This action of Congress was led by Congressman Philip Burton of California and Congressman Wayne Hays of Ohio.

Doesn't this suggest that the Democratic Congress is more or less anti-reform?

MR. STRAUSS: I don't think it suggests that at all. I think this, that unquestionably we had bad campaign practices, unquestionably a great deal of technical and other violations were overlooked.

We changed the law and people are complying with it. We changed the tone; we changed the intent. We changed the whole thrust and I think that no such suggestions are in my mind and I don't think in the minds of the American public.

MR. MONROE: If you change the statute of limitations from five years to three years, doesn't that make it harder for the government to prosecute politicians who have been involved in campaign contribution violations.

MR. STRAUSS: It makes it exactly two years harder, Mr. Monroe.

MS. MACKIN: To pursue my earlier line of questioning

about the platform, doesn't this mean that the Democrats are once again engaging in the politics of promise and the politics of rising expectations when actually we have diminishing resources?

MR. STRAUSS: No, I don't believe that, Miss Mackin. In the first place, I reject the notion that we have diminishing resources. This is a great nation with great resources. I think we have at times failed to have the capacity to utilize those resources and I think our platform is a sound platform and the reading of it is a sound one. It is a responsible platform. I would be prepared to accept almost every word of it myself and I think it points out that we can.

MS MACKIN: But you can't bank on it.

MR. STRAUSS: It is a good platform and we can't do everything in that platform at once. It is goals for this nation, and I think we have to have goals for this nation.

MS MACKIN: Let me ask you this: You are a businessman. Where is the money coming from to pay for these --

MR. STRAUSS: In the first place, if we each our employment goals that we seek, that in itself will cure this terrible short-fall we have had in income in this country and I think we are going to have to find other sources. I do think that we are going to have to have continuing tax reform to which Mr. Otten referred later. I think Governor Carter will give us those things when he is President. I think we

will have to find where the fat is, and I don't think we are going to accomplish everything. I am not here to say to you Governor Carter, once he becomes President, is going to wave a magic wand and this is going to be Utopia. Of course it isn't going to be. But he has the drive and he has the energy and he has the conception and he has the guts and he is imaginative enough, I think, to come to grips with these problems one by one and get on with the job of solving them. Not all at once. Inch by inch. We haven't been making any progress. This country has been -- stagflation -- is that the term -- we have been slipping back and I think we are have got to cure it.

MS. MACKIN: Well, you said earlier that you didn't think the mood of the country was in favor of big spending programs. If it isn't, does that put you in an awkward position since you have all these big new programs in your platform?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I think it depends upon what you are talking about. I think when you travel around this country and you see people having difficulty with health care, when you see them trying to take care of their elderly parents who are ill and who are hospitalized, who need day and night care, if you will, when you travel around this country and see people unemployed, when you see people ill-housed, the people of this nation want to come to grips with those problems and



they are prepared to pay, but they want efficient programs and they want delivered programs and they want monitored programs, that once they fail they destruct. That they don't stay in existence and continue to waste. That is what this nation wants.

MR. BRODER: Mr. Strauss, do you, as Democratic/^{National}Chairman, support the election of Wayne Hays to Congress?

MR. STRAUSS: Do I support the election of Wayne Hays to Congress? As Chairman of the Democratic party, support the election of all Democrats running for office, and I expect to campaign for all Democrats running for office from the presidency right down to the Court House, the County Court House.

MR. BRODER: Will the funds and facilities raised by the Democratic party be used to help Mr. Hays in his campaign?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I have made no allocation of funds right now. It wouldn't be fair to answer that question. I made a pretty broad statement in answer to it though.

MR. BRODER: Your likely nominee, Mr. Carter, said here this week that he would not disavow the candidacy of Mr. Hays. Do you think that your statement just now and his statement earlier this week raises a legitimate issue for the public as to the position of the Democratic party on the kind of abuse of power that is represented by Mr. Hays?

MR. STRAUSS: I do not and, as a matter of fact, Mr.

Broder, I think this, that I read the account of his statement and I just heard your question and my answer, and I think you can -- I think with all the great problems facing this country, with all the things that Jimmy Carter has to do to get ready to -- first to secure the nomination, mount a campaign and keep his promises to the American people -- which I think he intends to do; and as to the extent I am able to hope to help him do -- I think this is flyspeck issue on that. The extent of his support or non-support for Wayne Hays -- who, so far as I know hasn't been convicted of anything yet --

MR. BRODER: Do you think Mr. Hays' behavior is just a flyspeck on the record of Congress?

MR. STRAUSS: No, I don't. I am not -- I have no apologies to make for his behavior, but I think there are far more important issues facing this country today than that -- that specific individual. Not the course of conduct; not that type of thing. I am talking about -- that specific individual. I think there are more important things for us to be talking about.

MR. BRODER: Do you think it reflects at all on the Democratic members of Congress as a whole who re-elected Mr. Hays to that position of committee chairmanship, who kept him in that position knowing the way in which the power of that position was being used?

MR. STRAUSS: First, I don't know how much they know about that power, and let me also say this: To get to the broader question, the men and women in the Congress aren't perfect and far from it. They are full of imperfections, just like people in media are, and those who are in the corporate suites, the business interests of this country and the farm community, the working men. They don't have any license on morals or are they any less morale and I think you find the same standard of conduct, and I think the American public recognizes that.

over the country, they were doing and said you were hearing from people all it was waiting for the platform; you congratulated them on the work Platform Committee, the Democratic Platform Committee, when MS. MACKIN: Mr. Strauss, ten days ago you came to the of NBC News. We will have the first questions now from Catherine Mackin in New York City two weeks from tomorrow. Mr. Strauss will speak the 1976 Democratic Convention to order compromises that would ease divisiveness within the party reduced the Democratic party's debt and worked for further election disaster of 1972. In the past four years he has party chairman's post by a narrow vote after the Democratic Committee, a Texas lawyer and businessman, Mr. Strauss, the Robert Strauss, Chairman of the Democratic National MR. MONROE: Mr. Strauss today on WEEI THE PRESS IS

MR. OTTEN: I have a feeling you are going to duck this but I feel duty bound to ask it: Do you want to predict whether Mr. Ford or Mr. Reagan is going to be the Republican nominee?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, if I had a prediction I would give it. I think it is the flip of the coin. I really think it is Tweedle Dee and Tweedle Dum, which one is, and which one we run against, Mr. Otten.

MR. OTTEN: Which one do you think would be the tougher for the Democrats to beat?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, you can make an argument that it would be a bit tougher electorally to beat Governor Reagan and a bit more difficult in popular vote, I think, to beat President Ford. But their campaigns have been such -- they have been appealing to such a narrow constituency that I think they are either one defeatable. I think it is going to be a tough campaign, I don't think Governor Carter, I don't think I as chairman of the Party, I don't think the others who are going to be managing Governor Carter's campaign, can take a single voter in this country for granted, or a single state for granted and I know he doesn't intend to and I don't intend to, nor do the others.

MR. OTTEN: The recent public opinion polls show Mr. Carter very heavily beating either one of them. I gather from what you just said that you expected it to be a

much tighter race.

MR. STRAUSS: I certainly do and let me say this: My knowledge of Jimmy Carter is such that he is not going to read the polls and relax. You are going to find him campaigning up until election eve, the same way he campaigned to get this nomination.

The last conversation I had with him day before yesterday was, he said, "And I will assure you of one thing, Bob, I'll outwork you." I said, "Well, we'll see."

MR. OTTEN: Mr. Carter didn't really hold up too well in some of the primaries. He lost more of the late primaries than he won. Do you see a possibility the same thing will happen again, that he will start fading as the campaign goes on?

MR. STRAUSS: You know, Mr. Otten, I am amused at "He didn't hold up very well." The man won nineteen out of thirty primaries. The man -- we were sitting on programs like this -- I was talking to the press just a few months ago and they were saying there were going to be a multitude of candidates there and you are going to have a madhouse, an irresponsible convention. And now we find that he "didn't hold up well enough." Well, he eliminated some twelve to fifteen candidates and did it a month ahead of time. I don't know what else you want him to do.

MR. OTTEN: But he did lose most of the late primaries



MR. STRAUSS: Well, he started awfully early and he was spread very thin and I think -- it isn't very often you see a nominee picked several weeks ahead of the convention, able to spend his time unifying the party and do the things he has done. I don't quite know how you satisfy, if that doesn't do it.

MR. MONROE: Mr. Straus, a few months ago you said the present system of primaries was debilitating and costly.

MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

MR. MONROE: And you predicted there might be a great reform coming out of this primary season, possibly the country turning to regional primaries. Do you still feel that way?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I don't think the region -- I did say that it is very debilitating and very costly, and I think that is true. And when I don't term a regional primary great reform, if you will -- I think the primary process is a good process. I think -- I think, for example, Jimmy Carter knows about the people of America probably better than any man or woman in America today, for having been in all those states. Having started out going into homes with two or three people and sitting around and talking with them and finding out what is on their mind, their hopes and their aspirations as well as their frustrations.

Now I think it does take a toll in money and in time and in effort. And one of the things -- and I have appointed a commission -- it is studying very hard, under Morley Wintergrad our state chairman of Michigan. And I have -- we have a first-rate commission studying what we should do with the process.

One of the things we are looking at is regional primaries, where we would have five, six, seven regions shorten the time, lessen the expense and the wear and tear.

MR. MONROE: If Jimmy Carter became President and he was not in favor of reform of the primary system, you wouldn't likely get any big reform, would you?

MR. STRAUSS: My judgment is he would be the kind of President, that, his impact would be felt. I would hope so.

MR. MONROE: What about the present system of fund raising with federal subsidies, do you think that is working well?

MR. STRAUSS: I think it is a great improvement over what we have had in the past. As far as I am concerned there is much more to be done and it is a subject I know something about and a subject I hope to be heard from in the future.

MR. MONROE: What more is to be done?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I think, No. 1, I think we need to -- I need -- we need a little stricter requirement on how people become candidates and qualify for matching funds. We need a little quicker turn-off on people when they cease the right to get matching funds.

I think we possibly need to increase the thousand dollar limit. Not a great deal; maybe a few thousand dollars more. It makes it pretty hard, and there are a number of other things we could do. But we are on the right track. We have a long way to go and I think we will be getting there.

MR. MONROE: We have a little more than two minutes.

MS. MACKIN: At this convention next month, the number of women, blacks, chicanos and young people will be down from what they were, the percentages, from 1972. Does it concern you that their percentages are down or do you figure the Democrats have those votes anyway?

MR. STRAUSS: No, it concerns me a great deal. As a matter of fact, I wired our state chairman several weeks ago to try to improve, but let me say this, Ms. Mackin. The percentages are not going to be down as great as those things. The representation of women was 38 percent in '72 with quotas. I think without quotas we will have it up to 35 percent. They got there through a process. A real process. I am proud of that.

2

With respect to black participation, it was 15 percent in '72. It will be 12 percent. I am sorry for those two fall-offs, but these people got there happily on their own, through the process instead of through a quota.

The American people don't like quotas.

MR. BRODER: Mr. Strauss, do you favor debates between the presidential candidates this fall?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, it is something I would think of. I know Governor Carter looks with favor on considering the debate. I heard him say so. I think this: If I were the Republicans and had been talking about Rhodesia and the Panama Canal and little else for the last six months, I'd like to get someone in the arena with me who would broaden the discussion and give them a platform and a number of issues to talk about they haven't seen fit to talk about.

I think we will make that decision as the campaign moves along. We will still make the decision.

MR. OTTEN: Mr. Carter, apparently intends to keep his campaign headquarters in Atlanta. Won't that make tremendous problems in terms of coordinating the --

MR. STRAUSS: We think it is going to be a very, very good plan. We have worked out the plan. We know what we are going to do here in Washington with a strong Washington presence. What he will do, his field operation will run out of there.

I am very pleased with the plan we have worked out. I think he is.

I know that Hamilton Jordan, the others on his staff, are pleased with it. The people on my staff are. We have been working a week on it. Very hard. It is good.

MR. MONROE: Mr. Strauss, are you saying that Jimmy Carter has made it clear to you that he will debate either Reagan or Ford?

MR. STRAUSS: I did not say that. I said that I heard him say at the Senate the other day -- a couple other places before the press -- that he would look with favor on considering a debate. As far as I am concerned, I say it is a decision we would make later.

I know one thing: Governor Carter is not worried about any debate. He has been debating all across this country for the last 18 months, and I would remind you also those Republican candidates haven't appeared on any of these public debates, where NBC and others have offered that time. No one's accepted. He has been there each time.

MS. MACKIN: A subject matter like capital punishment, decriminalization of marijuana and civil rights for gay people?

MR. STRAUSS: Yes.

MS. MACKIN: Were deliberately kept out of the platform because they were called red flag words. Why are these subjects not appropriate for a platform?

MR. STRAUSS: Well, I think this: I think the platform went into the question of priorities and I think they didn't get there on the priorities because the members of the Platform Committee didn't put them there. Had they elected to put them there, they would be there.

MR. MONROE: Our time is up.

Thank you, Mr. Strauss, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.

* * * * *

Next week: A special one-hour July 4th program originating in Philadelphia, with five governors. This special edition of MEET THE PRESS, beginning half an hour earlier than usual, at 12:00 noon, Eastern Time, will include Governor Robert Ray of Iowa, Governor Michael Dukakis of Massachusetts, Governor Wendell Anderson of Minnesota, Governor Mills Godwin of Virginia, and Governor Milton Shapp of Pennsylvania.

- - -

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC NEWS RADIO
AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

I S S U E S A N D A N S W E R S

SUNDAY, JULY 11, 1976

GUESTS:

SENATOR GEORGE McGOVERN (D. SD)

REPRESENTATIVE BARBARA JORDAN (D. Texas)
Keynoter, Democratic National Convention

GOVERNOR WENDELL ANDERSON (D. Minn)
Chairman, Platform Committee,
Democratic National Convention

MODERATOR:

Bob Clark - ISSUES AND ANSWERS Chief Correspondent

Sam Donaldson - ABC News Correspondent

- - -

- - -

This is a rush transcript for
the press. Any questions re-
garding accuracy should be re-
ferred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS

- - -



MR. CLARK: Welcome, all of you, to ISSUES AND ANSWERS into the ABC anchor booth here at the Democratic Convention. I think it would be fair to say that you all had either hopes or expectations that someone other than Jimmy Carter would be the nominee of this convention.

Governor Anderson, you were a Humphrey backer, and Senator McGovern, you would have preferred, I believe, either Frank Church or Mo Udall and Congresswoman Jordan, you stayed out of it; you didn't endorse anyone.

Are any of you going to have any problems giving Jimmy Carter, the certain nominee of this convention, your full-hearted support?

Senator McGovern, we will start with you.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: No, I fully intend to give my support to Governor Carter. He won the nomination under the rules that the party established four years ago.

He won that nomination fair and square. He took his case to the people. He got a higher percentage of the vote across the nation than any other candidate and although he was not my choice, I play by the rules and I will support him.

MR. CLARK: And Governor Anderson, you were a co-sponsor of the Humphrey For President Committee. Do you have any reservations about Governor Carter?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: None whatsoever.

Of course, I served with Jimmy Carter. He was one of my colleagues for four years and I think he was an outstanding Governor, but two things have really impressed me.

First, his ability to win 19 primaries. I think that is an incredible achievement. If Hubert Humphrey had won nine or ten I would have been bragging and boasting about it, and properly so.

The other thing that impresses me about Jimmy Carter, I had the good fortune to work on the Platform Committee with some of the key Carter people, a very, very impressive group, and I think they came up with a sound platform, a platform that makes great sense to the American people.

Mr. Carter has indicated willingness to support that platform. I am very pleased by that. I can support him enthusiastically.

MR. CLARK: Ms. Jordan, you never endorsed anyone, but do you have a secret favorite for the nomination?

REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: No, I really didn't have a secret favorite, and it should not be interpreted, the fact I did not endorse anyone, that I was "anti" anyone. We had so many people of great capacity and ability that it was very difficult to single out the one who ought to be the nominee of the Democratic party.

I don't say that tongue in cheek. I will have no difficulty whatsoever supporting Governor Carter. I intended to support the Democratic nominee almost without exception, and even that exception did not come about, so I have no difficulty with the nominee of the party or working enthusiastically for it.

MR. CLARK: And with this strong praise we have just received from what we might call divergent forces within the party, do you think Jimmy Carter should be or will be nominated by acclamation, with no other names even put in nomination?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I don't think there is any problem with other people having their name submitted. I think if I were Mo Udall, who is a distinguished gentleman and a great public servant, I think it would be very proper for him to have his name submitted. I think there are a tremendous number of delegates who have great affection for him, great respect.

I shouldn't expect Mr. Carter to be nominated on the first ballot, but I certainly don't think anybody should feel embarrassed about nominating somebody else.

MR. CLARK: Anyone else have feelings about this?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I think it is a good thing to give the convention a chance to work its will. There is no question in my mind that Governor Carter will be the nominee. I think he will win on the first ballot. But as Barbara Jordan has said, we had a number of very able candidates this year. Their supporters felt strongly about them, and it is an indication of the diversity and the strength of the Democratic party that we permit these views and these other candidates to be heard. So I don't think it is going to hurt us if we have a few other names spread in contention.

REPRESENTATIVE JORDAN: I agree with that, but I think it ought to be clear that it is a conclusion that Mr. Carter will be the nominee of our party, that still does not mean that every living breathing Democrat enthusiastically endorses Jimmy Carter, because that is not the case.

Yes, he had an impressive string of primary victories, but yes, also, only a minority of the Democrats participated in those primaries from coast to coast.

Let it be clear that there are people still within the Democratic party who would prefer to see someone else.

to be realistic about it, that remains the case.

MR. DONALDSON: Let me go to one who may be with us today. Senator McGovern, by saying the governor won fairly by the rules and you support the rules, that is a little bit like a President when asked his position saying he will enforce the law; and it is a bare minimum.

Now, is Jimmy Carter a McGovern Democrat? Does he stand for the things you stand for?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I would not say he is a McGovern Democrat in the sense of pioneering in new ideas that may be a little bit ahead of where the consensus is. I think Governor Carter has made a judgment that the proper strategy in winning the nomination in 1976 was to find a consensus on the major questions; and it has worked for him. But I think perhaps one of the reasons that there is some reservation on the part of very conscientious Democrats about the nomination of Governor Carter is that they are not quite certain yet where he will come down on some of the issues that people care.

I think Governor Anderson and his group have written an excellent platform. It is an impressive, forward looking platform. Governor Carter has said he will run on that platform. To whatever extent he does, he will come closer to what is sometimes referred to as the McGovern Democrats. It is a platform I could run on.

MR. DONALDSON: Do you fear Governor Carter may be a little bit too conservative for what you see to be the main wing of the Democratic party, or the wing that you helped in 1972 represent?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I think that reservation is there. It isn't a matter of personal matter with me; it is a matter that a great many Democrats are still somewhat concerned about where the governor will lead as a President. But it is up to those of us who have some of those reservations to use what influence we have to see that the positions are more clearly spelled out. I intend to do that. I intend that when I get a chance, to talk with Governor Carter, to talk to him very bluntly about the need to spell out positions on the hard issues.

And I think he is doing that. I find him more effective, I find him more specific, I find him more forthright now than he was a few months ago, and I think we will see more of that as he sharpens the issues with the Republican contender.

I think that is what a campaign is all about, and these issues will be more clearly defined as the campaign moves along. I have no doubt about that.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Just on that point, I think charges were made some months ago that Jimmy Carter was not very specific on the issues. I found that not to be the case, working with the Platform Committee. I reviewed his speeches, I reviewed his press releases. He submitted a 107 page statement to the Platform Committee. I must say he was, I thought, incredibly specific, particularly in light of the charges. I know that James Reston

and the Wall Street Journal have both had articles dealing with that issue. I think to his credit he has been much more specific than people have given him credit for.

MR. CLARK: Governor Anderson, the one exception to that might be, and it was an exception recited repeatedly on the campaign trail by your man Hubert Humphrey, and that is in Jimmy Carter's plan to reorganize the government, where he is going to reduce the government agencies from 1900 to 200, I heard Hubert Humphrey deliver a ringing speech in Minneapolis saying those who are campaigning against Washington owe it

to the people to tell where they are going to reduce the bureaucracy. Would you agree with that?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I think Mr. Carter made it very clear that during the campaign would not be the time to deal with the specifics of government reform. But in the platform, for example, we indicate we should cut the defense budget by \$5 to \$7 billion. We don't say where, but I think it tells you something that is separate and distinct about the Democratic party, its platform and Jimmy Carter, when the Republicans, if they do have a platform, I am sure, will be calling for more and more billions for national defense and I don't think it is necessary to indicate to the American people here specifically where we are going to eliminate those dollars, but we have made a philosophical commitment and a specific commitment to eliminate \$5 to \$7 billion.

MR. CLARK: And Congresswoman Jordan, the Congress of the Caucus of Black Elected Officials a couple of months ago put out a very detailed set of recommendations to the Democrat- it Platform Committee, a set of recommendations much more detailed than the platform that emerged. Are there areas where you would like to see either the Platform Committee which Governor Anderson headed, or Jimmy Carter, address himself in greater detail, be much more specific about issues that are important to blacks, or low-income Americans in the country as a whole?

MS. JORDAN: Let's be clear about this. Yes, the Black Caucus submitted to the Platform Committee a very detailed recital of issues considered important to black people. It did not mean -- it, the Black Caucus, did not mean that unless the Platform Committee were to endorse in totality the submission of a specific set of issues, that blacks would then reject the platform and be turned off by it, because the language in the platform addresses all Americans, because it addresses those who are unemployed and underemployed and those who don't get their fair share of America's largesse.

If you just look at that platform -- you don't have to look too closely or with any care -- you will find that blacks are in there, women are in there, the underprivileged are in there. It is not said in specific language, but it is there.

MR. DONALDSON: The Platform is not going to be elected. Let's face it. A man is. Do you think that Jimmy Carter,

do you trust him to fulfill what you have written in the Platform?

MS. JORDAN: Now, Sam, Governor Anderson said that the / Carter people worked with him and tried to help get the language together, and I think a test of the credibility of this man who will be the nominee of the Democratic party is whether, after we leave Madison Square Garden, he carries that platform with him across this country and runs on it, and commits himself to do the things which are called for in it.

MR. DONALDSON: You said in your initial statement many Democrats still have some reservations.

MS. JORDAN: Well, that is true.

MR. DONALDSON: Are you one of them?

MS. JORDAN: Am I one of the Democrats with some reservations about Jimmy Carter?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes.

MS. JORDAN: I believe that Governor Carter is telling the truth when he says he can run on the Democratic Platform, he will do the things which the platform calls for to be done, and also he said he never tells a lie.

MR. DONALDSON: Just one more question: What do you feel about Governor Carter? Never mind the platform, never mind his words -- and I am not doubting his truthfulness, either -- but what does your instinct tell you about this man?

MS. JORDAN: Sam, I do not know enough about Governor Carter to develop any impression about this man. I don't know him well enough, and I want to get to know him as the campaign takes place.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

MR. CLARK: We want to talk a little about the Vice Presidency, which is the last remaining element of mystery here at the Democratic convention. I will ask Senator McGovern first, do you have any feelings about the Vice Presidency? Do you think it is incumbent on Jimmy Carter to pick someone who is, for example, satisfactory to the liberal wing of the party which you represent?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Well, I suppose, Mr. Clark, I am the last person that ought to be advising anyone on picking a Vice Presidential runningmate. I told Governor Carter that the other night when he phoned me about it. But I think he is going about it in the right way. He is using the time, the luxury that he has as the apparent nominee, to be very careful and very prudent in his selection.

I personally am very pleased with the names I see on the list. I haven't encountered a name on that list that has been discussed in the press, men like Mondale, Muskie, Church and others, I think they are all first-rate people and would strengthen the ticket.

I think it is important that the governor do what I understand he is thinking about doing, and that is pick someone with some experience with national government, who has had to grapple with the great national and international questions. Most of these personalities whose names have been mentioned are such people. I think any one of them would strengthen the ticket.

MR. CLARK: You say that you talked with Governor Carter about it. Did you suggest any specific names to him?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Yes, as a matter of fact, I did. He asked me if there were any names that came to my mind that I thought would make strong runningmates. I suggested to him that both Congressman Udall and Senator Church had worked very hard, had come off well in some of the primaries, that they were well known, they had been tested under fire. I mentioned Congressman Rodino and the brilliant job that he did presiding over the impeachment proceedings, and I made clear to him that there might be others who would be even stronger, but those were just three names that came to my mind.

MR. CLARK: And Governor Anderson, you were on the original lengthy list of potential Vice Presidents that were being checked out by the Carter people. You have not reappeared as the list has been distilled down to a few names. Has Governor Carter been in contact with you?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: He has not. If he were, I must tell you I have a very strong feeling about a fellow by the name of Fritz Mondale who happens to be from Minnesota. I have known Fritz for some 18 years. As you know, he served as our state attorney general, from the United States

Senate, and it seems to me the test should be who would be a good President, and I think Fritz Mondale would be a tremendous President, and I could give him, and I do give him my unqualified support.

MR. CLARK: Congresswoman -- I was going to ask Ms. Jordan because I heard a member of your Texas delegation last night talk in a very upset way about the fact that there was no woman on that long list of some 15 names that Carter people were checking out. Does that disturb you?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Well Barbara Jordan's name was on the list.

MS. JORDAN: My name was on the list.

MR. CLARK: Oh, I see. I --

MR. DONALDSON: Do you think it really was?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Listen, if my name was on the list Barbara's name was on the list.

MR. DONALDSON: Governor Carter consistently said in the early part of the process that he was not excluding the possibilities of a woman or a black or any American for that matter who met the Constitutional qualifications might be on his ticket. But I am just really wondering whether you think he was serious about that, because it has come down to five or six, and there is no woman, and there is no black.

MS. JORDAN: Sam, I never thought he was serious about that, if in fact Governor Carter had anything to do with my name appearing on that list of 14 to begin with. It was a little political PR flotation out there to see what public reaction would be to that name showing up.

It was all right with me; it did not hurt at all for me to go into my district in Houston, Texas, and say "Listen, I am on the list," and it became sort of a matter of some pride. But do I think that I was ever under any serious consideration by Governor Carter as a Vice Presidential nominee? No, sir, I do not.

MR. DONALDSON: Did any of his people ever contact you?

MS. JORDAN: No.

MR. CLARK: Would you like to be Vice President?

MS. JORDAN: Well, I don't think that is a question I have to answer at all. Why would I have to deal with something so "iffy" and ethereal and far removed?

MR. CLARK: The reason I thought you might is because I heard Governor Anderson asked that same question on another show, and he said yes, he would like to.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I said I would ponder it carefully for two or three seconds before saying yes.

MS. JORDAN: That question might be asked Governor Anderson. It is not going to be asked Barbara Jordan, at least not tomorrow or the next day.

MR. CLARK: Senator McGovern, you mentioned that when you talked to Jimmy Carter you had put up Mo Udall's name,

among others. Perhaps that's been a surprise, that Congressman Udall's name I am sure was not on the long list of 15 names and has never reappeared. Do you think and do the rest of you think that Udall, who did come in second throughout the primary season, do you think that he should be seriously considered for that office?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I think we make a mistake if we think that Jimmy Carter has limited it just to four or five or 14 people. I don't think anybody knows what he is going to do. I don't think he has decided, and I would have to think that Mo Udall is a name that would cross his mind, and properly so. So I don't think we are being totally fair with Mr. Carter, because we don't know what he is thinking.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Let me say in all fairness to Governor Carter, he said "These are three good men; they are people I have as a matter of fact thought about."

He mentioned that he knew Congressman Udall well from his experience with him on the campaign trail. He said the same thing about Senator Church. I got no negative reaction at all --

MR. CLARK: Well, you think Udall may be on a secret --

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I think that he is one that has been considered. I think Congressman Rodino is on that list. I think Senator Church is. I wasn't trying to give him any comprehensive list; I was trying to put forward two or three names that were in my mind; and he mentioned a number of others that I thought were very fine men, including Senator Mondale, who I tried to get to run with me four years ago.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Well, we have a tradition: Normally there is someone on the ticket from Minnesota, and I think it's --

(Laughter)

MR. DONALDSON: Let's --

MS. JORDAN: Sam, before you get into that, let's get back to the Udall question, being on the list. Now, Udall ran in I don't know how many primaries, 20-plus, and did not win one. Governor Carter has so carefully crafted his political campaign strategy to this point that I think he would think long and hard and carefully before he brought onto the ticket someone who had not demonstrated the "runable" (?) quality which is so important to Governor Carter.

MR. DONALDSON: Well then how can he consider Senator Mondale who not only did not enter the primaries, but shrank from the Presidential race because of that stream of primaries?

MR. CLARK: Or Senator Glenn or Senator Muskie? And those are supposed to be two finalists.

MS. JORDAN: No, but they were not out there in those primaries.

MR. CLARK: Why weren't they?

MS. JORDAN: Well, I suppose that is a question that



could best be answered by them.

MR. DONALDSON: Why weren't you, Senator McGovern?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Why wasn't I a candidate this year?

MR. DONALDSON: Yes.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Well, basically for two reasons: In 1974 when I was a candidate for reelection to the Senate, I told the voters in South Dakota I would not be a candidate in '76. I know sometimes those promises are made and quickly forgotten, but I said it, and it was very difficult to turn that around.

And then secondly, the fact that I lost so heavily in 1972 seemed to me to be a reason to give others a chance at the nomination in '76.

MR. DONALDSON: Are you sorry you didn't run?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Well, I am a little wistful, looking around Madison Square Garden at that beautiful rostrum that somebody else is going to give that acceptance speech, but there will be some other wistful people out in that crowd, too, and what we have to do in politics is to recognize that fate plays a very heavy hand in it. I used to think everything was done by careful design and planning, but in many cases a turn of fate, a little twist here, an accident there can change the whole thing.

I was thinking when Barbara Jordan mentioned that Udall had not won a single primary - the fact is that he barely missed in New Hampshire. I think there were 4,000 votes that separated him --

MR. CLARK: Wisconsin --

SENATOR MC GOVERN: In Wisconsin we went to bed thinking he had won. In Michigan, less than 1 percent. So with a little turn of the dice at one time or another it could have been Udall. If Humphrey had come in two or three months ago who knows what would have happened?

I think in politics we have to recognize the hand of fate is very, very important, and we can't always control that.

(ANNOUNCEMENTS)

MR. CLARK: Senator McGovern, I was looking back the other day at a long laundry list of the chief items on your program in 1972. A lot of those became part of the 1972 platform, some did not, but the greatest discrepancy between what you stood for then, what you presented to the party in your bid for President, was defense spending; in my view it was defense spending. You had called for very deep slices in defense spending, something in the neighborhood of 40 percent, from \$87 billion to \$52 billion or something like that. This time the platform committee, under Chairman Wendell Anderson here, has called for what might be called a minimal deduction in the defense spending, five to seven billion dollars.

My question would be first to you, if, when the moment comes that you were talking again to Jimmy Carter about your views and the things that disturbed you, would it be defense spending? Would you say we have to cut the defense spending much deeper?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: No, Mr. Clark. I never, to my knowledge, went so far as a 40 percent cut. What we talked about in 1972 was a \$30 billion reduction in military outlays, but that was over a three-year period. We were proposing a ten billion cut in each of the next three fiscal years.

MR. CLARK: 85 to \$55 million, which comes to the area of 40 percent.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Yes. Well, not quite that, but we will not argue about the details. I would say this, that we probably were a little more specific than we needed to be. I think it aroused some anxieties needlessly. It might have been better to talk in terms of the waste in the military sector, to point to some specific examples of it, to talk about zero-based budgeting; in other words, to begin with the assumption that we have to build the defense forces from the ground up rather than assuming that everything we now have is justified and everything on the drawing board is justified.

I think the platform states it quite well this year. It talks in terms of a five to seven billion dollar cut, does it not, Governor? And that is a reasonable target.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: More than that, though, Jimmy Carter has said that the most bloated federal agency is the Defense Department. He has made it very clear that there are more Admirals and Generals around today than there were at the end of World War II.

When he talks about zero-based budgeting, I think the first place he would apply that would be to the Defense Department. More specifically, he has taken a public position against the B-1 bomber, and our platform --

SENATOR MC GOVERN: He has taken a position to defer it, as I understand it.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I think he has taken a position against it. No, I asked that specific question of him. I asked him about the Trident submarine and the B-1 bomber last December, and he said no to the B-1 bomber.

MR. DONALDSON: Under his position it is that he would continue R&D and he would defer the actual production of the first set of B-1 bombers.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Our platform indicates --

MR. DONALDSON: It strikes you that is a little bit of something for everyone?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: Not to me.

MR. CLARK: You mentioned the Trident submarine. Of course, Governor Carter is for the Trident submarine --

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: That is correct.

MR. CLARK.-- which is an extremely costly program. I noted in the platform there is a phrase cautioning against excessive spending for exotic weapons systems which might include the Trident submarine.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: We also have a statement in there saying that the next President should make the decision on the B-1 bomber which I think is a position you supported in the Senate.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Let me just underscore my own view on the defense budget. I don't apologize for the alternative defense budget we outlined in 1972. I think it was sound. I think it was carefully crafted, carefully worked out. All I am suggesting to you is when you present a plan that specifically, you have to be ready for a lot of criticism. It gives your critics a chance to twist it, to distort it, to arouse anxieties that perhaps are needless. For that reason I don't really quarrel with the way the platform presents it this time. If we can accomplish a \$5 to \$7 billion reduction in overall military outlays when Governor Carter becomes the President, that is far better than we have been able to do in the last eight or ten years.

MS. JORDAN: Well, Senator McGovern, don't you see a change in mood in the Congress and the country from 1972 to 1976 in the attitude towards defense spending? I have just been appalled at how the defense budget has escalated and gone galloping through, both the House and the Senate, with hardly a whimper.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I have. I have been shocked by it.

That is why I think this platform probably stands in sharp contrast with what has been the actual situation in the Congress. I was amazed this year particularly at a time when we are not involved in the Vietnam War, we are not involved in any major conflict or even a minor conflict anywhere around the world, and yet for the first time in 200 years of American history we have increased our military budget after a war was over. Usually when a war ends the

military budget goes down. This time it took off like it was going to go right through the heavens, and I think it is one of the most serious problems that the next President of the United States is going to have to go through.

MR. DONALDSON: Let me throw me up for grabs. Is there another things you may sense in this country, and that is our relationship with the Soviet Union may get worse, not better? Detente seems to be in ill-repute, certainly as a word. There is a feeling, is there not, that we may have given away too much on the grain deal? Governor Carter has campaigned by saying we gave away too much at Vladivostok. We gave away too much at Helsinki. He promises to be a tough negotiator.

Do you think we may be entering into another mini-cold war with the Soviet Union?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I sincerely hope that is not the case. It is absolute madness for us to be piling up more and more overkill regardless of whether the Soviets choose that course. Either side now has the capacity, even if they don't build another thing, to absorb a first strike and still retaliate with enough power to utterly destroy the other society.

Either Russia or the United States could do that. What is the sense either for Moscow or Washington, in those circumstances, to be using the taxpayers' money, neglecting other urgent problems while we pile on more and more excessive overkill? It makes no sense at all, and all detente really means is a recognition that two countries that disagree with each other ideologically have to find those areas where they can agree and learn to live on the same planet, even while reserving their different philosophical views.

MR. DONALDSON: Maybe I should change to another --

MS. JORDAN: I just wanted to say, Sam, I agree with what Senator McGovern has said, and I hope we are not moving into a mimi-cold war period, but I would suspect that Republican campaign rhetoric has been largely responsible for this new sense of withdrawal and Americanism and isolationism, if we want to go that far. I absolutely fault the heightened Republican political rhetoric with this kind of attitude the people seem to feel.

MR. CLARK: Let me suggest a pitfall that may lie ahead for Jimmy Carter and get your reactions for it, and that is the prospect of strong and probably militant new leadership in Congress. In the Senate you may well have Hubert Humphrey as the Majority Leader. It could be Bob Byrd, but if it is Hubert Humphrey, it is going to be aggressive, militant leadership I suspect.

In the House you are going to have Tip O'Neill.

Let's begin with you on this. Can you foresee a Congress flexing its own muscles in a new Democratic administration,

4
 initiating its own programs in some of these areas of void that disturb you about Mr. Carter's programs? Would this be a serious problem for Carter if he becomes President?

MS. JORDAN: I don't think it will be a serious problem; the change in leadership in the House will be a serious problem for President Carter. The reason I feel that way is that Tip O'Neill, the apparent successor to Carl Albert, is highly, highly partisan. He wants to see a Democrat in the White House in the worst sort of way; I would say worse than any of us here on this program, and he is not going to engage upon a course of action which might embarrass or make it more difficult for the new President of the United States to govern.

We will see a honeymoon period, the likes of which you have not seen, I think, since Lyndon Johnson assumed the presidency. I think we will see that with Tip O'Neill in cooperation.

MR. CLARK: Governor Anderson, can you see your man, Hubert Humphrey, sitting still if he becomes the Majority Leader of the Senate, and waiting for President Carter to initiate programs and send them to Congress?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I think there is nobody in the Congress that is easier to get along with than Hubert Humphrey. He likes people; he has, I think, great admiration for not only Jimmy Carter, but for the presidency, and I think that very quickly President Carter will learn Hubert Humphrey's public number and his private number and his unlisted number, and I think they will develop a very close, warm relationship. And, Humbert Humphrey, again, is a team player, and he is going to help Jimmy Carter be a great President.

MR. CLARK: Senator McGovern, how about that strong liberal wing in the Senate that includes Senator Humphrey?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Mr. Clark, it is going to take that wing and all the energy they can muster to carry out the kind of program that Presidential candidate Carter is going to run on. That platform that we have been talking about is committed to national health insurance for all Americans; it is committed to fundamental welfare reform, including something very close to what I was proposing four years ago of a \$1,000 minimum income plan; it calls for a guaranteed job for every American who wants to work --

MR. CLARK: A little short of a commitment to the Humphrey-Hawkins full employment bill.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: It doesn't mention the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, But it says we are going to get down to three percent unemployment by the end of the administration, the first four years. It talks about fundamental reform of the tax structure. Now, the only way those things are possible is with a liberal, forward-looking, activist Congress, strong leadership in the Congress. So I would think that Governor

5

Carter would be praying for that kind of leadership in the Congress. There is going to be one other thing it is going to take to accomplish this program, and that is a President who doesn't use the veto power the way President Ford has. One of the worst things about the last two years is that Governor -- President Ford has exercised that veto 53 times. You can't run a government that way.

MR. CLARK: We would like to talk more about the prospect of Jimmy Carter using a veto against the Democratic Congress.

(Announcements)

* * * * *

MR. CLARK: We were talking just before our break about presidential vetoes and I am wondering if what the Republicans call the big spending Democratic Congress churns up in the euphoria of a new democratic administration program, social programs, perhaps beginning with the Humphrey-Hawkins Full Employment bill, that cost a lot of money, more money than the then President Carter might feel should be spent, can you look ahead and foresee vetoes by a Democratic President against bills passed by a Democratic Congress?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: First, the strongest commitment that we make in our platform is to deal with unemployment. I just noticed this morning that black unemployment in America, young blacks, is 40 percent. We know every percentage point of unemployment costs the Federal Treasury \$16 billion, and what Jimmy Carter has said, and what all of us collectively have said, we have got to reduce unemployment to at least three percent in the next four years. I think if we do that, it is going to generate a tremendous amount of money for the national treasury. If in a two-party system and a democracy we cannot reduce unemployment, we better get out of the business.

MR. CLARK: You also know, I am sure, Governor, that Jimmy Carter has been less than enthusiastic about the Humphrey-Hawkins bill in its pure form, indicating that he has concerns about the cost and would like to lean more heavily on the private sector to produce jobs.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: But he also made it very clear that he strongly supports that objective, to reduce unemployment to three percent by 1981. We did not specifically endorse any bill in the platform, and I think perhaps that was wise. But I think he has a responsibility to bring that about, whether it is through the Humphrey-Hawkins bill or something else or an amended version, I am not concerned. But I think he has to deliver on that promise.

MR. DONALDSON: Governor, how do you feel about the idea of cutting out the state from revenue-sharing so the



money goes directly to the localities? That is Mr. Carter's program.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I don't like that. That is a position he took when he was Governor, and I think it is one issue where he and I differ and he differs with his colleagues. He strongly supports revenue sharing.

But, in Minnesota, for example, about half the funds that we receive from revenue-sharing goes directly to the cities and municipalities. The states get the other half. I like that. I prefer that. He and I have an honest difference of opinion.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I don't want to let it stand, gentlemen, that the Congress is any less interested in fiscal integrity than President Ford.

As a matter of fact, I think we have taken a much more common sense and intelligent position than Mr. Ford has.

For example, he recently vetoed the Public Works bill. To be sure, that bill would have cost us about \$3 billion, but it would have put tens of thousands of people back to work doing things that need to be done. The Ford approach is to keep those people unemployed, keep them out of the taxpaying bracket, give them unemployment compensation or give them welfare. I think the democratic approach is a lot better, to put them back to work doing something useful.

MR. CLARK: Let me bring up the painful subject, if I may, of price tags which seems to concern Governor Carter more perhaps than the liberal wing of the Democratic party in Congress.

While the Platform Committee deliberately did not put prices on the major programs it is recommending, there are price tags the experts put on those. National health insurance, something like \$75 billion a year. The Humphrey-Hawkins bill, perhaps \$30 or \$40 billion a year. Welfare reform with an income floor of some sort, perhaps \$30 billion a year.

Aren't those extremely costly programs to present to a new Democratic President?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: First we were extremely careful when it came to anything that involved money. We start with the premise we are going to reduce the ^{defense} budget by five to six billion dollars, close tax loopholes to generate another \$5 billion each year, and gradually to reduce unemployment, and for every percentage point you reduce it, you gain \$16 billion, and with those revenues do some of the things you just mentioned. But again it was not a budget document, but when we tried to be very, very careful about being realistic, and I think the platform is realistic; I think it deals sensibly with those difficult problems. I think it has been well received by the general public. I have not heard of a single Democrat who would not be willing to try to implement that after the election.

MR. DONALDSON: Miss Jordan, do you think that the platform may stress too much the question of money and not enough the question of the human needs in this country?

MS. JORDAN: Well, quite the contrary, Sam. - Now, goals are set forth in the platform and yes, they are going to cost money and the Platform Committee did not choose to deal with dollars and cents, but we are not going to reach the goal of three percent unemployment or national health insurance or welfare reform without the Congress, through its new, fast-becoming-old, budgetary process, going into that and making a sensible approach to phasing in these goals in a way that does not bust the budget. And we have sense enough in the Congress, whether people believe it or not, to work in such a way that we do not exacerbate the fires and flames of inflation and can make a sensible, gradual approach. We are not trying to say that the minute Jimmy Carter is inaugurated on the 20th of January that on the 21st we have got national health insurance, welfare reform, Humphrey-Hawkins and full employment. No. What we are saying is that is where we want to go. The Democrats have always said where the Democrats want to go.

MR. DONALDSON: Didn't you say to your constituents when we want to get you a job and if you just stick around for a few years, we will have it for you?

MS. JORDAN: We don't have to say that. We passed that job bill that would have put about 300,000 people to work incidentally, if the President had only signed it. We will approach it, I would say, three hundred thousand at a time.

MR. CLARK: Ms. Jordan, let me remind you and remind Senator McGovern again of his program in 1972, and I was smitten by the fact as I look back over it that it contains some of these great goals, the national health insurance, welfare reform, put the country back to work, that are in the Democratic platform this time. I think realistically you would agree with me the reason national health insurance has gone nowhere in the last four years and the reason a Federal welfare program, reform program, has gone no where in the last four years, is because of the tremendous costs involved. Would you agree with that?

MS. JORDAN: Well, that is one reason, but also because we did not have leadership in the White House in this country that was committed to these programs.

MR. CLARK: You had leadership in Congress, and neither bill even got to the point of vote in either house of Congress.

MS. JORDAN: Well, there is an influence which comes from the Executive Branch of the government that stymies progress, even in the Congress.

SENATOR McGOVERN: Let me just say too there is some slow but perceptible change in attitudes towards these things. I think for example on the issue of welfare reform, that a consensus is beginning to form that we didn't have four years ago, that we need to replace this present jumble of six or seven different kinds of welfare programs, federal and state, with some kind of a uniform Federal income maintenance program.

The Conference of Mayors, Republicans and Democrats, has come out for that. The Committee for Economic Development, a group of businessmen, have come out for it. The Democratic platform has. I think even the Republican leadership is flirting with that concept of some kind of a flat, minimum income that would undergird the income both of the working poor and those who are unable to work. And I think that is going to happen in the next four years, if we have Mr. Carter in the White House.

MR. DONALDSON: May I take us back to politics for a moment and ask one of these multiple-part questions?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: We have not left politics.

MR. DONALDSON: This one goes back to the election. Some of us have been talking here on this program as if Governor Carter will be President Carter. So my first part is: Will he be the President; secondly, what is your hunch about his opponent, President Ford or Ronald Reagan?

Let's start with Ms. Jordan.

MS. JORDAN: I think Mr. Carter will be president. I think he will defeat the Republican nominee. I think the Republican nominee will be the present President, Gerald Ford.

I make those assumptions and statements of belief because I do not foresee the Republicans ousting a sitting President. We have heard that time and time again. The Republicans are a little shaky, but they are not that shaky.

MR. DONALDSON: Do any of you have --

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I think Jimmy Carter will be running against the incumbent President. Jimmy Carter will win, but I think it is going to be a much tougher campaign than the polls suggest at this time.

MR. DONALDSON: They show him 20 percentage points ahead.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: But I don't believe good polls any way. But I think by the time of the election, I think the polls are going to be relatively close. I think Mr. Carter believes that, and he said that publicly.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Never underestimate the power of an uncumbent, even a shaky one such as President Ford. He will be the nominee of the Republicans in my judgment. I think Governor Anderson is right, that while the polls show Governor Carter out in front now, I think it is going to be a very tough race. I think it will be tight, and we will not know until it is right down to the wire.

MR. CLARK: Do we have the agreement of all three of you that President Ford probably will be the nominee, and also he will be the tougher of the two men to defeat?

SENATOR McGOVERN: There is no question in my mind about that.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I agree.

MR. DONALDSON: Let's look forward then. Let us assume that the Republicans can stop their -- after their convention -- their party split; somehow put their party back together. Then the power of the incumbency, would you agree that President Ford has the economy going for him now, not against him?

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: I would disagree. The unemployment rate is now 7.5 percent. It went up, the biggest jump it took in the last 13 months. As I just mentioned earlier, when you have 40 percent of all the young blacks in the country unemployed, you have 20 percent of all the young people, looking at the entire population, unemployed, we are just asking for trouble. I think again, Republicans think you have to have a lot of unemployment to cool off the economy. We reject that.

MR. DONALDSON: I am intrigued by Senator McGovern's statement that he thinks it might go right down to the wire. What would be the factors then that would narrow that gap, as in 1968 Mr. Nixon started 20 points ahead and was almost beaten by Senator Humphrey? What are the factors?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Well, I think one of the things is the problem we talked about here a while ago, that not only do the members of this panel not know very much about Governor Carter, but that is true with the great American



public. Right now he is emerging as the obvious nominee, but there are millions of Americans who doubtless are not as comfortable with him as they are someone they know. They may have some questions about President Ford, but they know him. And that is why I think an incumbent whose actions, his style, his mannerisms are known to many American people, has a certain advantage. I think Governor Carter will be nominated and will be elected. All I am saying is it would be a serious mistake for any Democrat to assume this is going to be a landslide.

MR. CLARK: Governor Anderson, you said earlier that, with tongue in cheek, I believe, that it is traditional to have a Minnesotan on the national ticket.

GOVERNOR ANDERSON: That wasn't tongue in cheek.

MR. CLARK: There will be a Minnesotan running for President, Eugene McCarthy, running as an independent. Does that concern anyone? Are any of you concerned that he might bleed off enough votes to do any harm?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I am not sure how many --

MR. CLARK: He will be on the ballot in a number of states.

SENATOR MC GOVERN: I don't know how many states where he will be on the ballot. Former Senator McCarthy is still a very attractive, intelligent man, but traditionally, third party candidates have not done very well. I can't see this as a major factor in 1976.

MR. CLARK: Is he a serious man?

SENATOR MC GOVERN: Yes, I think he is a serious man. Furthermore, I think the country owes Gene McCarthy a lot. He was the first man to stand up as a Presidential candidate in 1968 and say the war is wrong and somebody has got to raise the standard against this war. And no matter what else may be said about him, history is going to be very kind to Gene McCarthy for what he did in 1968.

MR. CLARK: I am sorry, at this point we are out of time. Thank you all for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

-- --

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS NBC RADIO AND
TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "NBC'S MEET THE PRESS."

M E E T T H E P R E S S

SUNDAY, JULY 18, 1976

Produced by Betty Cole Dukert

GUEST:

REPRESENTATIVE ANDREW YOUNG (D. Ga.)

MODERATOR AND EXECUTIVE PRODUCER:

Bill Monroe - NBC News

PANEL:

Douglas Kiker - NBC News

Robert Novak - Chicago Sun-Times

David Kraslow - Cox Newspapers

- - -

- - -

This is a rush transcript provided for the information and convenience of the press. Accuracy is not guaranteed. In case of doubt, please check with



- - -

MR. MONROE: Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is Congressman Andrew Young, Democrat of Georgia.

Mr. Young made a seconding speech for Jimmy Carter at last week's Democratic Convention. He has been described by Governor Carter as the individual to whom he feels most indebted for his political support. The first black Congressman from the South since reconstruction, Mr. Young is now in his second term representing a district that includes Atlanta.

We will have the first questions now from Douglas Kiker of NBC News.

MR. KIKER: Mr. Young, you are described as one of Jimmy Carter's closest political associates; you are described as his chief black adviser. He has won the nomination. What advice are you giving him now?

MR. YOUNG: Keep running and running hard. I don't really need to give him that advice, but we have taken nothing for granted from the very beginning. I think Governor Carter has known it was an uphill struggle all the way and he is going to keep on doing it that way and I hope to help him.

MR. KIKER: You and others have claimed the black vote in this election for Governor Carter. If he does get that vote in the general election, as a black leader, what do you think that Governor Carter would owe the American black people in return?

MR. YOUNG: Well, let me say that I think that Governor Carter owes the people of America something. He owes them good government; he owes them a sensitive response to the problems of the people of America, all of the people of America.

I think one of the things you see now is that there are almost no specifically black problems, that black people get sick and have trouble paying the hospital bill, but so do the white people in a great majority in larger numbers than blacks, so the things like health insurance are kind of derationalized issues.

I think basically what the black voters want is an end to the kind of lethargic economy and job opportunities and a part of the American dream.

MR. KIKER: What role will you play in this presidential campaign and if Jimmy Carter is elected, what role will you have in his administration, or what role would you like to have? The cabinet, for example?

MR. YOUNG: I have been trying to help out in terms of registering voters, organizing the "get out the vote" drive, helping to put together the kind of organization where the people who supported us very early by and large, many of them, it was their first political campaign and there is a job of blending that with the established political leadership.

(Announcements)

* * * * *

MR. KRASLOW: Congressman, in a recent interview with the Los Angeles Times, you made clear the depth of your commitment to Governor Carter, but you also said that Governor Carter "is surrounded by a lot of people who make me nervous." You mentioned Charles Kirbo who perhaps is the Governor's closest adviser, and you describe Mr. Kirbo as an old-fashioned Georgia cracker.

What did you mean by that? Does it have a racist connotation and who are some of the others around Mr. Carter who make you nervous?

MR. YOUNG: I think that was in an early morning breakfast with the Los Angeles Times Washington Bureau.

Let me say that I think we do have a group of people who come from extreme opposites. I have not known Charlie Kirbo very well until just recently, but every experience I have had with him so far has been good. But in some ways he does come from a completely different, much more conservative background.

I come from an extremely liberal to radical background. We get along very well personally, but I still get nervous about it. I have talked with him about it. We are very frank about it and I think the amazing thing about Jimmy Carter's candidacy is that he does have the breadth of support from people like me on one end and Charlie Kirbo on the other.

All I want to do is make sure that he hears my side as

he hears Mr. Kirbo's side.

MR. KRASLOW: Who are some of the others you feel uneasy about?

MR. YOUNG: Well, basically I guess he was the only one I was talking about right then. But, you know, you don't know. A campaign grows so big, it grows so fast. The small group of us that started out two years ago now has expanded and I don't know who they are. There are all kinds of people coming in and at this point you get a little nervous about who is going to have what influence. I don't know Mevzinsky for instance, and what sort of foreign policy input I would have. I was impressed with his recent article in Foreign Policy, but you know, there has been no personal relationship and when you talk about the person who is perhaps going to be running this country for the next eight years, I think you ought to be nervous.

MR. KRASLOW: Are you saying that you are curious as to whether you are going to continue to have the kind of access to the candidate that you feel you should have to influence policy?

MR. YOUNG: No, I am really not at all worried about that. My relationship is basically -- I would say a friendship. I have never had any trouble talking with Governor Carter. In fact he has now called me up and asked, upon occasion, but it is really no day-to-day adviser

role as the press sometimes portrays it.

MR. NOVAK: Congressman Young, last Thursday Governor Carter talked of the total compatibility between him and his vice presidential selection, Senator Mondale. Senator Mondale has about a 95 percent ADA record; he consistently votes for lowered national defense spending and he has, on occasion, been called "Mr. Busing" in the U. S. Senate.

Does that mean that Governor Carter did a little job on that 50 percent conservative vote that he had and that Governor Carter is really that liberal?

MR. YOUNG: No, I don't think so. I think I understand compatibility to mean more compatibility of personality styles. I thought they would get along very well for that reason. They are both extremely smart; they both work very hard. They both have a kind of dedication to the same values. Now they will probably have different opinions about things, as do Governor Carter and I, but I think that they will respect each other and they will work together very well and that is the way I understand his interpretation of compatibility.

MR. NOVAK: So you don't believe that Governor Carter, as President, would support the reductions in national defense that Senator Mondale has consistently, through his career, voted?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I don't know the details of Senator Mondale's voting record on defense spending. I would say that

Governor Carter brings to that job more firsthand knowledge and experience of the defense needs of this nation -- our basic defense structure right now is a deterrent one built around nuclear submarines which was a part of his career.

He will know where the defense budget can be cut and he will probably make those cuts and he will probably make it in a way that it would be compatible with the defense needs of this nation.

But, quite often I think those of us who are the liberals in the House and in the Senate do a lot of protest voting. We don't have a chance of getting the budget cut. We usually come up in the House about 100 votes short. So we find ourselves voting against things because we want to make a point, but if we really had the votes to do it, I sometimes question whether I would vote for all the cuts that I vote for.

MR. NOVAK: Let me ask you one other aspect of the differences between Governor Carter and Senator Mondale.

Governor Carter says he is against forced busing whereas Senator Mondale has voted consistently against any amendments to restrict busing. Do you think as President Governor Carter would take the same pro-busing positions as Senator Mondale?

MR. YOUNG: No, I don't think the issue is busing at all for either of them. I think Senator Mondale has said he

doesn't like busing. I don't like busing --

MR. NOVKA: He votes for it and so do you?

MR. YOUNG: I vote for it --

MR. NOVAK: What position do you think Carter would take? Whether he likes it or not, would he take the same position as you and Senator Mondale, which turns out to be pro-busing?

MR. YOUNG: No, I don't think he would, but I think he would be a staunch advocate of moral leadership on the question of integration. You see, the busing orders that have caused the difficulty have been busing orders that had no local leadership and where there were really games being played with the emotions of the people. That was true in Boston. Denver had a similar busing order. There was local leadership. They carried it off very smoothly. We have not had any moral leadership on the question of school desegregation or any other kind of desegregation in the White House since 1965-'66. I think Governor Carter will bring the kind of leadership on that question that the country really is looking for.

MR. MONROE: Congressman Young, was Senator Mondale your first choice as the vice presidential candidate?

MR. YOUNG: Well, let's say he was one of my choices. I try not to say "This is my choice." I tried, in talking with Governor Carter, to give him as much information about

the people from the perspective of people that I knew in the House of Representatives, and I reported to him what I felt to be the feelings of the members that I talked to and I told him by name things that were said. It was true that Mondale, along with several others, was generally respected by members of both the House and the Senate, so it may have come out that way.

MR. MONROE: In effect, Mondale was one of the persons you recommended to Governor Carter?

MR. YOUNG: Yes, he was.

MR. MONROE: Mr. Mondale hurt the ticket in the South? You are familiar with Southern voters. If I remember correctly, your district has a majority of white voters.

MR. YOUNG: No, I think Mondale will be very well received in the South because I think people forget that the South is different than it was and even after Governor Carter's victories we still don't want to accept the fact the South has changed, and part of that is -- Georgia, for instance, has a black registered vote that is 30 percent of the total vote and South Carolina, North Carolina, Louisiana, all 25 percent are, you know, plus or minus a few percentage points.

I think Mondale, along with Governor Carter, will run very, very strongly in the South because the South knows that they have gone through a period of turmoil. They

don't want any retreat on that. Things are getting better for everybody, and I just think that the Carter-Mondale ticket is going to be good for this nation and the voters are ready for the kind of leadership that will come from Governor Carter and Senator Mondale.

MR. MONROE: In the face of polls showing the South is more conservative, more inclined toward defense spending, less inclined toward busing, generally the South has gone Republican in recent elections. You find Governor Reagan strong in the South. You don't mean the old South has disappeared, do you?

MR. YOUNG: Just about, and I think that lots of the questioning on the part of the pollsters -- you know, you can be very strong for a strong defense, but still not be against cutting and, you know, I don't think that the polarization that usually is put forward by the intellectuals that phrase the polls, and by people who comment on issues necessarily reflects the mood of the people. People want those polarities reconciled and I think they see in Governor Carter somebody who can reconcile the tensions in their lives, and they can have it both ways.

MR. KIKER: We saw an appearance of Democratic party unity in New York last week, but the fact is that the people who are running the Carter campaign, including Governor Carter himself, really don't know eastern

liberal Democrats; they just don't know each other.

Now, Mr. Carter ^{is} /sitting down in Plains, Georgia, resting as he is entitled to.. What sort of plans does he have for really uniting this party? Is he calling these people, are they calling him? What is going to happen now?

MR. YOUNG: Well, from the very beginning Governor Carter has stayed on the telephone. He has probably called more persons, more people in a broader spectrum than anybody else I know running for any office. He is extremely accessible.

One of the things that the Democratic National Committee has done is put together a top-level Steering Committee that will do some of the troubleshooting that is necessary at the state and local level to kind of relieve the candidate of all that pressure.

MR. KIKER: But there is an atmosphere, it seems to me, of, we are not going to let them take us over on the part of the Carter staff. The campaign is going to be run from Atlanta not from Washington.

It is our turn now. We went out and fought through these primaries; we got the nomination; we now control the party and the people who live up here are part of the party establishment, if you will.

Isn't there really a feeling within the Carter staff we are going to fight to keep these people from having too

much influence?

MR. YOUNG: I don't think there is, because I think the Carter staff realizes they basically won elections almost like Republicans do.

For instance, they won Pennsylvania by carrying the small towns and Pittsburgh and taking just a small portion of the vote in Philadelphia. Normally Democrats do it just the opposite. They win Philadelphia big and then take what they can get in the small towns.

Now, the Carter campaign has sense enough to know they have got to hold what they have got in rural Pennsylvania, but they have also got to get a big vote in Philadelphia, and with candidates like Bill Green running for the Senate and the members of the House that are running in those urban areas, the Carter campaign has made an effort to plug into the other people who are running.

They are going to campaign with members of Congress, with people who are running for the Senate, and I think that when you get to the self-interest of getting out the vote, of raising money, which Governor Carter can't use now too much, but he can raise money for people who are running for congressional seats and for Senate seats. There is going to be a merger there which I think will balance out very well.

MR. KRASLOW: On one of your favorite subjects, American policy toward Africa, you have said Governor Carter, as a white

Southerner, is far more qualified to move in the direction of a creative African policy. Do you and Mr. Carter have the same definition of what that policy should be?

MR. YOUNG: I don't know that we have the same definition. We have talked about it on a couple of occasions and I think we have a same sense of direction basically growing out of our experience in the South.

For one thing, most of the changes in the South were made by a coordination of political and economic activity.

The other thing is that Governor Carter understands racism and he understands that people can change. He has seen people change. He knows what is necessary to help them change.

MR. KRASLOW: How vigorously do you think Governor Carter will press for black majority rule in South Africa, Southwest Africa and Rhodesia?

MR. YOUNG: Well, I don't know that he will press very vigorously, but insofar as that is a tension point which affects the total policy of America in the rest of the world, and from what I know about his policies as a Governor of Georgia, rather than wait for things to explode, he tends to be very aggressive.

He tends to go in and put out fires while they are smouldering, before they blaze. So in that sense I think he would be aggressive toward protecting the national interests

of the United States in Southern Africa.

MR. KRASLOW: Very specifically, Congressman, how far should the United States go in pressing for the kind of objectives you have in mind in South Africa?

MR. YOUNG: I think we should go very far, very fast.

MR. KRASLOW: What methods, trade embargo, diplomatic sanctions? How far would you go?

MR. YOUNG: Well, you are talking negatively and basically our experience in the South is that you can do it positively; that the banks that invest in South Africa have a lot to say about what happens there just as northern banks had a lot to say about what happened in the South.

I tell all the time about a luncheon that Dr. King and I had with Roger Blough of U. S. Steel at the time of the Birmingham crisis and once he understood the social and political dimensions of Tennessee Coal and Iron's involvement in Birmingham, he made some decisions that pulled the banks together, eventually gave some leadership to the merchants and in three months' time we had a desegregated city.

I am saying that the utilization of total American power, not just the political agreements, but trade, or aid, investment policy, and monetary policy, would give us the kind of progressive policies in Southern Africa that would protect the lives of people, help to restore human rights on a reasonable basis and certainly blunt the kind of impact that the Soviet Union and Cuba have had in the past few years.



MR. NOVAK: Congressman Young, the missing word in all that oratory in Madison Square Garden including Governor Carter's speech was Inflation. Nobody mentioned it. Does that mean you and your candidate and your party really don't think the high cost of living is much of a problem for the American people?

MR. YOUNG: No, I think he did mention inflation in his speech and he said, though, that inflation should not, you know, we shouldn't use unemployment as a means of controlling inflation.

I think basically Governor Carter also said something about balancing the budget during his term of office and he talked in terms that I think were designed to remind the American people that basically his policies as a governor were basically those of fiscally responsible., almost fiscally conservative policies.

Hamilton Jordan says that Governor Carter is just cheap, and especially cheap with other people's money and with his own.

I think you are going to have responsible management of this government and reorganization is part of the key to that.

MR. NOVAK: Do you think that is consistent with the Humphrey-Hawkins bill which most economists believe would increase and cause a tremendous inflationary effect?

MR. YOUNG: Well, most economists start out assuming their projections about the economy of 7.7 to 7.3 per cent unemployment is what we have got to deal with, and then they assume that every job, to deal with that, has got to be a public service job or a government created job, and then they put an enormous price tag. I think the election of Jimmy Carter is going to bring a kind of stimulant to the economy that came when John Kennedy was elected after the lethargy of the economy during the Eisenhower years, and rather than dealing with 7.7 per cent we will probably be dealing with more like five per cent.

He talks also about dealing with government employment largely in the age group of sixteen to twenty-five, young adults and minorities. But I don't think we anticipate even in the Humphrey-Hawkins bill the kind of high price tag that the opponents have tagged onto it.

MR. NOVAK: Congressman, I would like to ask you one question about your personal appreciation of Governor Carter. Back in 1970 he was commending Governor Maddox for sending the National Guard to Augusta. In 1972 he was urging a boycott in Augusta against busing. In 1973 he wanted Vice President Agnew to stay in office. Do you think there has been some sudden transformation in Governor Carter that he appeared Thursday night as a great liberal or populist?

MR. YOUNG: I don't think there has been any transformation at all. I think he was the chief executive in Georgia, dealing with an extremely volatile situation, and Governor Carter is Southern and white. He knows and he understands the tremendous emotion in that situation and he was trying to give some leadership. And part of giving leadership is empathizing and identifying with the people you try to lead. He was trying to do that and at the same time he was constantly meeting with the black community trying to find ways to move that whole state of Georgia out of the dark ages. And interestingly enough, he did. That state will never be the same from his four years. I think if we look at the results of his four year term of office we will see a kind of balanced administration that would be very good for this country.

MR. MONROE: Congressman Young, Jesse Jackson said in New York City during the Democratic convention that Governor Carter committed himself to the biggest voter registration drive in the black community since 1960, and in his speech Governor Carter said, "It is time for universal voter registration." Do you see ahead some strenuous efforts in voter registration during the campaign and afterwards if Jimmy Carter wins some new legislation on voter registration?

MR. YOUNG: I think I see all of that. One of the things that he did very effectively was open up the democratic process in Georgia for all of the people. Of course the

voter registration drive doesn't have to be too big, to be the biggest one since 1960 but now the Federal Election Commission does give money to the Democratic National Committee and the Republican National Committee to do things like registering voters so there will be more funds available and there certainly will be an interest and I intend to put a lot of my time into seeing that gets done.

MR. MONROE: Will that be concentrated on special groups such as blacks?

MR. YOUNG: No, I think what we are trying to do is get people who control the voter registration mechanism to open it up to everybody. We certainly will be concentrating on those who are, you know, usually left out.

MR. MONROE: We have about thirty seconds.

MR. KIKER: How close an election are we going to have? The polls show Jimmy Carter handily beating either President Ford or Ronald Reagan if the election were held today. What do you predict in November?

MR. YOUNG: I think it is going to get a lot closer in the meantime and it will get to be a big margin in November.

MR. MONROE: Our time is up. Thank you, Congressman Young, for being with us on MEET THE PRESS.