

**The original documents are located in Box 49, folder “7/22/76 - Readers Digest” 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 Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

THE PRESIDENT'S BRIEFING BOOK  
QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

\*\*\*\*\*

FOR: THE READER'S DIGEST INTERVIEW

JULY 22, 1976

\*\*\*\*\*

10/10/10

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

July 21, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: JIM SHUMAN

SUBJECT: READER'S DIGEST INTERVIEW

The Reader's Digest has scheduled for its October issue an interview with the two Presidential candidates.

Jimmy Carter will be interviewed on July 27th. Because the magazine operates with a three-month lead time between its copy deadline and publication date, the editors have also interviewed Ronald Reagan, in the event he should win the Republican nomination.

The Digest, as you doubtless know, is the largest circulation magazine in the United States, after TV Guide. Its circulation is in excess of 18 million, which according to industry standards of measurement, which figure multiple readers for each copy, gives it a readership in excess of 50 million people. It also publishes 30 foreign editions, most of which are based on material published in the U.S. edition.

Politically most Digest readers range from moderate to conservative and, according to Digest advertising research, stand in the upper levels of income and education in every community in the United States.

The Interviewers

The magazine is still owned by Mr. and Mrs. DeWitt Wallace, who founded it in 1922, (Mr. Wallace owns 51 percent; Mrs. Wallace owns 49 percent). Mr. Wallace recently changed many of his top executives. Those interviewing you represent the new generation of editors, which is now taking over. They are:

Edward T. Thompson, the Editor in Chief. In my ten years as an Associate Editor of and writer for the magazine, I found him the most well informed, tough-minded and objective editor on the staff. He is a graduate of MIT, a former editor of

FORTUNE, and the son of a former managing editor of LIFE, (who is now editor of the Smithsonian Magazine). Ed is trying to move the magazine into new directions, tightening management, eliminating waste, concentrating the Digest's original article assignments (at one time 60-75 percent of the magazine was commissioned by its own editors) to topics which will appeal to the magazine's large audience, yet are not likely to be covered by other magazines.

Kenneth O. Gilmore, one of three managing editors, was in competition for the job DeWitt Wallace gave to Thompson. Gilmore, a graduate of Brown and the son of a minister, served as the Digest's Washington editor, and in addition to supervising a staff of approximately nine and working with freelance writers in Washington, wrote articles on government and foreign affairs -- under his own by-line.

Bill Schulz, the present Washington Editor, succeeded Gilmore. Before joining the Digest he was ghost writer for Fulton Lewis' column, as well as a writer of newspaper columns under his own name.

Jerry Dole, an Assistant Managing Editor, is in charge of producing the October issue. A Yale graduate, he has spent most of his professional career with the Digest, as have the others. He has, however, been an editor of Playboy and writes humorous articles for the Digest under a pseudonym.

### The Questions

Before Watergate, the Digest was so close to the Nixon Administration that many people considered it a spokesman for The White House. The magazine retains its strong conservative outlook, but now is carefully trying to maintain an independent stance.

The editors expect to ask you approximately 12 questions. The first question, we have been told, will try to pinpoint the differences between you and Jimmy Carter. (I have suggested two alternative answers). The others will be selected from the 24 questions included in this briefing book.

In answering the questions, Mel Laird recommends that you hammer at the cost of Carter's proposals on health insurance, tax reform, a guaranteed income, and so forth.

Laird also recommends that you keep your answers simple and clear, aiming at the Digest audience, which is used to reading material which goes to the heart of the matter and avoids digressions.

For your further information, Carter's stands on the issues raised by the questions follow, wherever possible, in a separate section at the end of the briefing book.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

DIFFERENCES WITH CARTER

Alternative Answer One

- Q. What are the differences between you and your opponent, Jimmy Carter?
- A. The main difference is that I have a sound record as a successful President.

JBS/7-21/76



## DIFFERENCES WITH CARTER

### Alternative Answer Two

Q. What are the differences between you and your opponent, Jimmy Carter?

A. There are two main differences.

1. The first is experience. I have been President for more than two years. I know how the Federal Government works, and I know how to get things done in Washington, and my record proves that the country can prosper under my leadership.
2. The other is our basic view of the role of government. As a Democrat, Jimmy Carter believes in Federal Government solutions to our national problems, and that involves bigger government and more expensive government.

I believe in returning the government to the people, through programs such as General Revenue Sharing. And I believe in strengthening the private sector to provide jobs and to provide solutions to our problems.

It was the people who built this country, not the government, and I intend to strengthen the people's ability to continue to build it.

JBS/7-21-76

## PEACE AND PROSPERITY

- Q. Peace and prosperity are the main concerns of most Americans. Why should American people believe that you will provide peace and prosperity for them?
- A. No President can guarantee peace and prosperity. There are too many complex and unexpected phenomena in the world for anyone to make so bold a pledge.

But a President can show -- through his past record and the steadfastness to which he holds to a course likely to lead to peace and prosperity whether he is likely to achieve those goals. He must understand the changes that are taking place at home and in the world and he must anticipate new developments. Further, he must resolve a variety of difficult problems in a way which reflects the interest of all the American people -- avoiding giving in to excessive pressures for short-sighted decisions and rejecting prescriptions for extreme action. He must assess the impact of decisions made today on the well-being of all Americans for years to come. He must have a sense of where America is going and where the world is going, and have the courage of his convictions to make responsible decisions which move us in constructive directions. Good judgment and long-term view as to what is good for America will in the final analysis determine whether a President makes a contribution to peace and prosperity. I am proud of my record on both counts, and I believe that when the American people judge my record -- and the condition of the United States now -- they will agree that I can -- barring the unforeseen -- provide peace and prosperity.

7/20/75

WHY I WANT TO BE PRESIDENT

Q. Why do you want to be President?

A. I want to be President for two reasons. One is to continue the job I started when I took office: restoring trust in the Presidency, restoring the economy to health, and bringing peace.

We have made good progress on all three objectives, and I am sure that if I am elected we will make even more progress.

But restoring conditions of stability are only the foundation that will enable me to pursue my second and broader goal. I want to create the conditions that will enable Americans to continue to pursue our age-old dream of individuality, through reducing the size of government and other massive institutions, and giving people a greater say in the way they live and work.

JBS/7-20-76

SELF-CONFIDENCE

"Humphrey, Muskie, Jackson, McGovern -- they all came to see me and we'd discuss national issues and I decided I knew as much as they did. I started to think about the Presidency in human terms, not historical terms."

The New York Times Magazine  
December 14, 1975

SELF-CONFIDENCE

When Bill Moyers asked Carter, during that extraordinarily revealing television interview last week. "Do you have any doubts? About yourself, about God, about life?"

Carter replied: "I can't think of any."

Los Angeles Times  
May 12, 1976

## TRUST

- Q. Why should people trust you? Concretely, how would you restore trust in the government and the Presidency?
- A. According to the polls I have seen, trust in government and in the Presidency has been restored significantly.

In October, 1974, for example, the Gallup poll showed lack of trust in government as the second most important problem facing the nation, in the minds of most people. By January of this year, lack of trust in government did not even appear on the list of the ten top problems.

So apparently people do trust me.

I will continue to set high standards of ethics for my administration and see that those standards are met so that people will continue to trust me, and trust their government as a whole.

JBS/7-21-76

## Federal Spending

- Q. What should the spending level be for the coming year? Given the probable makeup of the next Congress, how can we control Federal spending and the inflation rate? What is your view on deficit spending? Government spending currently totals 35 percent of GNP. What level should it be in 1980?
- A. The budget I originally submitted to the Congress for fiscal year 1977 was for about \$395 billion. Our latest estimates for FY 1977 expenditures are about \$400 billion, a level which should not be increased. The combination of tax and spending changes I am proposing set us on a course that not only leads to a balanced budget within three years, but also improves the prospects for the economy to stay on a growth path that we can sustain.

We have recently learned an important lesson: inflation can lead to recession and increased unemployment. I am hopeful that the next Congress, regardless of its makeup, will understand this lesson. The new Congressional Budget Committees are a hopeful beginning. These committees must prevail in the struggle to control both Federal spending and the inflation rate. Should the Congress send me any bills proposing unnecessary and inflationary Federal spending, I shall not hesitate to veto them just as I have done over the past two years.

Deficit spending has been required during the recent recession to provide needed stimulus for the economy. The estimated \$47.5 billion deficit for FY 1977 is \$22.1 billion less than in 1976. This deficit is necessary as we continue our recovery from the recession. It is my objective to lower the deficit still further in 1978 and balance the budget in 1979.

Federal spending currently totals about 23 percent of GNP. We must not continue drifting in the direction of bigger and bigger government. While the predominant growth has been at the State and local level, the Federal Government has contributed to the trend too. The driving force of our 200-year history has been our private sector. If we rely on it and nurture it, the economy will continue to grow, providing new and better choices for our people and the resources necessary to meet our shared needs. It is my objective to lower Federal spending relative to GNP.

## REDUCING DEFENSE SPENDING

Q. Should we reduce defense spending? If so what size? Specifically, what programs should be reduced or eliminated? Should we reduce or hold the number of Defense Department employees at the present level?

A. In my Budget Message to the Congress in January, I proposed an increase in defense spending, and said: "The amounts I seek will provide the national defense it now appears we need. We dare not do less."  
At the same time I urged specific steps against waste.

I have asked for a total Budget authority of \$115 billion for defense needs. If, in good conscience I could propose less, I would.

I have urged that we continue to expand toward a force including 16 army combat divisions, I called for starting production on the B-1 bomber, increased funding on the Trident missile, increasing the number of our M-60 tanks by 927, buying more F-14, F-15, F-16 and A-10 planes, adding 16 new ships, more helicopters and many other new weapons.

At the same time I have proposed some \$2.8 billion in savings in 1977 alone through adjustments in military compensation, personnel reductions, travel restraints, more efficient use of petroleum by such plans as increased use of simulators, and various actions in the pay and pension area. Indeed, the Congress has not been willing thus far to cooperate fully in my efforts to produce real economies in the Defense program. In fact, they have added a number of unneeded programs, and have failed to act favorably on my proposed restraints.

We must provide every cent needed for defense -- and not one penny more. I believe my program answers both requirements.

0000000000

OMB 7-20-76

## REVENUE SHARING

Q. What are your views on the revenue sharing program for the States and cities?

A. I believe that General Revenue Sharing is one of the most effective programs we have for providing financial aid to state and local governments. It is also one of the most successful.

It puts decision-making back at the local level, letting people in every community decide how to spend their own money.

I also believe the program should be expanded. It should go to both city and State governments. My opponent, Jimmy Carter, believes it should go to only one of them.

Note: Since 1972, the revenue sharing program has returned over \$26 billion to the 50 states and 39,000 units of local government to help them serve the needs of their citizens. It has been a remarkable success, and I have been seeking an extension of this important program. I hope that the Congress will soon adopt the necessary legislation. Frankly, renewal of this program is urgently necessary in order to avoid serious economic and fiscal problems for many States and communities.

RP/7-21-76



## REVENUE SHARING

Q. What are your views on the revenue sharing program for the States and cities?

A. I believe that General Revenue Sharing is one of the most effective federal programs for providing fiscal assistance to State and local governments. The revenue sharing program also returns substantial power and resources to these units of government and stands in marked contrast with the maze of categorical grants and the burdensome administrative requirements associated with those programs.

Since 1972, the revenue sharing program has returned over \$26 billion to the 50 States and 39,000 units of local government to help them serve the needs of their citizens. It has been a remarkable success, and I have been seeking an extension of this important program. I hope that the Congress will soon adopt the necessary legislation. Frankly, renewal of this program is urgently necessary in order to avoid serious economic and fiscal problems for many States and communities.

Beyond the pressing need to continue General Revenue Sharing, the value and effectiveness of this program has demonstrated the need to modify the existing structure of categorical grant programs. My legislative recommendations to terminate some programs and consolidate other under the block grant approach would restore the proper balance in our Federal system and end the often duplicative and wasteful expenditure of scarce Federal dollars.

RP/7-20-76

## BIG GOVERNMENT

Q. There has been much discussion of government bureaucracy and reducing the size of government. What is your position on regulatory reform? Specifically, what would you do about EPA, OSHA and FEA?

A. To take up your last point first, we have task forces now at work seeking to upgrade administratively the efforts of both FEA and OSHA. A major effort is underway at EPA to improve the cost-benefit analysis work there.

But that is merely the tip of the iceberg. Since I became President one of my high priorities has been to try to do at least something to get bureaucracy off the taxpayer's back -- to try to cut down "big government".

For instance we have a rail reform plan and a trucking reform plan before the Congress.

We have an effort underway to cut down on federal paperwork -- 12% of the forms that OMB controls have been eliminated in the past few months.

I have proposed "block grant" programs to combine a flock of programs in the HEW area -- for instance I proposed to combine Medicare and 16 other health programs, and I proposed combining a large number of school lunch programs.

Finally I introduced legislation in May which commits the Executive Branch to undertake a comprehensive review of the regulatory impact of Federal activities over the next four years, and requires the Executive to submit proposals for reforms and establish a mechanism for Congressional consideration in November of each year.

But let there be no mistake: in many, many areas Congress must pass laws to make the recommendations work, and so far too few reforms have become law.

000000000000

## NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE

- Q. Do you favor national health insurance (NHI)?
- A. It is important not to underestimate the prevalence of health insurance right now. Over 90 percent of the population has coverage already, from public or private sources. Our country should assure that no American is seriously impaired as a result of high medical bills, and in time our country should adopt a NHI program that would do so. However, to avoid stalling the economic recovery now in progress, I have asked that no major new programs, outside of the energy and defense fields, be enacted.

In addition, the health field poses unique issues. Although provider groups, union leaders, academicians, and others have propounded their widely divergent view on NHI, I do not feel that we know what the average citizen really expects from a NHI plan. For example, does he seek protection only against expensive medical bills or against all bills, and what costs of coverage is he willing to bear? What form of government intervention does he really want? What kinds of changes in the delivery system does he want and how should these be brought about? I think it essential that we have more public debate before enacting a bill.

I would also hate to see a repetition of the inflationary impact of Medicare and Medicaid. Before enacting a bill, this country needs to further develop its management capability in the health field; devise reimbursement systems that control costs without stifling progress; institute new programs to prevent the fraud and abuse that have at times characterized Medicare and Medicaid; and control the seemingly inexorable rise in health care costs, which are now escalating at around twice the inflation rate for the economy as a whole.

SM  
7/20/76

## NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE FINANCING

Q. How should NHI be financed?

A. Currently, almost 80 percent of the population below age 65 has some private coverage, typically through the work setting. I strongly oppose any approach that would substitute Federal for private spending. Instead, I favor building upon the considerable strengths of the current system and continuing to rely on the employer to provide coverage to the bulk of the employed population. Publicly financed coverage should be restricted to persons who cannot obtain private coverage at rates that are both affordable and reasonable. Any comprehensive system that is fully public would require the Federal government to carry an unbearable fiscal burden, preclude our funding other equally desirable programs, and necessitate the heavy hand of government in managing the health care delivery system. We cannot either afford these costs or the loss of personal freedoms that would be involved.

SM

7/20/76

## PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS

- Q. What is your position on government-financed public service jobs programs?
- A. I believe the primary instrument for job creation should be the private sector, not the government. This is the core of my economic policy, and I believe that the steady improvement in the economy over the last year on both the unemployment and inflation fronts bears witness to its success. In the past year, the unemployment rate has fallen from 8.7 percent to 7.5 percent and, more importantly, overall employment has increased by more than 3 million jobs.

From time-to-time, it may be appropriate to provide some public service jobs. During the worst part of the recent recession, for example, we thought it appropriate to create a public service jobs program. We proposed and the Congress approved a program which is still in force providing about 300,000 jobs. But any good public service jobs program should have the following characteristics:

1. The jobs and the projects should be temporary.
2. The compensation should be such that it provides an incentive to seek permanent employment in the private sector.
3. The program should be administered through State and local governments to avoid the creation of a new Federal bureaucracy.
4. The program should be of such a size that it can be administered by State and local governments.

7/20/76

## NATIONAL ECONOMIC PLANNING

- Q. There has been much talk about national economic planning. Do you believe the President and his Executive Office should do national economic planning?
- A. Of course I am in favor of planning. We all plan both in our jobs and in our private lives. We do a lot of planning in government. The annual budget process is the primary example.

But some of the current proposals for national economic planning suggest an increased role for the government which I think is unwise. When you have the Federal government establishing targets and allocating resources for the private sector you will quickly run into trouble. I believe the market is the best allocator of resources in the private sector, not the government.

7-20-76

## BUSING

- Q. Most Americans are opposed to busing. Yet little seems to be done about it. What are your specific plans to reduce dependence on forced busing?
- A. I recently submitted to the Congress legislation to minimize forced school busing. I asked the Congress to join with me in establishing guidelines for the lower Federal courts to follow in school desegregation cases. Busing as a remedy ought to be the last resort and it ought to be limited in duration and in scope to correcting the effects of previous violations. The legislative guidelines I have suggested would establish this in law.

I believe every American community should desegregate on a voluntary basis. Therefore, I also proposed the establishment of a committee composed of citizens who have had community experience in school desegregation and who are willing to assist other communities in voluntarily desegregating their schools.

Citizens groups I have consulted on both sides of the busing issue have told me such a committee would be a welcome resource to communities which face up to the issue honestly, voluntarily and in the best spirit of American democracy.

## ARAB OIL EMBARGO

Q. In the event of another Arab oil embargo, would you use American grain as a weapon?

A. Since taking office, I have been working to build the elements of trust, confidence and cooperation that reduce the likelihood of economic or military confrontation. The progress we have made in our Middle East policy has diminished the threat of war, or oil embargo, and has been of mutual benefit to the economies of the U.S. and of the Middle East nations.

If there were another embargo, however, my decisions and the U.S. response would be based on a number of factors. At this point, I would not want to speculate on any particular course of action to respond to such a complex contingency. Suffice to say that I would take such action as would be necessary to assure the protection of U.S. interests.

7/21/76



## INTELLIGENCE

- Q. What, in your opinion, was the effectiveness and the net result of the Congressional investigation into U.S. intelligence activities? How would you handle this situation? Are you in favor of publication of information concerning CIA, FBI and other national security and intelligence operations of the United States government?
- A. As a result of our intensive review of the entire Intelligence Community within the Executive Branch, I signed a comprehensive Executive Order in February. This Order establishes policy guidelines and restrictions for the intelligence agencies and a new command structure and oversight mechanism for the Intelligence Community.

So far, no action by Congress has added to the improvements represented in my Executive Order.

Finally, I do not favor publishing national security secrets that could assist enemies and potential enemies of the United States.

MD/7-20-76

## PUBLIC EMPLOYEE UNIONS

- Q. Do you favor legislation to increase rights for public employee unions, including the right to strike?
- A. This question must be divided into two distinct parts. First, as it relates to Federal government employees and secondly, as it relates to State and local government employees.

The relationship of the Federal government and its employees is governed by Executive Order 11491. This Executive Order is based on a concept of evolutionary change in labor-management relations in the Federal government. The Federal employee is given the right to join or to refuse to join a union. Federal employees are prohibited from striking under Executive Order 11491. However, recent amendments to that Order are designed to increase significantly the scope and level of union-management negotiations by expanding the range of matters that can be bargained. Experience under these amendments is limited and further observation and evaluation of that experience is warranted.

I do not believe that the Federal government should or has the authority to pass comprehensive legislation involving the labor-management relations of State, county and city employees and their governmental employers. The National League of Cities case recently decided by the Supreme Court seems to lend weight to my beliefs on this subject. In conjunction with this, I have often stated it should be up to the individual states whether or not they have right to work laws.

### Background

On June 24, 1976 the U.S. Supreme Court held in National League of Cities vs. Usery that the Fair Labor Standards Act could not be constitutionally applied to those States and local government activities which provide integral parts of the government services which states and their political subdivisions have traditionally afforded. This case centered on the issue of Federally established minimum wage rates and the applicability of such rates to State and local governments. If the Federal government cannot constitutionally prescribe the minimum wage rates to be paid by State and local government employers the power of the Federal government to set collective bargaining standards for States and local governments is highly suspect.

## GUN CONTROL

- Q. Do you favor gun control? Restriction on "Saturday Night Specials" or on all guns?
- A. I have stated on a number of occasions that I am unalterably opposed to Federal registration of guns or Federal licensing of gun owners. The way to cut down on the criminal use of guns is not to take guns away from the law-abiding citizens but to impose mandatory sentences on those who use guns to commit crimes.

Last year, I submitted to the Congress a comprehensive anticrime bill which included a number of provisions aimed at controlling the illegal use of handguns. I urged the Congress to enact mandatory prison sentences for persons committing Federal crimes involving the use of handguns and to tighten up controls on the manufacture and sale of cheap, highly concealable handguns, commonly referred to as "Saturday Night Specials." I also called for increased law enforcement efforts aimed at handgun violators, particularly in our urban centers, to protect the law-abiding majority.

These tough proposals were specifically designed to reduce the criminal use of handguns -- not to penalize legitimate owners of firearms.

RDP/7-19-76

## HEALTH EDUCATION AND WELFARE SPENDING

**Question:** The budget for the Department of Health, Education and Welfare is now larger than that of the Department of Defense. Would you reduce spending on HEW programs?

**Answer:** The issue is not whether we can, or should, cut the HEW budget, or whether it should or should not be larger than the Department of Defense's budget. Since it is becoming increasingly clear that our resources are not unlimited, and that we must make some tough choices, there really are three basic questions: (1) how can we control growth of governmental expenditures generally, and of social programs in particular, (2) how can we bring about a more coherent and rational set of social programs, and (3) how much, and for what, are we willing to tax ourselves?

Several factors are relevant in answering these questions.

First, 95 percent of HEW's budget is for programs which have expenditures based on individual entitlement, or to finance obligations contracted for in previous years. For example, expenditures for Medicare and Social Security in fiscal year 1977 are expected to be \$112 billion of a total HEW budget of \$140 billion. Thus, the ability to control the level of expenditures in any one year is very limited—longer term and more basic actions are required.

Second, the rate of growth of expenditures for social programs during the past 20 years has been very large—from 9 percent of the GNP in 1955 to over 20 percent today. Year-to-year growth in the HEW budget recently has averaged 15 percent annually, with some programs increasing at a faster rate. Health care costs, for example, have risen at a rate well in excess of 15 percent. Estimates of the growth in the HEW budget next year project an increase of approximately \$5 billion for more Social Security beneficiaries, \$6 billion for automatic benefit increases to compensate for inflation, and \$4 billion for medical care price increases. Clearly, we need to control this rate of growth.

Third, we, as a nation, have added more and more social programs in an ad hoc fashion without eliminating old ones, or making changes in the program structure. This has led to our programs promising more than we have the resources or management capacity to deliver.

Accordingly, there are some very fundamental reforms needed in our social programs and in our expectations about them, rather than only budget constraints applied annually. I am talking about such reforms as consolidation and simplification of some of the 370 categorical programs managed by HEW, devolution of day to day management of many of these programs to the state and local level, reform of the welfare and health financing systems, and substantial improvement in program management at all levels of government. I have proposed a number of such reforms and will propose others. For example, I have proposed legislation for three block grants—one for health programs, one for education and one for social services—which would consolidate over 40 programs and gives States greater opportunity to meet local priorities and needs. Clearly, however we need an informed national debate on the whole range of issues concerning our social programs and their expenditures.

GUARANTEED ANNUAL INCOME (Welfare Reform)

Q. Are you in favor of a guaranteed annual income? If so, how can we pay for it?

A. No. A guaranteed annual income is not the answer to the problems of our welfare system.

The current system is a "mess" and is in need of reform. But finding acceptable alternatives is not easy. I intend, however, to continue to try to improve existing programs and at the same time seek new, effective long-range solutions.

WAM/DC  
7-20-76

## Wage-Price Controls

Q. Are you in favor of wage-price controls? If so, under what circumstances would you impose them?

A. I do not favor the use of wage-price controls. During the controls of 1971-74 so much pressure was built up under the wage and price lid that when controls were removed the economy simply got out of control. The rate of inflation got up to more than 12 percent at one point and that, combined with the oil embargo of 1973, helped trigger the recession from which we have just recovered.

Some very distinguished economists and some very concerned Members of Congress urged me to impose controls when we were experiencing high rates of inflation. I rejected those suggestions and all of the other quick fix proposals that were the wrong medicine for the American economy. Our strong and sustainable recovery with falling unemployment and inflation prove the wisdom of rejecting quick fixes and focusing on the fundamentals. There is certainly no need for wage-price controls in view of today's healthy economy.

7-19-76

## MIDDLE EAST SITUATION

- Q. How would you handle the current Middle East situation? What can be done differently to find solutions to the problem?
- A. Since taking office I have consistently accorded top priority to the Middle East, and I feel that our policies are working. Let me first explain the importance of the Middle East, for a peaceful settlement in the Middle East is a matter not of choice but of necessity, for all the world.

The war and oil embargo in 1973 brought about untold human suffering, disrupted the world economy and threatened great power confrontation. The repetition of the events of 1973 would pose the gravest of threats not only to the Middle East but to the world in general. This is why the search for peace in the Middle East must continue and must not become a partisan issue in the United States.

Now let me explain what we have been doing. Since the October War, the U.S. has been able to assist Israel, Egypt and Syria in negotiations -- courageously undertaken and concluded by all sides -- which produced agreements that reduced the danger of another war and improved prospects of a final and durable peace. We have enhanced our close relations with Israel and provided the economic and military means to ensure its security and survival. Today we enjoy Israel's confidence and trust. We also enjoy the confidence and trust of many of the Arab states in the area with whom we have developed good political and economic ties.

The Sinai Agreement concluded in September 1975 was a significant step toward an eventual overall settlement in the Middle East, and we have been working with the interested governments in the area to obtain agreement among the parties on additional steps.

I am determined to keep alive the momentum for a peace settlement from which all nations will benefit. In the future, as in the past, we shall follow that course which seems most likely to be acceptable to the parties directly involved and to produce concrete results. We are not interested in a propagandistic approach to such an important problem as the Middle East. We are interested in serious progress toward the goal of an eventual overall settlement, based on Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338.

7/20/76



## CABINET

- Q. We would like some idea of what your next Cabinet would look like. What individuals might you be considering?
- A. First of all I should emphasize that I am very pleased with my present Cabinet and the high quality of the individuals who head each of the departments. If for one reason or another any of these Cabinet officers should leave, I would expect to appoint men and women of the highest caliber. With reference to specific individuals, I would rather not speculate but can assure you that they would certainly reflect the same high degree of ability and character as all my appointments have been in the Executive Branch including the regulatory commissions.

DB/7-21-76

AMERICAN FORCES IN KOREA

- Q. Should we withdraw American troops from Korea?
- A. At present we have about 40,000 American military personnel in the Republic of Korea. Our forces are there under our Mutual Defense Treaty with the Republic of Korea. Our military presence manifests the high priority we place on preserving peace on the Korean Peninsula. We have no plans to reduce the number of our forces in South Korea.

7/20/76

TROOP WITHDRAWAL - EUROPE

Q. Should we withdraw U.S. troops from Europe?

A. No. U.S. troops in Europe play a vital role in meeting America's defense interests, and they should not be unilaterally withdrawn. The basic objective of our defense posture is to deter any aggressor from attack on ourselves and our allies, and to defend our interests and those of our allies if deterrence fails.

Our troops in Europe help meet that objective and help to fulfill our commitments under the North Atlantic Treaty, which has safeguarded the peace of Europe and served the United States and its other member nations extremely well for more than a quarter century. The maintenance of troops in Europe is vital to our security interests. At the same time, while we retain our strength, we will pursue responsible negotiations with the nations of the East aimed at lessening tension and increasing stability. However, as President I will ensure that in such negotiations America is never dealing from weakness, and I will ensure that our vital interests and those of our allies are fully safeguarded.

7-20-76

## ROLE OF NUCLEAR POWER

Q. What is your position on the role of nuclear power as an energy source?

A. We must increase the use of both coal and nuclear energy in order to meet our energy needs in the years ahead. Even with strong efforts to conserve energy, the nation's energy needs will be increasing. We cannot continue to increase our reliance on expensive imported oil without jeopardizing our nation's power, several points are important:

- . First, we are now in the 18th year of commercial nuclear power production in the United States. We now have 58 plants operating, supplying about 9% of our electricity. In total, the Nation's commercial nuclear plants represent nearly two hundred plant years of operating experience -- without a single death from a nuclear accident. That's a good record.
- . Second, even though we have an excellent safety record, we are continuing our efforts to assure it remains so in the years ahead. As one step, I have asked for more funds in 1977 for both the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and ERDA for reactor safety R&D. I have also requested funds for a major expansion of programs to provide safe, secure and environmentally acceptable transportation and storage for nuclear wastes.
- . Third, in January 1975, I activated NRC as an independent regulatory agency for commercial nuclear power. Ensuring the safety and security of nuclear power plants are primary responsibilities of that agency.
- . Fourth, my environmental advisers have told me that from an environmental point-of-view, nuclear energy is preferable to the other principal ways of generating electricity.

Finally, I recognize that a number of responsible people in this country have legitimate concerns and questions about nuclear power. This is quite understandable. We should expect questions about any relatively new technology. It's important that we respond to these questions in a thorough and candid manner, and I have asked that all Federal agencies do just that.

We will have to rely on coal and nuclear energy until more acceptable alternatives are developed. We are pushing ahead with work on all promising alternative technologies but it is clear that we cannot expect the major contribution to our energy supply from any of these alternatives until late in this century.

GRS/7-20-76

## NUCLEAR MORATORIUM

- Q. Do you favor an absolute moratorium on nuclear testing?
- A. No, I do not believe that an absolute moratorium on nuclear testing would necessarily be in our own national interest. Development and testing of nuclear weapons continues to be a necessary element of our national security. We will accept limitations on this activity only on the basis of mutual agreement and adequate verification.

As you know, we have just completed negotiations of a new treaty governing peaceful nuclear explosions in which we achieved a dramatic breakthrough -- the ability to conduct on-site verification. This agreement, together with the Threshold Test Ban Treaty, represents real and realistic progress -- progress based on a carefully worked out scheme of verification to ensure compliance.

These agreements impose the first limitation on nuclear explosions since the 1963 Limited Test Ban Treaty and, thus, constitute a significant additional step in the control of nuclear testing. The TTBT also contains a commitment by the United States and the USSR to continue to work towards the goal of a comprehensive test ban.

With their far-reaching verification provisions, these treaties lay a solid basis for further progress in this area.

CARTER'S VIEWS

QUESTION ONE: PEACE AND PROSPERITY



America is searching for that which does not change. It is a country seeking "a basic integrity," and "men of faith" -- he seemed to be referring to himself and his predominantly male audience -- must recognize their responsibility to provide an immutable core of strength.

"...a truer demonstration of strength would be concern, compassion, love, devotion, sensitivity, humility -- exactly the things Christ talked about -- and I believe that if we can demonstrate this kind of personal awareness of our own faith we can provide that core of strength and commitment and underlying character that our nation searches for."

New York Times  
June 20, 1976

RELIGION

"We are supposed to have a responsibility as citizens to make sure the law, the government, the public authorities do provide for honesty, for fairness, for compassion, for concern, for equality of opportunity, for love as expressed in the Bible. . .

"So we have a responsibility to try to shape the government so it does exemplify the teachings of God. . . If at times the government, because of an inadequate influence of ourselves, violates in our opinion the word of God, then we are supposed to obey the word of God but accept the punishment that's administered to us by the state."

The Washington Post  
June 28, 1976

RELIGION

"The church has made us look in the same direction that Christ looked, to those who need our ministrations most."

He said there was "a close correlation between worship services and correcting wrongs -- and that's what the Bible teaches." The nation still has a long way to go "until there is pure justice and there is pure opportunity in this country, under the law."

Carter used this occasion to reaffirm his belief in the separation of church and state, but he noted, "That does not mean we ought to have a different standard of morality and ethics in our public life from what we have in our private life."

There is a "kind of hunger among the American people for something that doesn't change" at the core of their lives and for "a basic integrity." "This puts a tremendous responsibility on those of us who have been blessed by God. The biggest blessing that we have in our lives is our belief in Christ, which gives us -- depending upon the surety of our faith -- an unchanging core around which our lives can function."

Baltimore Sun  
June 20, 1976

ARROGANCE

Jimmy Carter said tonight [6-29] that if elected President he may ask Congress before his inauguration to give him authority to reorganize the federal bureaucracy.

Washington Post  
June 30, 1976

QUESTION THREE: TRUST

## GOVERNMENT

CARTER'S VIEWS

"The people in this country are intensely patriotic, they love their government so much it almost hurts. They feel that they've been betrayed."

"The competence of government is not an accepted characteristic anymore."

"...generally they (the people) feel that Washington is an obstacle to the realization of that hope rather than an asset to be tapped in the future in the consummation of that hope."

Washington Post  
March 21, 1976

## GOVERNMENT

Carter said United States policy should aim "to establish justice in a sinful world."

Carter said because of events in the last four years, "we have lost our vision of what this country can be.... we have lost our standards... there is not an adequate amount of probing to find out what is right and what is just."

"A government that is a source of inspiration and not of shame" is his goal, one that "will make us proud once again."

Dallas Morning News  
April 30, 1976

GOVERNMENT

"We can have a government that's as good and honest and decent and truthful and as fair and idealistic and compassionate and as filled with love as the American people are."

Los Angeles Times  
May 3, 1976

GOVERNMENT

"Nothing's been done to make us a weak nation. Our system of government is the best on earth. Richard Nixon didn't hurt it. Watergate didn't hurt it. Vietnam and Cambodia haven't hurt our system of government. The CIA revelations haven't hurt it either. It's still clean...decent...immaculate...a basis upon which to predicate answers to complicated questions...correct our mistakes...bind ourselves together...heal the divisions that exist among our people."

Washington Star  
May 16, 1976

QUESTION FIVE: DEFENSE

## DEFENSE

don't believe that our basic strategic interests have been reassessed since 1950. That needs to be done in a long-range fashion. We need to have a simplification of the purposes of the military. The military duplicates. There's an unbelievable bureaucratic hierarchy that's been established since the second World War. Some management improvements, I think, would restore to a great degree the confidence of our people in the military. I think these management-improvement efforts would result in roughly a 5 to 7 billion dollar decrease in the defense budget."

U.S. News and World Report  
May 24, 1976

## DEFENSE BUDGET

Asked if he would have to spend more than the Ford Administration is asking for defense, or less, or about the same, he said "I would say about the same, maybe 5 per cent less....I would like to see our Defense Department changed into a much more effective fighting force within the present budgetary limits. We're wasting enormous quantities of money. We've got too many military bases overseas: about 2,000. We've got too many support troops per combat troop - about twice as many as the Soviet Union. We've got too top-heavy a layer of personnel assignments. We've got more admirals and generals than we had at the end of the Second World War."

Washington Post  
March 21, 1976

## B1 BOMBER

Elsewhere Carter announced that he would kill the controversial B1 Bomber program. But in Omaha, the headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, he announced that he would continue research and development, because "it might be after I become President, I would change my mind."

He was asked if this did not represent "a refinement of his position" and he stoutly denied it.

The Washington Star  
May 10, 1976



QUESTION SIX: REVENUE SHARING

## REVENUE SHARING

Carter said that the Nixon Administration had "robbed the disadvantaged" by giving revenue sharing to state and county governments and not restricting it to specific categories of federal aid that had been eliminated.

St. Louis Post Dispatch  
April 11, 1976

---

## REVENUE SHARING

"I would favor an approach which would give funds directly to local cities and communities rather than the states. I would favor this for two reasons. First, it is a means of giving local governments more control over programs that affect them daily, because it is a mechanism that combines effectively local needs and decision-making processes....Second, and more important, local communities do not have the capacity to generate extra income -- through taxes or other methods -- that the states have."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

---

QUESTION SEVEN: GOVERNMENT SIZE

## BUDGET/GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

"The first piece of legislation I will send to Congress will initiate a complete overhaul of our federal bureaucracy and budgeting systems. By executive order, I will require zero-based budgeting for all federal departments, bureaus, and boards.

"The second part...would initiate the reorganization of our federal bureaucratic structure."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

## GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Carter said Monday that he is not prepared to detail his plan for reducing the number of federal agencies from 900 to 200. "If I am elected president, the executive branch will be made efficient, economical, purposeful and manageable."

Atlanta Constitution  
May 18, 1976

## GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

Our government in Washington now is a horrible bureaucratic mess. It is disorganized, wasteful, has no purpose, and its policies -- when they exist -- are incomprehensible or devised by special interest groups.... We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision of the federal bureaucracy, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its many varied services."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

## GOVERNMENT REORGANIZATION

"Another thing that I would do would be to have a complete reorganization of the structure of the federal government, to make it, for a change, economical, efficient, purposeful in management. The bureaucracy is now an obstacle to any sort of economic progress. I would also promote the aggressive sale of American products overseas. I would remove some of the tax incentives and other incentives that have encouraged American corporations to manufacture products in foreign countries, when their own employees in this country are out of work. Other nations don't do this, but we do."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

## ANTI-WASHINGTON

"I've never expressed deliberately any anti-Washington feeling or any anti-government feeling. I'm not going to disrupt anything when I get here to Washington, if I'm elected. I'm not anti-Washington at all. And when I come here, I think I'll get along fine. But I would be a very activist President. I never have said I wanted a small government. I want one that, when it performs a function, does it well and performs a function in the ways that alleviate the problems of those who have not had an adequate voice in the past."

LA Times (Moyers interview)  
May 16, 1976

QUESTION EIGHT: HEALTH INSURANCE

"National Health Insurance alone cannot redistribute doctors or raise the quality of care. So we must plan, and decisively phase in, simultaneous reform of services and refinancing of costs.

"Coverage must be universal and mandatory.

"We must reduce barriers to early and preventive care in order to lower the need for hospitalization

"Benefits should be insured by a combination of resources: employer and employee shared payroll taxes, and general tax revenues.

"Uniform standards and levels of quality and payment must be approved for the nation...Incentives for reforms in the health care delivery system and for increased productivity must be developed.

"We must have strong and clear built-in cost and quality controls.

NATIONAL HEALTH INSURANCE - page 2

"Rates for institutional care and physician services should be set in advance.

"...freedom of choice in the selection of a physician and treatment center will always be maintained.

"Consumer representation in the development and administration of the health program should be assured.

"...While public officials have continued to dispute whether coverage should be catastrophic at first or comprehensive immediately, the system has become a comprehensive catastrophe.

"Incentives for the reorganization of the delivery of health care must be built into the payment mechanism."

Before the Student National Medical Assn.  
Washington, D. C.  
April 16, 1976



"When I say we need a national health insurance program, I mean to do it. body's ever done it. It's been talked about by very fine Democratic presidents ever since as early as Harry Truman. That will be the difference."

New York Times  
June 16, 1976

HEALTH

Such a national health insurance system should be financed by a combination of employer-employee shared payroll taxes and general tax revenues. Consideration should be given to developing a means of support for national health insurance that taxes all forms of economic income.

We further support increased federal aid to government laboratories as well as private institutions to seek the cure to heart disease, cancer, sickle cell anemia, paralysis from spinal cord injury, drug addiction and other such inflictions.

We must develop new health careers, and promote a better distribution of health care professionals, including the more efficient use of paramedics. All levels of government should concern themselves with increasing the number of doctors and paramedical personnel in the field of primary health care.

...including the development of Community Mental Health Centers that provide comprehensive social services not only to alleviate, but to prevent mental stresses resulting from social isolation and economic dislocation. Of particular importance is improved access to the health care system by underserved population groups.

We must have national health insurance with strong built-in cost and quality controls.

Demo platform 7/2/76 Cong Record

QUESTION NINE: PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS

## PUBLIC WORKS EMPLOYMENT BILL

Carter supported the public works-employment bill now before President Ford, saying, "It would not be rejected by a president who genuinely understood about our cities and their people."

Milwaukee AP  
June 29, 1976

## JOBS BILL VETO

Carter condemned Ford's veto of the latest federal jobs bill as a "very serious indication" of the President's "insensitivity to peoples' needs."

Washington Post  
July 12, 1976

## UNEMPLOYMENT

"drastic reduction" in the present jobless rate of about 7.5%. His goal is to bring unemployment down to about 4% or 4.5%. To accomplish this he advocates "an expansionary fiscal and monetary policy," stimulation of private industry by the federal government to hire the unemployed and supplemental government action to create "useful and productive" public employment.

Los Angeles Times  
May 9, 1976

## EMPLOYMENT

"As a last resort, public employment jobs need to be created similar to the CCC and the WPA during the depression years, particularly for young Americans 18-20 years old who have an extremely high unemployment rate - - in excess of 40 per cent for black young people."

"The net cost will be about \$20 per week for each young person hired."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

## UNEMPLOYMENT

Demo platform: Democrats pledge themselves to make every responsible effort to reduce adult unemployment to 3% within 4 years. This ambitious goal can be achieved by marshaling all our employment policies to that end, with particular emphasis on reducing unemployment in chronically depressed areas and among particular groups in the labor force, such as youth.

Demo platform - 1976  
Cong Record - July 2, 1976

## UNEMPLOYMENT

"We must give highest priority to achieving a steady reduction of unemployment and achieving full employment -- a job for everyone who wishes on e-- as rapidly as possible, while reducing inflation."

"The federal government has an obligation to provide funds for useful and productive public employment of those whom private business cannot or will not hire."

Baltimore Sun  
May 6, 1976  
(from Carter position paper)

## PUBLIC JOBS

Would you provide public jobs for people, other than those chronically unemployed, who weren't able to find jobs in the private sector?

"I don't believe we can afford that, on a permanent basis. This would create in our nation an inclination to circumvent the private sector, to depend on the federal government as a first supplier of jobs, and it would be extremely expensive. It costs about \$12,500 to supply a job for a person in the public sector. I would not want to use massive public-jobs programs except in an extreme case, and I believe that as President I could avoid that circumstance."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

## UNEMPLOYMENT

"If you had an area of high unemployment, a geographical area, and a company that had 1,000 employees, and they had to lay off 100 employees temporarily. I would like to see the government and that industry, on a competitive bid basis perhaps, for a short period of time, like six months, employ all the people there for a shorter workweek, and let the government and the industry share the extra cost."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

### PUBLIC SERVICE JOBS

The former Georgia governor said that if he becomes President "the mayors of America will have direct access to the White House to get assistance on any problems that may arise," he said.

To attack high unemployment in cities, Mr. Carter called for more public-service jobs coupled with financial incentives for private businesses to hire the unemployed.

The Wall Street Journal  
June 30, 1976

**QUESTION TEN: NATIONAL PLANNING**



## PLANNING

"There's got to be some increased interrelationship among Government, business, labor, manufacturing, agriculture, science and education in our society. There's just no predictability now about Government policy -- no way to tell what we're going to do next in the area of housing, transportation, environmental quality or energy. So I favor coordinated Government planning to attack problems in these and other fields.

We can do it by extending existing agencies and techniques. The role of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, for example, could be expanded to include this type of planning and to deal with long-range problems to fit individual sectors into an over-all plan for the economy."

U.S. News and World Report  
May 24, 1976

## PLANNING

"We have not had in the past any overall housing policy in this country. We've had no overall policy on transportation. We've had no overall predictable policy on urban problems. We've had no overall concept of the system of federalism.... The lack of longrange planning creates disharmony, consternation, gross waste and confusion. And it also discourages people."

Philadelphia Inquirer  
April 12, 1976

QUESTION ELEVEN: BUSING

"I don't think we ought to amend the Constitution every time we have a transient problem, and that's what I consider the busing problem - transient."

"...in most instances where busing orders have been put forth, the communities have eventually accommodated themselves to a workable procedure."

"I would hate to reopen the entire divisive question of busing for all the state legislatures in the nation to redebate. It would unnecessarily create disharmony, racial and otherwise."

"I don't favor mandatory busing simply to achieve racial balance...my preference is the Atlanta plan...as President if the courts ruled differently I would support the courts."

Washington Post  
March 21, 1976

## BUSING

Carter reiterated that he favored voluntary, not mandatory, busing. But he criticized Boston for not including more blacks in the management of its school system and he said he would uphold any court orders.

Los Angeles Times  
June 23, 1976

## BUSING

Jimmy Carter said he does not believe it would be feasible to put a time limit on court-ordered busing. Carter said: "I do not believe it would be feasible to put a three year limit, or a five year limit, on a federal court. That would require passage of an amendment" to the Constitution. He did not elaborate.

Washington Post  
June 23, 1976

QUESTION TWELVE: OIL EMBARGO

## OIL EMBARGOES

"I would not permit that to happen again. I would let the Arab countries know that we want to be their friends, that we are heavily dependent upon oil being imported from them, that if they declare an embargo against us we would consider it not a military, but an economic, declaration of war, and that we would respond instantly and without further debate in a similar fashion... We would not ship them any food, no weapons, no spare parts for weapons, no oil drilling rigs, no oil pipes... I don't think this country ought to yield to an embargo again."

Boise Idaho Statesman  
April 2, 1976

QUESTION THIRTEEN: INTELLIGENCE

## FBI

*GENERAL*

The former Georgia governor said that would take the attorney <sup>A</sup> who is boss of the FBI, out of politics and "let the bureau seek its natural role as a nonpolitical political organization."

"We must make sure the FBI becomes completely professional once again and is removed from politics." He said he would like to see the attorney general appointed for "a certain period of time -- maybe five to seven years" on a merit basis.

He said he would have "the Senate confirm that appointment but not remove that person from office unless the president and leaders of Congress have designated a special prosecutor and determined that the attorney general was not adequate to perform the duties of that office."

Baltimore Sun  
January 12, 1976

## CIA

He is against any dissolution of the Central Intelligence Agency and he opposes any cessation of its covert operations. "We need them, I regret to say; I wish we didn't but we do."

NYT magazine  
June 6, 1976



Carter indicated he may be interested in reorganizing intelligence agencies in light of CIA abuses.

"I think that we need a good, competent intelligence network. We now have, I think, seven different agencies. I think that's too many to be deriving information from."

As President, he would be "personally responsible" to the American people for the "proper performance" of intelligence gathering. And he said that within a week to 10 days he will begin receiving CIA briefings.

UPI (Wesley Pippert)  
July 12, 1976

## INTELLIGENCE

Our civilian and military intelligence agencies should be structured to provide timely and accurate information and analysis of foreign affairs and military matters. Covert action must be used only in the most compelling cases where the national security of the US is vitally involved; assassination must be prohibited. There should be full and thorough Congressional oversight of our intelligence agencies.

Demo platform  
7/2/76 Cong Record

**QUESTION FOURTEEN: PUBLIC EMPLOYEES**

PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Carter favors binding arbitration for teachers, firemen and policemen,  
and the right to strike only if the employer rejects the arbitration.

UPI (no date)

CIVIL SERVICE/HATCH ACT

We support the revision of the Hatch Act so as to extend to federal workers  
the same political rights enjoyed by other Americans as a birthright,  
while still protecting the Civil Service from political abuse.

Demo platform  
7/2/76 Cong Record

## CIVIL SERVICE

The Democratic Party is committed to the review and overhaul of Civil Service laws to assure: insulation from political cronyism, accountability for nonfeasance as well as malfeasance, protection for the public servant who speaks out to identify corruption or failure, performance standards and incentives to reward efficiency and innovation and nondiscrimination and affirmative action in the recruitment, hiring and promotion of civil service employees.

Demo platform  
7/2/76 Cong Record

QUESTION FIFTEEN: GUN CONTROL



"I favor registration of handguns, a ban on the sale of cheap handguns, reasonable licensing provisions, including a waiting period and prohibition of ownership by anyone convicted of a crime involving a gun and by those not mentally competent."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

#### GUN CONTROL

\* He has a mass-supported gun-control education program about to be launched. He claims it will bring gun control to a nation that has shown, by a large majority, that it desires it. "Within five years we'll break the National Rifle Association."

Washington Star  
April 12, 1976

\* MORRIS DEES  
CARTERS DIRECT MAIL MAN

QUESTION SIXTEEN: HEW

## EDUCATION

"The federal share of public education costs was 10% in 1974. If existing inequalities are to be eliminated and American teachers provided with a decent standard of living, the portion must be increased. The return from Federal expenditures can be greatly enhanced by simplification of laws and regulations to substitute education for paper-shuffling grantsmanship. As President, I will initiate as a major and early priority a comprehensive attack upon the basic problems of education in America with particular emphasis on the obviously inadequate system of financing."

"...a stronger voice for education at the Federal level through the creation of a separate Department of Education..."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

## EDUCATION

Carter told NEA leaders that he was committed to major increases in federal aid to education, but he balked at supporting an unrestricted right of teachers to strike. Carter described the group's goal of \$18 billion to \$20 billion a year more in federal money for education as "a good goal." He would, as President, work to remove the prohibition on the use of revenue-sharing funds for education, would create a separate federal Department of Education and would work for "a rapid increase in the proportion of education costs to be financed by the federal government."

After the democratic convention he planned to work with the NEA and other groups "in evolving a four-year program for educational progress in the country...a nationwide commitment" that he could present to the voters this fall.

Los Angeles Times  
June 20, 1976



QUESTION SEVENTEEN: GUARANTEED WAGE

## WELFARE

Those persons who are physically able to work (other than mothers with dependent children) should be required to accept appropriate available jobs or job training.

This maintenance system should provide an income floor both for the working poor and the poor not in the labor market. It must treat stable and broken families equally. It must incorporate a simple schedule of work incentives that guarantees equitable levels of assistance to the working poor.

Local governments should no longer be required to bear the burden of welfare costs. Further, there should be a phased reduction in the states' share of welfare costs.

Demo platform  
7/2/76 Cong. Record

## WELFARE REFORM

"We have been promised welfare reform for over a generation. The basic components of a fair and a workable program are well known. We do not yet have such a program because of a lack of political courage. The ten per cent of recipients who are able to work should be separated from the other ninety per cent and treated as part of our unemployed work force. The private and public training and educational programs of this country should be marshalled to prepare them for employment commensurate with their ability and talent."

"Public jobs should be created as necessary for those who are able and willing to work. If a job is offered and not accepted, benefits should be terminated. The remaining ninety per cent are not considered to be employable. There should be an adequate fairly uniform, nationwide allocation of funds for these families and individuals to meet the necessities of life."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

"There ought to be one nationwide payment to meet the basic necessities of life - varying in amount only to accommodate the cost of living."

"There ought to be a work incentive aspect built in, which is absent."

"...remove the elements of the welfare that encourage or force a father to leave the home. And cut down the number of programs to no more than one or two. That would eliminate the food stamp program."

Washington Post  
March 21, 1976

### WELFARE

Carter said he favors a welfare reform plan nearly identical to one before the governors' conference, including a federally financed minimum income provision. He has said a full federal takeover of welfare expenses would be too costly. But with the minimum income plan he endorsed, there wouldn't be much more for the federal government to take over anyhow."

AP - Hershey, Pa.  
July 6, 1976

A "simple and fair" nationwide welfare program, featuring a uniform cash payment, should replace the current multiplicity of programs, including food stamps, the candidate says.

Wall Street Journal  
April 2, 1976

#### WELFARE

"There'd be a fairly uniform nationwide payment, varying only with the cost of living. I can't say the whole nation would be at the New York level. That would cost \$22 billion. There's no way the Federal government can prevent any state from paying a bonus."

New York Times  
May 14, 1976

**QUESTION EIGHTEEN: WAGE-PRICE CONTROLS**

### WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

"I would like to have standby wage and price control authority that could be used for a limited period of time, but I doubt that I would ever use it."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

**QUESTION NINETEEN: MIDDLE EAST**

## ISRAEL

"I favor early movement toward discussion of the outline of an eventual overall settlement. Limited settlements, as we have seen in the past, leave unresolved the underlying threat to Israel. A general settlement is needed, one which will end the conflict between Israel and its neighbors once and for all. "

"Peace in the Middle East depends more than anything else on a basic change in attitudes. To be specific, on Arab recognition of the right of Isarel to exist as a Jewish state.

"This change must be reflect in tangible and concrete actions by the Arab countries, including:

- recognition of Israel;
- diplomatic relations with Israel;
- A peace treaty with Israel;
- open frontiers by Israel's neighbors;
- an end to embargo and official hostile propaganda against Israel "

"Final borders between Israel and its neighbors should be determined in direct negotiations between the parties. They should not be imposed from outside."

## ISRAEL - page 2

"We want no clash with the Soviets, but we could not accept the intervention of its combat forces into any Arab-Israel conflict."

"I donot believe that the road to peace can be found by U.S. -Soviet imposition of a settlement."

Statement by Governor Carter on the Middle  
East  
June 5, 1976



**QUESTION TWENTY: CABINET**

## CABINET/BLACKS

"I have said flatly that when I'm elected there will be black members in my Cabinet. You can depend upon it. "

UPI

April 16, 1976

## CABINET

Asked if Cabinet meeting minutes should be made public, he said "There would have to be some exclusions. States have done this. When you have staff members advising a superior, that ought to be an area that would be kept private, because you've got to have the freedom of debate."

"I would like to see, for instance, Cabinet members go before joint sessions of Congress to be examined and questioned about foreign affairs, defense, agriculture and so forth."

Asked if he would send his secretary of state to Congress to answer questions from the floor, he said, "Yes, I would. If the Congress would accept this, I will be glad to have it done. The President ought to tell the truth always. I see no reason for the President to lie, and if any of my Cabinet members ever lie, they'll be gone the next day."

LA Times

May 16, 1976

(Moyers interview)

CABINET/ Regulatory agencies/Nader,ralph/Arrogance

Jimmy Carter has already hired an Atlanta attorney, Jack Watson, to investigate possible choices for cabinet positions under a Carter administration, Jack Anderson reported Thursday.

Carter instructed Watson to look beyond Georgia for prospects. Carter said he wouldn't want to surround himself in the White House with the Georgia mafia.

For Secretary of State, Carter has three prospects in mind: George Ball, Cyrus Vance and Sen. Frank Church. Anderson said his sources say Carter definitely wants Vance in his cabinet, if not as Secretary of State then as Secretary of Defense.

For Secretary of the Interior, Carter is considering Gov. Cecil Andrus (D-Idaho). Carter has already sounded out Andrus about his philosophy toward public and interior problems. Carter has also spoken to Ralph Nader about the kind of people he should appoint to the regulatory agencies. Carter also said

CABINET (cont.)

privately he would check with business leaders but that he doesn't want to appoint any regulators that are opposed by the consumer movements.

ABC 7-15-76

CABINET

Watson, chairman of the Georgia Board of Human Resources, which oversees health and welfare programs, planned to report to Carter on his search for people to serve in a Carter administration, including possible Cabinet members, an aide said.

AP, 7-20-76

QUESTION TWENTY-ONE: KOREAN TROOP WITHDRAWAL

## KOREA

"I would remove all atomic weapons from Korea."

"I cannot see any circumstances imaginable under which we need or would use atomic weapons in the Korean area."

"But I would not be rash about the withdrawal of troops from South Korea.... I'd make sure the Japanese knew what we were doing.... I would make sure that in the four or five years when we get our troops in Korea substantially removed that Korea would still be able to defend itself against North Korea."

Washington Post  
March 21, 1976

## SOUTH KOREA

"We have a commitment made by the Congress, the President, the people and the United Nations in South Korea. I would prefer to withdraw all of our troops and land forces from South Korea over a period of years -- three, four years, whatever. But, obviously, we're already committed in Japan. We're committed in Germany."

LA Times  
May 16, 1976  
(Moyers interview)

## SOUTH KOREA

"I think Park is much too autocratic and has very little concern about human freedoms and human rights. Our commitment is not to Park. Our long-standing commitment has been to the people of South Korea. I think that to reduce our land forces in South Korea gradually over a period of years would be an appropriate action to take. The South Koreans would have a competitive force with that of the north."

Newsweek  
May 10, 1976

---

## SOUTH KOREA

though  
\_ / He has frequently espoused the gradual withdrawal of American troops from Korea, before conservative audiences he has said he is "against withdrawal" of troops "except on a phased basis."

NYT magazine  
June 6, 1976

QUESTION TWENTY-TWO: TAX REFORM



"I do not favor a tax cut for 1976. I believe most American people would much rather see some control over excessive spending ...than to have a tax cut at this time with deficits in the neighborhood of \$70 billion."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
Mrch 15, 1976

TAXES (Housing)

"We must undertake a comprehensive review of the hidden ways in which our tax laws influence housing policy. Deductible mortgage interest and property taxes benefit upper- and middle-income homeowners in the amount of \$11 billion, while total federal expenditures for subsidized housing amount to approximately \$2 billion."

Carter campaign issues reference book  
March 15, 1976

## TAX POLICY/HOUSING

A reporter noted the candidate had advocated doing away with the tax deduction for home mortgage interest, and Mr. Carter testily interrupted to insist: "I did not." He added that he had said this was one "incentive I would consider modifying," and then without elaboration, asserted, "If I change the deduction it would be increased and not decreased."

Wall Street Journal  
April 26, 1976

## TAX POLICY

He publicly advocated as part of a tax package, the closing of the loopholes that permit many of us to deduct mortgage payments from our taxes. Privately, according to (former Carter speechwriter) Shrum, he denied taking any such position.

Baltimore Sun  
May 6, 1976

## TAX REFORM

What about the deduction for interest on mortgages that favors homeowners?

"I haven't ever said I would keep it as an income-tax deduction. I've said I would keep the same amount of incentive for homeownership, or more. I think the \$10-billion figure to encourage private homeownership is a very good thing -- whether it would be done through the income-tax structure or another mechanism, I don't know yet. If I make any change in it, it would be to increase the figure, or if I make any change in who gets the benefits, it would be to give low-and middle-income families more benefits than they get now."

"I'm not qualified yet to say what specific aspect of a tax-reform package I will maintain maybe two years in the future after I've had a chance to go into the concept."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

## TAX REFORM

"I think the nation is ready for comprehensive, total tax reform. This has been advocated by people from a wide spectrum of basic political philosophies -- all the way from the Brookings Institution to William Simon. There are four basic principles that I've adopted. First, to treat all income the same. Second, to tax income only once. Third, a progressive tax rate. And fourth, to greatly simplify the whole system."

Fortune Magazine  
May 1976

## TAX REFORM

We will strengthen the internal revenue tax code so that highincome citizens pay a reasonable tax on all economic income.

We will reduce the use of unjustified tax shelters in such areas as oil and gas, tax loss farming, real estate, and movies.

We will eliminate unnecessary and ineffective tax provisions to business and substituting effective incentives to encourage small business and capital formation in all businesses.

We will end abuses in the tax treatment of income from foreign sources; such as special tax treatment and incentives for multi-national corporations that drain jobs and capital from the American economy.

We will overhaul federal estate and gift taxes to provide an effective and equitable structure to promote tax justice and alleviate some of the legitimate problems faced by farmers, small businessmen and women and others who would otherwise be forced to liquidate assets in order to pay the tax.

more -----

## • TAX REFORM (continued)

We will seek and eliminate provisions that encourage uneconomic corporate mergers and acquisitions.

We will eliminate tax inequities that adversely affect individuals on the basis of sex or marital status.

We will curb expense account deductions.

And we will protect the rights of all taxpayers against oppressive procedures, harassment and invasions of privacy by the Internal Revenue Service.

Demo platform  
Cong Record 7/2/76

QUESTION TWENTY\_THREE: NUCLEAR ENERGY

## NUCLEAR POLICY

"US dependence on nuclear power should be kept to the minimum necessary to meet our needs. We should apply much stronger safety standards as we regulate its use. And we must be honest with our people concerning its problems and dangers.

"Nuclear energy must be at the very top of the list of global challenges that call for new forms of international action.

"I suggest that new lines of international action should be considered in three main areas: action to meet the energy needs of all countries while limiting reliance on nuclear energy; action to limit the spread of nuclear weapons; and action to make the spread of peaceful nuclear power less dangerous. "

New York Times  
May 14, 1976

QUESTION TWENTY-FOUR: NUCLEAR TESTING

## NUCLEAR EXPLOSIONS

"There is one step that can be taken at once. The United States and the Soviet Union should conclude an agreement prohibiting all nuclear explosions for a period of five years, whether they be weapons tests or so called 'peaceful' nuclear explosions, and encourage all other countries to join. At the end of the five year period the agreement can be continued if it serves the interests of the parties."

New York Times  
May 14, 1976