

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER ON
National Health Policy
BEFORE THE
STUDENT NATIONAL MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
WASHINGTON, D.C.

April 16, 1976

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

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

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

Advances

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

Present Problems

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

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

the diseases of highly industrialized nations—the rate of heart disease and cancer.

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

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

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

What are some of the tragic inadequacies of health care?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Where Has All the Money Gone?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

is more loss of money and time, and the wasted talents of administrators.

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

What Are the Solutions?

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

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

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

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

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

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

tribute the new developments of medical technology.

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

Improved Health Care and Delivery

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

To improve the availability of services, especially preventive services, the work of nurse practitioners and physicians' assistants is crucial. In addition to these new clinicians, we need more paraprofessionals and allied health personnel who can free doctors and nurses for the work that only they can do. A

project in Portsmouth, Virginia, and others that we started in Georgia have demonstrated that many of the poor can fill paraprofessional roles, instead of being forced onto welfare rolls. The preventive work they do in their own neighborhoods reduces sickness and the expense of treatment.

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

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

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

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

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

National Health Insurance

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

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

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

- Uniform standards and levels of quality and payment must be approved for the nation as part of rational health planning. Incentives for reforms in the health care delivery system and for increased productivity must be developed.
- We must have strong and clear built-in cost and quality controls. Necessary machinery for monitoring the quality of care must be established.
- Rates for institutional care and physician services should be set in advance, prospectively.
- Maximum personal interrelationships between patients and their physicians should be preserved; freedom of choice in the selection of a physician and treatment center will always be maintained.
- Consumer representation in the development and administration of the health program should be assured.
- National priorities of need and feasibility should determine the stages of the system's implementation. While public officials have continued to dispute whether coverage should be catastrophic at first or comprehensive immediately, the system has become a comprehensive catastrophe. We must achieve all that is practical while we strive for what is ideal, taking intelligent steps to make adequate health services a right for all our people.

- A basic concern shall be for the dignity of the person, not for the individual's wealth or income.
- Incentives for the reorganization of the delivery of health care must be built into the payment mechanism.
- We must have resources set aside to encourage development of alternative approaches and to spur new distribution of health personnel.

Conclusion

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

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

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

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

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

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

ADDRESS BY JIMMY CARTER BEFORE THE National Wildlife Federation

March 15, 1975

Thank you very much.

I might first say that I came in from New York this morning on TWA and for the last hour or so we had been stuck on the runway of the airport. Fortunately, however, the four feet of snow that had accumulated in front of our plane's wheels was finally shoveled out of the way and I arrived here just in the nick of time to hear one of the finest Congressmen in Washington give you his talk.

You know, if every member of Congress had the same understanding, sensitivity and capability and motivations as Congressman Heinz, you would not have to be concerned about the future of our nation.

Insofar as I am concerned, let me first say that I do appreciate the introduction given. You know, sometimes an introduction can separate a speaker from his audience. This happened on an occasion, not too long ago, with me.

Some four or five years ago I was visiting a college campus, the campus of the oldest women's college in the nation. Each summer we bring to that campus the 400 brightest high school students in the state, as determined by comparative examinations. They spend eight weeks there studying various subjects, advanced subjects, such as new teaching techniques and the like.

There is one day, out of that eight-week session, that we set aside for career training, and we spend that full day bringing onto the college campus professionals—doctors, dentists, nurses, businessmen, scientists, engineers, teachers, etc., so that students in small groups can study what they want to do in the future with their own brilliant young lives—in order to plan their careers in an orderly fashion.

I was invited at that time to make the main banquet speech and the individual, in introducing me, said, "Tonight we are happy to have at this time, Jimmy Carter to come and tell us how to plan our life careers." He then pointed out that I was born and raised in Georgia, had gone to college there and then he said—"Senator Carter went to Georgia Tech where he studied engineering and then he went to the Naval Academy at Annapolis where he got a degree in Naval science and then he went to Union College in New York, where he did his graduate work in Nuclear

Physics and now he grows peanuts for a living and is now going to tell us how to plan our life's careers." (Laughter) Well, by the time I got my speech done, I had finally gotten that audience back.

I do want to talk to you today, however, about some concepts that are important to us all.

You know, God has given us a great heritage to take care of, which sometimes we don't appreciate adequately.

I have tried to think of a story to illustrate this point and the only one I could think of was about the old gentleman who lived in the mountains and he, his father, his grandfather and his great grandfather before him had owned the same little tiny plot of land—fifty acres—and they were very proud of that and everytime, during those four generations, that they had made a nickel or a dime, they had put it back in the beautification of this little plot of land. The trees were beautifully pruned; the stream was absolutely pure; the rose garden was beautiful; the fences were all straight; the little house setting on the southern part of the farm was whitewashed and the old gentleman was very proud of what he had, the beauty of it and the like.

He had a new nephew who one day visited him coming from a far western area and that first night they were standing on the porch and the old gentleman said, "I want you to see the beautiful place we have. Just over there beyond the rose bushes you see the western boundary of our farm. Just beyond that little creek on the hill is the northern boundary and over there, just beyond those pine trees, is the eastern boundary of the farm and then my house here happens to be located in the southern corner. What do you think about our place?"

Well, the young man was very bright and replied, "By golly, do you call this a farm? Where I come from they have really got farms. My house also happens to be on the southern corner and I get into my pick-up truck early in the morning, drive as hard as that truck will go until ten o'clock in the morning and I have to stop and rest and put some oil in the truck and it takes me until noon to get to the northern corner of my farm. I then stop and eat lunch and by mid-afternoon I am back at the eastern corner and

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

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

then it is nightfall before I get back to my house in the southern corner. What do you think about that?"

Well, the old gentleman thought awhile and then replied, "Well, son, I sympathize with you. I used to have a pick-up truck like that myself."

Well, sometimes we do have different perspectives of beauty and different perspectives of our responsibilities and that is important to us.

I am an engineer, I am a conservationist, and I am a scientist, an environmentalist, I am a Nuclear Engineer, I am an outdoors man, I am a Christian, and I don't see any conflict among these things, but when I was elected Governor, I approached the Office with a great deal of anticipation, not as a politician but as a businessman, an outdoors man, as a planner, as a farmer, and I found a terrible bureaucratic mess.

For example, we had 300 agencies and departments in the Georgia government. We abolished 278 of them. We set up a simple structure, one that you could understand and that could deal with comprehensive problems of the people of the state in an effective, aggressive, comprehensive and understandable way.

We established a new kind of budgeting technique called "zero" based budgeting, where every year we stripped down the Georgia budget to zero and we analyzed every single program that delivered services to the Georgia people. If it was doing a good job, we kept it. Sometimes we even enhanced it. If it was ineffective, then we eliminated it.

We carefully put together each year a proper priority of the delivery of services to the Georgia people and a proper allocation of funds paid in by taxes of the people served.

We have long-range plans in every parameter of Georgia's life—mental health, physical health, transportation, education, environmental quality, recreation, parks, game and fish management, coastal plains, preservation of marshlands, etc.—so that the majority of people know ahead of time what is going to happen a year, two years, five years and sometimes even twenty-five years in the future.

We have a very economical and efficient government and I am proud of it and I would put it up against the efficiency and economy of many corporations, such as Delta Airlines, Sears Roebuck, Coca Cola, General Motors, or IBM.

However, I would also like to remind you that nowhere in the Constitution of the United States or Declaration of Independence, nor the Bill of Rights, nor the Old Testament, nor the New Testament, do you find the words "economy or efficiency." However, you find other words that are much more important—words like "self-reliance," words like "beauty" and words like "appreciation," and words like "foreight," and words like "stewardship," "brotherhood," "tenacity," "commitment," "compassion," and "love," that describe what a human being ought to be and also describe what the government of those human beings ought to be.

The title of my speech, as I noted it when I got here

this morning, comes from the Bible—"for if the trumpet be given an uncertain sound, then who shall prepare themselves for the battle?"

I tell you that this is no time for those of us who love God's earth and the beauty of it, the purity of the air and water, to compromise or to retreat or to yield in any possible measure to the devastation or deterioration of the quality of our lives or our environment.

If the members of the Environmental and Conservation groups of this nation are willing to compromise ahead of time on tough decisions relating to the quality of the lives of the American people, then who in God's world is going to maintain a staunch position from which we can make proper decisions?

Not long ago, I noted that one of the Cabinet Members made a statement—"Earth Day is over," and then another prominent official in Washington said, in referring to people like you and me, that we were green bigots.

Well, I think this is inevitable. I helped, for example, to organize the Georgia Conservancy and I have grown up, in relation to my life, in the swamps, rivers, fields and woods of Southwest Georgia.

I started with my game and fish conservation programs when I was a twelve-year-old child and I never had an electric light until I was fifteen years old. I know how important it is to stand fast when problems get serious and when challenges get great and when public opinion swings back and forth in a time of crisis.

Environmentalists now are under attack for one basic reason and that is because we accurately predicted what would happen in our modern fast-changing, technological world if we did not make long-range plans, concerning the population explosion, food shortages, pollution control, depletion of commodities, natural resources, energy supplies, and now with those predictions having come true, in some strange ways those of us who made the accurate predictions several years ago are being blamed for the consequences of a lack of planning.

There is no incompatibility between careful planning and economic progress on the one hand and environmental quality on the other hand.

Our present economic distress, in a major degree, has come from waste and from the lack of planning to corollate the disparate elements that affect our modern world.

Now, I happen to be a scientist and I have seen the almost complete severance of separation in the last few years of the scientific community from the decision-making center of our nation, which is in the White House.

You know, in times past, when the world was slowly changing, it was possible for political leaders to make predictions and judgements and then call on scientists and say, "This is what we have decided, now you help us achieve the goal we have established."

However, that time is gone. Now, the inexorable

forces of nature which cannot be changed on a world-wide basis, concerning food, population, pollution, energy resources, are so complicated that a full-time President, a full-time Congressman or a full-time Governor or a full-time Mayor has not the time nor most often the competence to predict what is going to happen and to design what the alternatives are—to make careful correlated planning for the future and use the best alternatives.

Now is the time when professionals, like many of you, and scientists like me, need to be in the most enviable and possible posture in our government.

Now, what is our nation's policy on energy?

Well, there is none.

What is our nation's policy on comprehensive transportation programs?

There is none.

What is our nation's policies on mental health, physical health, education, welfare, tax reform?

There are none.

How can we hope to inspire the American people to reach for greatness and to make sacrifices when they don't know the purpose of their sacrifice and don't know the consequences of selfish actions and have no way to look toward a common goal so that we can work in harmony and with a mutual support for realizing the potential of our great society?

The safety and good health of workers, for example, is not incompatible with the proper utilization of energy sources.

The destruction of the surface of our lands with uncontrolled strip mining is certainly not a logical approach to meeting energy requirements.

The unrestrained and profuse off-shore leasing of scarce and very lightly understood oil reserves is in no way protecting the public's interest and the public's oil deposits.

The right of private businesses, in conjunction with the Federal Government, to condemn lands over the opposition of state and local governments, farmers and ranchers, is no proper procedure in a free and democratic society.

The right to establish arbitrarily sites which might be derogatory to the environment of a beautiful area is no proper procedure for our government to espouse.

One of the most frequent questions I get in my travels around this country is "what are we going to do about energy?"

Other nations have a comprehensive energy policy—we do not.

We have, in the entire world, about sixty cubic miles of oil, total reserves and the best estimates are then that we can expect from the ground about seventy-five percent of that oil. We use about 1.3 cubic miles per year and the rate of that use is increasing year by year, not particularly in this country now but in the areas of the world which is becoming more industrialized—which means, in turn, we have enough oil to last about thirty-five years: we have enough uranium

to last forty or fifty years and we have enough coal to last six hundred years.

Among the Nuclear Physicists of this country, there is a fifty-fifty judgement about whether or not we will have electricity from fusion in this century. We are now seeing a struggle going on, an economic struggle, about how to use what we do have.

There is a great pressure to make synthetic fuels out of coal; to take coal and change it into oil or gas.

This is probably counter-productive because it takes a lot of energy just to change the form of coal but we do need research and development to make sure that when coal is used that the environment is less adversely affected.

Shale also has tremendous potential but enormous amounts of water and energy are required to extract oil from shale and to get four or five percent of our total energy resources from shale would require us to dig a Panama Canal every day.

The Federal Government has an integral role to play in every aspect of environmental life that I have mentioned to you this morning.

The total budget allocated to conservation and wildlife is about one percent of our total budget but that includes, in a major degree, two types of expenditures which quite often are counter-productive.

One involves the building of unnecessary dams by the Corps of Engineers and the other one is a channelization of our streams by the Soil Conservation Service.

Not too long ago, in Georgia, I vetoed a major dam project because it would have been destructive to the quality of Georgia's wildlife in the future and also a gross waste of money and that the computations used to economically justify that particular dam were false.

A great reduction must be made in the construction of dams and channelization of streams in this country. We need to enhance recreation and park expenditures, utilization of our forests, both privately and publicly owned and accentuate good wildlife habitat production for our wildlife. We have to become involved in the protection of natural areas, historic areas and sites that are important and the property management of public lands, not for the oil companies, not for the coal companies, but for the people of the country.

In closing, I would briefly like to indicate to you two incidents that happened to me.

One of these occurred when I was campaigning for Governor of Georgia.

Late one afternoon, I was tired and I was leaving one of our major cultural cities and as I was driving on the Interstate Highway, I-16, I looked into my rear-view mirror and was very, very saddened to see a haze of black smoke over that major city and remembered a conversation which I had with some fisherman on the banks of the Savannah River, who formerly could catch fish in the mouth of that river but who could no longer do so.

I could see the haze in my rear-view mirror and, at about that same time, overhead, over the Interstate Highway, which was used to transport hundreds of cars to and from the city, I saw a flash of bronze in the air and then about twenty yards in front of my car, as I drove westward, there was a turkey gobbler. Then, just in front of my car, he set his wings and he sailed into the Georgian swamp on the right.

I then thought to myself, would my three-year-old child ever see a wild turkey gobbler in Georgia? Will the natural areas of our state be preserved? Will the quality of our air improve? Will our land and water be protected?

Well, as Governor of Georgia, I tried to keep all of those factors in mind and never yielded an inch on the quality of our lives.

The people of this country are very deeply concerned about two basic things. One is the integrity and the purpose of our Federal Government. Does it represent accurately the character and quality of our people?

The second basic concern about the government is—is it accountable and able to deal with the complicated factors that will face our lives and which are going to get more complicated in the future?

As we approach the 200th birthday of our country, it is important for us to stop and see whether or not we as Americans in a leadership capacity, representing perhaps a minority view, can compromise our principles.

You know, during my last two years in the Navy, I worked for a remarkable man by the name of Rickover. He is probably the greatest engineer this nation ever produced. He is a great scientist and is completely dedicated. He works very, very hard. He will be seventy-five years old this year.

In years gone by he has been responsible for all the nuclear and power generation for the Navy Atomic Submarines and the Atomic Energy Commission. Further, he has absolutely no tact—doesn't care for anything. As a matter of fact, all the time I worked for him he never said a decent word to me. However, he did change my life because he had one characteristic, and still has it, which has always been unique. He would never accept mediocrity or low average achievement in relation to anything he did or anyone under him did.

I helped him and a few others develop the first two atomic submarines and I worked at the General Electric Company at that time and whenever the Admiral would come around to inspect my work, if I had done a perfect job, which wasn't too often, but every now and then I did, he never said a word—never once did he say, "good job, Jimmy" or "well done, Carter." If he found no fault, he simply looked, turned around and walked away.

However, if I made the slightest mistake, in one of the loudest and most obnoxious voices I ever heard, he would turn around and tell the other people in the area what a horrible disgrace I was to the Navy, and

that I ought to be back in the oldest and slowest and smallest submarine from which I had come.

Further, I remember the first time I met the Admiral. We were in a room almost a quarter as large as this one. There was one table in the room and a chair on each side. I was being interviewed for a job and that interview lasted three and a half hours. He looked right between my eyes the whole time. He never smiled. He let me choose any subject I wanted to talk about and, of course, I carefully chose a subject about which I knew the most at the time, navigation, seamanship, foreign affairs, music, art, drama, whatever it was, and then with questions of increasing difficulty, in each instance, he proved that I did not know anything about the subject I had chosen.

Toward the end of our interview I was sitting there in a cold sweat and he asked me a question in relation to which I could finally redeem myself.

He asked—"how did you stand in your class at Annapolis?"

Well, I had done very well and so my chest swelled up with pride and I replied, "Sir, I stood so and so in a class of 765."

Well, I sat back to wait for a favorable reaction and the congratulations never came. I found out later, for example, he had stood number 1 in his class.

He then asked me another question. He said, "Did you do your best?"

I started to say "yes" but then I remembered for a part of the time when I was there, there were times when I could have learned a little bit more about things, weapons, seamanship, navigation and so I gulped a couple of times and I said, "No, sir, I did not always do my best."

Well, he sat there for a long time looking at me and then he turned his chair around to end the interview and asked me one final question, something which I have never been able to forget and to which I have never been able to think of a good answer to. He asked, "Why not?" Well, after a while, I got up and walked out of the room.

Well, this room is filled with people who love God's world, who love the grass and the trees and the mountains and the wildlife; who are concerned about the future; who consider themselves stewards; who have natural leadership capabilities, who are trusted by their fellow Americans, neighbors; who have seen firsthand some of the problems that we personally face; who have been tempted to compromise our principles because of public pressure or political pressure. However, let's not do it.

I think that it is incumbent upon us, on the cutting edge of the preservation of the quality of life, to ask ourselves the question that Admiral Rickover asked every single officer who goes into an atomic submarine—for the people of this country, for the future of it, for our nation and for ourselves individually—and a question we should ask ourselves—"why not the best?"

Thank you very much.

Jimmy Carter Presidential Campaign

"A New Beginning"

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

June 16, 1976

GOALS: OPENNESS, COMPASSION, EFFICIENCY

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

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

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

Yours is a serious responsibility that extends beyond fashioning a document we can win with in November. I believe you have an obligation to write a platform that will

be a binding contract with the American people. The American people are tired of inflated promises which cannot be kept, of programs which do not work, of old answers to new problems. Our platform should not mislead the American people. Our platform should not signal a retreat. Rather it should set forth realistic goals and achievable, affordable policies which can and should be attained.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

A. THE ECONOMY

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

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

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

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

(1) To reach full employment we must assure:

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

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

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

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

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

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

(g) Improved *manpower training* programs;

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

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

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

- (a) *Steady flow of jobs and output;*
- (b) A better matching of *supply and demand;*
- (c) *Reform of government regulations*, such as the backhaul rule, which unnecessarily add to consumer costs.
- (d) *Strict anti-trust and consumer protection enforcement;*
- (e) Increased emphasis on *productivity;*
- (f) *Lower interest rates;*
- (g) *Effective monitoring of inflationary trends and forces;*
- (h) Standby wage and price controls, which the President could apply selectively. There is no present need for the use of such standby authority.

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

- (a) Giving the President the power to *appoint the Chairman of the Federal Reserve for a term coterminous with the President's;*
- (b) Requiring the Open Market Committee of the Federal Reserve Board to *state its objectives more clearly and publicly;*
- (c) Requiring the Federal Reserve Board to submit a *credit market report* on past and expected monetary conditions to be included with the Economic Report of the President.
- (d) Requiring the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the Office of Management and Budget and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board to show in a consolidated report that their policies are *mutually consistent* or explain the reasons they are not consistent.

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

B. THE CITIES

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

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

Our cities have needed help and the Republicans have turned their backs. Between 1972 and 1974 alone, the Republican Administration cut \$4.5 billion in urban programs

and another \$7 billion in programs to aid the poor, the untrained, the unemployed, and the medically indigent, all at a time when municipalities lost \$3.3 billion in purchasing power.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

C. TAX REFORM

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

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

D. WELFARE REFORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

E. EDUCATION

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

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

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

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

The following steps are necessary:

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

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

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

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

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

F. HEALTH AND HEALTH CARE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I believe the basic concept behind OSHA is excellent. We should continue to clarify and expand the state role in the implementation of Health and Safety. *OSHA must be strengthened to ensure that those who earn their living by personal labor can work in safe and healthy environments*. Nationwide efforts in this area must continue until our working citizens are safe in their jobs.

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

G. CRIME CONTROL

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

H. TRANSPORTATION

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

Federal government has invested substantially in the development of that system, so that today there are more than 915,000 miles of Federal-aid highways, 325,000 miles of railroad tracks, 12,750 airports and 25,000 miles of commercially navigable waters. Federally-supported mass transit systems are in place in many of the nation's major cities. As a consequence, America has, with the notable exception of urban mass transit, (where substantial new construction needs remain), an essentially mature total transportation system. Priority now needs to be given not to developing massive new national transportation systems, except in the case of public transportation, but rather to achieving more effective utilization of the existing rail, highway, and airport networks.

The chief impediments to more effective utilization of the existing system are physical deterioration and outmoded regulations. Examples of both problems abound in all modes of transportation: Over the last seven years nine major Northeastern railroads have gone bankrupt.

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

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

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

While the private sector should be encouraged to undertake this rehabilitation work directly with privately raised capital, it must be recognized that the task of rebuilding the existing transportation system is so massive, so important and so urgent that private investment will have to be supplemented with substantial direct public investment. In certain program areas, such as highways, this will involve substantially reordering current program priorities to stress rehabilitation work. In yet other areas, such as public transportation, this will require reinforcing current program trends with increased investment levels.

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

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

I. HOUSING

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

J. AGRICULTURE AND RURAL AMERICA

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

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

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

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

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

K. ENERGY

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

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

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

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

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

I support *restrictions* on the right of a single company to own all phases of production and distribution of oil. However, it may not always be in the consumer's interest to

limit a company to one single phase of production. Such a restriction, for example, might make it illegal for the same company to explore for oil and then extract that oil from the ground once discovered.

I support legal prohibitions against ownership of competing types of energy, such as oil and coal. There may be some limited instances in which there should be joint responsibility for any phase of production of competing energy sources. For example, fuel oil and some propane are produced from crude oil. Their production clearly cannot be separated until after extraction and refining take place. It may not be beneficial to the consumer to separate control of these two competing energy sources.

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

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

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

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

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

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

(1) Environmental Protection

It is time that this country had a coherent, clear national policy dedicated to the protection of our environment.

I do not believe that there is an incompatibility between economic progress and environmental quality. We should not be diverted from our cause by false claims that the protection of our ecology and wildlife means an end to growth and a decline in jobs. This is not the case.

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

The Democratic Party should:

- insure that the *Army Corps of Engineers stops building unnecessary dams and public works projects harmful to the environment* and that the Soil Conservation Service *ends uncalled for channelization* of our country's rivers and streams.
- *hold fast against efforts to lower clean air requirements of the Clean Air Act*. I support strict enforcement of the nondegradation clause of the Clean Air Act.
- *encourage the development of rapid transit systems* which will help alleviate somewhat our continued and increased dependence on the automobile.
- *insist on strict enforcement of anti-water pollution laws* to protect our oceans, lakes, rivers, and streams from unneeded and harmful commercial pollution, and oppose efforts to weaken the federal Water Pollution Control Act.
- *protect against the noise pollution* with which our advanced technology challenges us. I *opposed* development of the SST on this basis, and I also *opposed* granting *landing rights to the Concorde*.
- *assist coastal states which bear the economic and environmental impact associated with the development of the Outer Continental Shelf*. Federal officials should accept the states' recommendations regarding lease sales and development plans unless those recommendations seriously conflict with national security.
- *support the need for better land-use planning*. I favor giving planning assistance to the states if firm assurances are given by the states that these plans will be implemented and will protect critical environmental areas.
- *support efforts to place reasonable limits on strip mining*. We must require reclamation of land as a condition for strip mining.
- *encourage solid waste disposal*. We must reduce the volume of waste created, give grants to states to improve collection service, and expand research in the solid waste disposal area.

M. CIVIL RIGHTS AND WOMEN'S RIGHTS

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

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

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

I strongly support *federal legislation to prohibit the practice of red-lining* by federally-sponsored savings and loan institutions and the FHA. I believe that our platform should reflect a *strong commitment to enforcement of the Open House Act of 1968 and the Community Development*

Act of 1974. Moreover, we should *enable the Equal Employment Commission to function more effectively* and expeditiously in employment discrimination complaints. Its backlog is a major problem in enforcing laws guaranteeing nondiscrimination in employment.

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

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

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

In addition, we must assure that

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

N. CONSUMER PROTECTION

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

- *quality standards, where feasible, for food and manufactured items;*
- *warranty standards* to guarantee that consumers are not cheated by shoddy or defective merchandise;
- full product labeling of relevant information affecting price and quality and price-per-unit labeling;
- strict truth-in-advertising measures to require that manufacturers are able to substantiate product performance claims.

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

- strong enforcement of existing laws;
- enforcement of stringent flammability standards for clothing;
- adequate research programs to anticipate potential hazards;
- additional automobile safety research;
- *expanded pre-market testing* for all new chemicals to elicit their general characteristics and environmental and health effects.

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

O. SENIOR CITIZENS

The condition of our senior citizens is a national tragedy. They are twice as likely as the rest of the

population to be poor. They spend 50% more of their income on housing than do other Americans. 1.6 million elderly Americans live in houses without basic plumbing. In spite of Medicare, only 65% of the medical bills of old people are covered by government health programs.

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

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

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

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

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

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

We need to protect American workers against the uncertainties presented by existing pension laws. The Pension Reform Act of 1974 was a good beginning, but there is much that remains to be done. We need strict enforcement of the laws that guarantee the financial integrity of pension funds and strict accountability for those who administer those funds. And we need to minimize the excessive paper work which often slows the distribution of benefits.

I know from the personal experience in my own family, when my mother served as a Peace Corps volunteer at age 68, the tremendous contribution that older Americans can make to themselves and to the world if they are treated with dignity and respect and are given the opportunity to serve. To those ends, this Party and I will always be dedicated.

3. Government Reorganization and Budget Reform

The basic difficulty facing American government today cuts across all the other campaign issues. The proliferation of programs and agencies, particularly in the past ten years, has inevitably created duplications, waste and inefficiency. There are over 83 federal housing programs, 228 federal health programs, and over 1,200 assorted commissions, councils, boards, committees, and the like.

We must give top priority to a drastic and thorough revision and *reorganization of the federal bureaucracy*, to its budgeting system and to the procedures for analyzing the effectiveness of its services. We must establish mechanisms to set our priorities more systematically and to weigh our spending decisions more carefully. The luxury of multiple agencies functioning within one policy area, often at cross purposes, is no longer available to us.

The reform I am seeking is *not* a retreat; it is a marshalling of our resources to meet the challenges of the last quarter of this Century. The problem is not that program goals are unworthy; it is not that our public servants are unfit. What is at fault is the unwieldy structure and frequently inefficient operation of the government: the layers of administration, the plethora of agencies, the proliferation of paperwork. If we are to succeed in other substantive policy areas, government must cease to be an obstacle to our efforts.

We have a finite amount of resources. They must not be squandered by inefficiency. Government cannot truly serve the people if it cannot operate effectively itself. Reorganization is not a dry exercise of moving around boxes in an organization chart. It is a creative venture toward the better direction of the energies and resources of our government.

The first step is to reshape the way we make federal spending decisions.

First, the federal government should be committed to *requiring zero-base budgeting by all federal agencies*. Each program, other than income support programs, such as Social Security, should be required to justify both its continued existence and its level of funding. We need to continue and expand programs that work and to discontinue those that do not. Without such a comprehensive review, it will be difficult to assess priorities and impossible to redirect expenditures away from areas showing relatively less success. Zero-base budgeting was one of my most important policy innovations in Georgia, and it has been adopted successfully in Illinois, New Jersey and New Mexico. It can work in the federal government.

Second, we must commit ourselves to a greater reliance upon *long-term planning budgets*. I proposed in my Economic Position Paper that we adopt a three year rolling budget technique to facilitate careful, long-term planning and budgeting. Too many of our spending decisions are focused just beyond our noses on next year's appropriations. "Uncontrollable" spending is only uncontrollable in the short run; spending can be controlled if the planning system builds in more lead time.

Third, reforming the budget process will not be enough unless we are also committed to insuring that programs are *carried out with efficiency*. Improving government's performance will require action on several levels. The Democratic Party should commit itself to undertaking the basic structural reforms necessary to streamline federal operations and to make the government efficient once again. *The number of federal agencies should be reduced to no more than 200*. Other management tools will be required to achieve an acceptable level of performance. We need *increased program evaluation*. Many programs fail to define with any specificity what they intend to accomplish.

Without that specification, evaluation by objective is impossible.

In Georgia, we applied rigorous performance standards and performance auditing. Such standards, which are working in state capitols around the nation and in successful businesses, should be imposed upon federal departments and agencies.

Finally, the federal government is ill-equipped to deal with a growing number of problems that transcend departmental jurisdictions. For example, foreign and domestic issues are becoming more interrelated; domestic prosperity and international relations are affected by our foreign agricultural policy, by international raw materials and oil policies, and by our export policies, among others. We must *develop a policy making machinery that transcends narrow perspectives*, that protects the vital interests of the United States, and that provides our citizens and the world with policies that are rational, consistent, and predictable.

Our first priority must be to build a well-managed structure of government — one that is efficient, economical, and compassionate and with systematically established priorities and predictable policies. Government must again become an effective instrument for achieving justice and meeting our critical national needs.

4. Foreign Affairs

In the past few years the world has changed greatly and the United States has learned several lessons. One is that we cannot and should not try to intervene militarily in the internal affairs of other countries unless our own security is endangered.

We have learned that we must not use the CIA or other covert means to effect violent change in any government or government policy.

We have learned the hard way how important it is during times of international stress to keep close ties with our allies and friends and to strive for multilateral agreements and solutions to critical problems.

Another lesson we have learned is that we cannot impose democracy on another country by force. We cannot buy friends, and it is obvious that other nations resent it if we try. Our interests lie in protecting our national security, in preventing war, in peacefully promoting the principles of human freedom and democracy, and in exemplifying in our foreign policy the true character and attitudes of the American people.

Finally, we have learned that every time we have made a serious mistake in recent years in our dealings with other nations, such as Cambodia, Vietnam, and Chile, the American people have been excluded from the process of evolving and consummating our foreign policy. Unnecessary secrecy surrounds the inner workings of our own government. Because we have let our foreign policy be made for us, we lost something crucial and precious in the way we talk and the way we act toward other peoples of the world.

In the future we must turn our attention increasingly towards the common problems of food, energy, environment, scarce resources, and trade. A stable world order cannot become a reality when people of many nations of

the world suffer mass starvation or when there are no established arrangements to deal with population growth, energy, or environmental quality. Better mechanisms for consultation on these problems that affect everyone on this planet must be established and utilized.

Our policies toward the developing countries need revisions. For years, we have either ignored them or treated them as pawns in the big power chess game. Both approaches were deeply offensive to their people. Our program of *international aid* to these nations should be redirected so that it *meets the human needs of the greatest number of people*. This means an emphasis on food, jobs, education, and public health, including access to family planning. In our trade relations with these nations, we should join commodity agreements in such items as tin, coffee and sugar.

We must *more closely coordinate our policy with our friends*, countries like the democratic states of Europe, North America and Japan — those countries which share with us common goals and aspirations. Our continued prosperity and welfare depend upon increased coordination of our policies.

The policy of East-West detente is under attack today because of the way it has been exploited by the Soviet Union. The American people were told detente would mean a "generation of peace," at no risk to the nation's vital interests. Yet, in places like Syria or Angola, in activities like offensive missile development, the Soviets seem to be taking advantage of the new relationship to expand their power and influence and to increase the risk of conflict.

I support the objectives of detente, but I cannot go along with the way it has been handled by Presidents Nixon and Ford. The Secretary of State has tied its success too closely to his personal reputation. As a result, he is giving up too much and asking for too little. He is trumpeting achievements on paper while failing to insist on them in practice.

The relationship of detente is one of both cooperation and competition, of new kinds of contacts in some areas along with continued hostility in others. In the troubled history of our relationships with the Soviet Union, this is where we have arrived. The benefits of detente must accrue to both sides, or they are worthless. Their mutual advantage must be apparent, or the American people will not support the policy.

To the Soviets, detente is an opportunity to continue the process of world revolution without running the threat of nuclear war. They have said so quite openly as recently as a month ago at their 25th Party Congress. To the Soviet Union, with our acquiescence, detente is surface tranquility in Europe within boundaries redefined to its benefit, together with support for wars of national liberation elsewhere. It is having the benefits of the Helsinki Accords without the requirement of living up to the human rights provisions which form an integral part of the Accords. This is not the road to peace but the bitter deception of the American people.

But while detente must become more reciprocal, I reject the strident and bellicose voices of those who would have this country return to the days of the cold war with the

Soviet Union. I believe the American people want to look to the future. They have seen the tragedy of American involvement in Vietnam and have drawn appropriate lessons for tomorrow. They seek new vistas, not a repetition of old rhetoric and old mistakes.

It is in our interest to try to make detente broader and more reciprocal. Detente can be an instrument for long-term peaceful change within the Communist system, as well as in the rest of the world. We should make it clear that detente requires that the Soviets, as well as the United States, refrain from irresponsible intervention in other countries. The Russians have no more business in Angola than we have.

The core of detente is the reduction of arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings on offensive weapons before both sides start a new arms race to reach the current maximums and before new missile systems are tested or committed for production.

Our vision must be of a more pluralistic world and not of a communist monolith. We must pay more attention to China and to Eastern Europe. It is in our interest and in the interest of world peace to promote a more pluralistic communist world.

We should remember that Eastern Europe is not an area of stability, and it will not become such until the Eastern European countries regain their independence and become part of a larger cooperative European framework. I am concerned over the long-range prospects for Rumanian and Yugoslavian independence, and I deplore the recent infliction upon Poland of a constitution that ratifies its status as a Soviet satellite. We must reiterate to the Soviets that an enduring American-Soviet detente cannot ignore the legitimate aspirations of other nations. We must likewise insist that the Soviet Union and other countries recognize the human rights of all citizens who live within their boundaries, whether they be blacks in Rhodesia, Asians in Uganda, or Jews in the Soviet Union.

Our relations with China are important to world peace, and they directly affect the world balance. The United States has a great stake in a nationally independent, secure, and friendly China. I believe that we should explore more actively the possibility of widening American-Chinese trade relations and of further consolidating our political relationships.

The Middle East is a key testing area for our capacity to construct a more cooperative international system. I believe deeply that the foundation of our Middle East policy must be insuring the safety and security of Israel. This country should never attempt to impose a settlement in Israel, nor should we force Israel to make territorial concessions which are detrimental to her security. We should attempt to promote direct negotiations between Israel and her Arab neighbors. Israel must be allowed to live within defensible borders. As President, I would never force Israel to give up control of the Golan Heights to the Syrians, nor would I recognize the Palestinian Liberation Organization or any other group purporting to represent the Palestinians when those organizations refuse to recognize Israel's right to exist in peace. The negotiations that will lead to permanent peace can only proceed on the basis of a *clear and absolute*

American commitment to insure Israel's security and survival as a Jewish State.

In the future we should make multilateral diplomacy a major part of our efforts so that other countries know the importance the United States attaches to international organizations. We should make a major effort at reforming and restructuring the U. N. systems. The intensity of interrelated problems is rapidly increasing, and it is likely that in the future the issues of war and peace will be more a function of economic and social problems than of the military security problems that have dominated international relations since 1945.

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

Without endangering the defense of our nation or our commitments to our allies, we can reduce present defense expenditures by about \$5 to \$7 billion annually. We must be hard-headed in the development of new weapons systems to insure that they will comport with our foreign policy objectives. Exotic weapons which serve no real function do not contribute to the defense of this country. The B-1 bomber is an example of a proposed system which should not be funded and would be wasteful of taxpayers' dollars. We have an Admiral for every seventeen ships. The Chief of Naval Operations has more captains and commanders on his own personal staff than serve in all the ships at sea.

The Pentagon bureaucracy is wasteful and bloated. We have more generals and admirals today than we did during World War II commanding a much smaller fighting force. We can thin our troops in Asia and close some unnecessary bases abroad.

We must get about the business of arms control. The Vladivostok Agreement set too high a ceiling on strategic nuclear weapon systems. *The SALT talks must get off of dead center.* The core of our dealings with the Soviet Union must be the mutual reduction in arms. We should negotiate to reduce the present SALT ceilings in offensive weapons before both sides start a new arms race to reach the current maximums and before new missile systems are tested or committed for production. I am not afraid of hard bargaining with the Soviet Union. Hard bargaining will strengthen support for the agreements that can be reached

and will show that we, as well as they, can gain from detente. We can increase the possibility that the fear of war and the burden of arms may be lifted from the shoulders of humanity by the nations that have done the most to place it there.

As I mentioned in detail at the United Nations, we need *firm and imaginative international action to limit the proliferation of nuclear weapons* and to place greater safeguards on the use of nuclear energy. The Democratic Party should put itself squarely on record as favoring a comprehensive test ban treaty prohibiting all nuclear explosives for a period of five years.

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

Finally, I think there are certain basic principles which should guide whatever is done in foreign lands in the name of this country. Our policies should be open and honest, shaped with the participation of Congress from the outset. Our policies should treat the people of other nations as individuals with the same dignity and respect we demand for ourselves. It must be the responsibility of the President to restore the moral authority of this country in its conduct of foreign policy. We should work for peace and the control of arms in everything we do. We should support the humanitarian aspirations of the world's peoples.

And our policies should be aimed at building a just and peaceful world order in which every nation can have a constructive role.

5. Conclusion

The proposals I have suggested are likely to remain simply proposals unless we have a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress. It is time to put petty differences aside and to unite as a Party to achieve these goals. Together we can lead this nation to a New Beginning as the United States starts its second two hundred years. Together we can have an open, compassionate, and effective government which will reflect the best qualities of the American people.



MINNESOTA HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Copyright in the Walter F. Mondale Papers belongs to the Minnesota Historical Society and its content may not be copied without the copyright holder's express written permission. Users may print, download, link to, or email content, however, for individual use.

To request permission for commercial or educational use, please contact the Minnesota Historical Society.



www.mnhs.org