



Office of

Herman Talmadge *of Georgia*

UNITED STATES SENATE

FOR RELEASE IN PMs
Monday, December 6, 1976

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT
James C. Webster (202) 224-2035

ADDRESS BY SENATOR HERMAN E. TALMADGE OF GEORGIA
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate
To the Sixth International Commodities Conference
Continental Plaza, Chicago, Ill., Monday, Dec. 6, 1976

You give me a big order today -- to discuss the legislative outlook for the agricultural sector.

But it is a challenge that I am honored to accept.

There is always great difficulty in predicting the future.

There are any number of commentators and columnists who rush in where the more cautious fear to tread.

I prefer the cautious approach.

There are any number of imponderables and uncertainties on the legislative agenda during the next session of Congress.

One of the greatest unknown factors, of course, is the nature of the legislative proposals we may see from the Carter Administration.

There are some things that we do know -- and much that we do not know.

It is essential, in discussing the legislative outlook for agriculture, that we know first where agriculture is today.

And one thing that we know for certain is that agriculture is big business today. It is enormous business. It is important business.

The American food and agriculture system is a 530-billion-dollar industry. That's about seven times the size of the automobile industry.

It involves up to 17 million workers. That makes our food system one of our nation's biggest employers.

And it makes the health of the agricultural sector most essential to the health of the American economy at large.

Our food system is also one of the most efficient in the world.

Today, our farmers produce 53 percent more crops on 6 percent fewer acres than did their fathers.

Today, the average U.S. factory worker pays 27 percent less of his hourly earnings for a loaf of white bread than he did 25 years ago.

Part of this is due to better productivity in the food marketing system. Much is due to improved production on the American farm.

Each of us has a stake in the continued strength of the American farm and food system.

One of the essential components of a healthy American food system is farm exports.

-2-

Ten years ago, farm exports represented about 16 percent of all farm cash receipts. Today, exports represent about 24 percent of cash farm receipts.

I am sure you appreciate the economies of scale made possible by a large volume of farm exports.

You know how exports contribute to the remarkable productivity of the American farmer.

But erratic foreign demand, and the disruptive buying of large state trading organizations can create real problems here at home.

Gyrating prices provide the farmer little confidence that he can recover his investment, much less make a profit on his labors.

All of this has made agriculture a "hot line" for discussion in the past few years.

In my career, there has never been more widespread interest in agricultural policy.

All of a sudden agriculture has hit the front page.

This new attention to agriculture has both a positive side and a negative side

There are some who view the farmer as getting rich at the expense of the consumer.

Others blame high food prices on the middleman.

And some would like to place the blame for higher food prices on foreign exports.

If there is a lesson to be drawn from the events of the last several years, it is that we are all in the same game.

It is that the farmer's loss, or the processor's loss, is everybody's loss.

We must make sure, therefore, that our food and agricultural policies provide a balance of all the interests affected by policy decisions.

We must put together some rules to insure that nobody is needlessly hurt. And the rules have to be based upon sound judgment -- not political expediency.

The Senate Committee on Agriculture and Forestry has tried to provide some balance between the sometimes competing interests in food and agricultural policy.

We have constructed farm programs that seek to assure a minimum level of income security and protection from disasters for farm producers.

We have developed a new organization and rules for the oversight of the multi-billion-dollar commodity futures trading industry.

We have made revisions in our basic foreign food assistance legislation to provide a greater response to humanitarian food needs abroad, appropriate to current resources.

We have developed legislation to revamp the food stamp program to insure that it benefits only those truly in need.

And we have enacted grain inspection reform legislation to weed out corruption in the inspection and weighing of grain.

The outlook for 1976 and beyond is less clear, but it is beginning to take a sharper focus.

The basic authority for our farm programs will expire at the end of the 1977 crop years.

So Congress must decide at what level to set price supports -- how high, or how low, we should set target prices and loan levels for cotton, wheat and feed grains.

Although price supports will not be the only component of farm policy on the agenda, it clearly will be one of the most important.

-3-

Likewise, it will be one of the most difficult.

Before Congress adjourned in October, I assigned the Senate Agriculture Committee staff to begin the research and drafting work on a new farm bill.

It is my intention to have that bill ready for Congress to look at when we convene again on January fourth.

There were two specific parts in the assignment:

First, that target prices for the three major commodities be set at the full cost of production.

Second, that loan rates be set at about 80 per cent of the cost of production.

Having said that, there are some complicating factors that we must address.

One is the matter of determining a reasonable estimate of the cost of producing a crop.

Obviously the costs vary widely. The cost of land varies widely. Yields range from low and inconsistent to high and reliable. There are many, many variables.

We can, however, determine with some precision the average cost of production in years past.

We have reasonably good estimates of 1974 production costs and should have accurate estimates of 1975 costs within the next few weeks. Even preliminary 1976 costs can be estimated soon.

From those figures we may be able to project, within a range of reason, the costs for 1977.

But we are charged with the job, in 1977, of writing a farm bill which will have its first impact on the crops of 1978.

And no one can predict with any certainty how much OPEC oil will cost -- or how much fertilizer will cost, or how much fertilizer farmers will be able to buy at any cost -- more than a year ahead.

But estimating farmers' production cost is only one of the factors we have to weigh.

We also must consider the cost to the taxpayer.

Just as farmers are pleased with the new freedoms they have achieved with the strong demand of the past few years, taxpayers have been pleased with the reduced cost of farm programs.

In 1972, the cost of all farm programs approached four billion dollars. Last year, the cost was about half a billion -- and most of that in disaster assistance.

I do not find it likely that Congress -- or the new Administration, for that matter -- would look kindly on a new farm bill with a price tag of four or five billion dollars.

Those are just two of the problems which we must resolve in the first few months of next year.

But even these are not the only elements of a new farm bill.

We have to make a decision about the level of dairy price supports -- and whether to require adjustments in the support level more than once a year.

Two important components of our food policy complex also run out next year -- the Food Stamp Program and the Food for Peace Program.

Authority to regulate pesticides also expires -- and we must examine that problem once more, and decide how the authority should be extended.

-4-

And we must look also at the important subject of agricultural research, which underlies all the important gains of American agriculture in modern times.

Agricultural research was easy to ignore when we produced far more than we could use. But shortages have created a new awareness of the need for a sound, strong research program.

We need to consider conservation programs in a similar light. We must assure the long-term productivity of land and its related resources.

The need for a sound food and agricultural policy is probably greater today than ever before. We have less room for error in an age of increasing population and stable or shrinking resources.

There are greater demands on our food productive capacity than ever before.

And there are ever-growing risks and ever-increasing costs associated with production of food and fiber.

As a nation, we cannot afford the luxury of chance.

We cannot afford the risk of assuming that there will always be enough to go around.

We cannot afford to take the chance that our agricultural economy will be strong forever. We must work to make it so.

We must use our policy-making powers -- at every level of our society -- to assure that it happens.

We have learned that we must respect the needs and problems of each of the components of our food system.

We have learned that we must deal with the uncertainties which threaten the stability of American agriculture.

We have learned that cooperation, rather than confrontation, must be the basis of agricultural policies.

The challenges before American agriculture have never been greater.

And, as Chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, I am glad to be in a position to help meet those challenges.

They are important challenges.

Those of us who serve as leaders in the area of food and agriculture have the opportunity to contribute to the most crucial need of mankind-- the assurance of an adequate and growing food supply.

#

HOLD FOR RELEASE UNTIL MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1976 AT 11:00 AM
CALL JOHN CARBAUGH OR JIM LUCIER AT (202) 224-6342

ADDRESS OF U.S. SENATOR JESSE HELMS BEFORE THE PUBLIC AFFAIRS
CLUB OF DALLAS, TEXAS, 12:00 NOON, MONDAY, NOVEMBER 15, 1976
LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

A NUMBER OF PEOPLE HAVE ASKED ME WHAT I THOUGHT OF
THE ELECTION. WELL, TO BE TRUTHFUL, I TRY NOT TO THINK
ABOUT THE ELECTION. IF YOU INDULGE ME AN UNDERSTATEMENT,
I WAS NOT THE LEAST BIT ENTHUSIASTIC ABOUT PRESIDENT-ELECT
CARTER. AND I THINK IT IS DEMONSTRABLE, AS WE STUDY THE
ELECTION RETURNS, THAT THE ENTHUSIASM OF A GREAT MANY
AMERICANS FOR PRESIDENT FORD EXTENDED ONLY AS FAR AS HIS
OWN ENTHUSIASM FOR THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM. WHEN I LOOK AT
THE FINAL PATTERN OF THE ELECTORAL VOTE DECISIONS WHICH WERE
MADE ON NOVEMBER 2, I CANNOT HELP FEELING THAT THE FINAL
OUTCOME WOULD HAVE BEEN MARKEDLY DIFFERENT IF GOVERNOR REAGAN
HAD BEEN THE REPUBLICAN NOMINEE.

FOR THE ASTONISHING TRUTH IS THAT MANY AMERICANS--
REPUBLICANS, DEMOCRATS, AND INDEPENDENTS--ASSUMED THAT MR. FORD
AND MR. CARTER WERE JUST ABOUT EQUALLY MATCHED IN THEIR

-2-

CONSERVATISM. THIS IS A FRIGHTENING MEASUREMENT OF JUST HOW BADLY THE AMERICAN PEOPLE CAN BE MISLED IN AN ELECTION YEAR.

PRESIDENT FORD IS A DECENT MAN, AND PERSONALLY A VERY LIKEABLE GENTLEMAN. I CAME TO KNOW HIM WELL WHEN HE WAS VICE PRESIDENT AND PRESIDED OVER THE SENATE. INDEED, I BELIEVE THAT HIS INSTINCTS ARE CONSERVATIVE, AS IS DEMONSTRATED BY HIS RECORD OF FIFTY-FIVE VETOES OF EXCESSIVE SPENDING ON THE PART OF CONGRESS, FORTY-FIVE OF WHICH WERE UPHELD, SAVING THE TAXPAYERS \$9.2 BILLION.

BUT PRESIDENT FORD WAS HAMSTRUNG BY HIS SEEMING INABILITY TO EMBRACE THE REPUBLICAN PLATFORM WHOLEHEARTEDLY, BY HIS RECORD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS, AND BY THE INESCAPABLE FACT THAT THE BIGGEST PEACETIME BUDGET DEFICITS IN HISTORY WERE GENERATED IN HIS OWN ADMINISTRATION. THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT DEFICITS WOULD HAVE BEEN EVEN HIGHER IF THE DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS HAD HAD ITS WAY, BUT THE FACT DID NOT ESCAPE PUBLIC NOTICE THAT THE FABULOUS DEFICITS DID TAKE PLACE UNDER HIS ADMINISTRATION.

-3-

IF YOU WERE WATCHING THE LIGHTS ON THE FAMOUS NBC MAP ON THE EVENING OF NOVEMBER 2, YOU WERE PROBABLY STRUCK, LIKE MOST OF US, AT THE GEOGRAPHIC DIVISION BETWEEN FORD'S SOLID WEST, AND CARTER'S SOLID SOUTH. THERE IS NO DOUBT IN MY MIND THAT GOVERNOR REAGAN WOULD HAVE CARRIED ALL OF THOSE SAME WESTERN STATES AND MANY OF THOSE IN THE SOUTH.

DO YOU NOT AGREE, FOR EXAMPLE, THAT THE GREAT STATE OF TEXAS WOULD HAVE BEEN WITHIN THE REPUBLICAN CAMP IF GOVERNOR REAGAN HAD BEEN THE NOMINEE?

AND WHAT ABOUT THE STATES OF MISSISSIPPI, WHERE EXPERTS HAVE SAID THAT A SHIFT OF 6,000 VOTES IN THAT STATE, ALONG WITH TEXAS, WOULD HAVE CHANGED THE OUTCOME OF THE ELECTION?

NO DOUBT YOU WERE STRUCK, ALL EVENING LONG, HOW STATE AFTER STATE WAS TEETERING, HOUR AFTER HOUR, ON A 50-50 SPLIT. THE AMERICAN PEOPLE WERE UNABLE TO MAKE UP THEIR MINDS ABOUT THE FORD-CARTER CONTEST--AND I DON'T THINK THAT THEY HAVE MADE UP THEIR MINDS YET.

-4-

I DON'T KNOW EXACTLY WHAT TO THINK ABOUT PRESIDENT-ELECT CARTER EXCEPT THAT HE DOES EMBRACE THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM, A PLATFORM WHICH HAS BEEN THE WELL-WORN FOUNDATION STONE OF DEMOCRATIC CONGRESSES AND BUREAUCRATS FOR DECADES. THERE IS EVERY REASON TO BELIEVE--OR RATHER, I SHOULD SAY, TO FEAR--THAT CARTER AS PRESIDENT WILL IMPLEMENT WHAT THE DEMOCRATIC CONVENTION PROMISED. FOR THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM IS EVERYTHING THAT THE NATIONAL DEMOCRATS HAVE ALWAYS DONE WHEN THEY HAVE HAD THE POWER, AND THERE IS NO QUESTION THAT THEY HAVE THE POWER TO DO IT NOW.

IF YOU LOOK AT THE STATES WON BY CARTER, YOU SEE THAT THEY ARE BASICALLY OF TWO TYPES. THERE ARE, OF COURSE, THE SOUTHERN STATES; AND THEN THERE ARE SOME OF THE BIG CITY INDUSTRIAL STATES. AT FIRST THIS LOOKS LIKE ANOTHER COALITION OF CONTRADICTORY INTERESTS, AND TO A CERTAIN EXTENT IT IS. BUT THE COMMON DENOMINATOR IN BOTH IS THE MANIPULATION OF THE ELECTORATE IN BOTH KINDS OF STATES TO TURN OUT, ON A MACHINE-LIKE BASIS, THE BLOCK-VOTE AND THE SPECIAL-INTEREST VOTE.

-5-

THE POWER OF THE BIG-CITY UNION BOSSES WAS VERY USEFULLY PUT TO WORK THROUGHOUT THE NATION. BIG SPENDING, WELL-ORGANIZED CAMPAIGNS TO GET OUT THE VOTE--CONCENTRATING, OF COURSE, IN THE DEMOCRATIC PRECINCTS--SHOWED THE MUSCLE OF UNION POWER. NOW EVERYONE KNOWS THAT ONLY A MINORITY OF WORKERS IN THIS NATION BELONG TO UNIONS; THE MAJORITY OF WORKERS ARE NOT UNION MEMBERS AND ARE NOT SUBJECT TO DIRECT MANIPULATION OF UNION BOSSES. I AM FAR FROM CONVINCED THAT THE RANK AND FILE UNION MEMBER HIMSELF SUPPORTS THE LEFTIST POLICIES OF POLITICIANS BACKED BY THE LABOR BOSSES.

NONETHELESS, PRESIDENT FORD OBVIOUSLY DID NOT GIVE THE MAJORITY OF WORKERS ANY CLEAR REASON WHY THEY SHOULD VOTE FOR HIM. SO THEY WERE CARRIED ALONG WITH THE JUGGERNAUT OF THE UNION BOSSES, TOO.

IT HAS ALSO BEEN A WELL-PUBLICIZED FACT THAT PRESIDENT-ELECT CARTER RECEIVED 92% OF THE BLACK VOTE, EVEN MORE THAN SENATOR MCGOVERN GOT IN 1972. THERE IS NO INHERENT REASON WHY BLACKS SHOULD OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT CARTER

-6-

OVER FORD IF YOU BASE YOUR ANALYSIS ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT ANY CROSS SECTION OF THE BLACK COMMUNITY WILL HAVE THE SAME ASPIRATIONS AS ANY CROSS SECTION OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AT LARGE. BUT IF YOU BASE YOUR ANALYSIS ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT A POLITICIAN SHOULD USE THE POWER OF HIS OFFICE TO TAKE AWAY FROM THE COMMUNITY AT LARGE AND REWARD THOSE WHO VOTE FOR HIM AS A BLOC, THEN DO YOU NOT HAVE A REASONABLE EXPLANATION FOR THE 92% PHENOMENON? SUCH A REDISTRIBUTION CAN ONLY BE ACCOMPLISHED BY TAKING THE EARNINGS AND SAVINGS OF THE MIDDLE CLASS, THEREBY CREATING GREAT TENSIONS IN OUR SOCIETY.

NOW THE SOUTHERN STATES SHOULD, IN REALITY, BE OPPOSED TO BLOC VOTING AND UNION-MACHINE VOTING. YET IN THE SAME STATES WHERE UNION MONEY WAS GETTING OUT THE BLOC VOTE, MANY PEOPLE WENT TO THE POLLS AND VOTED FOR CARTER THINKING THAT HE REPRESENTED SOUTHERN VALUES AND CONSERVATIVE THINKING.

-7-

IN MY STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, MY GOOD FRIEND AND FORMER COLLEAGUE, SENATOR SAM ERVIN, BLANKETED THE STATE WITH RADIO SPOTS IN THE LAST DAYS OF THE CAMPAIGN. NOW SENATOR SAM IS VIEWED AS A CONSERVATIVE IN OUR STATE, AND WHEN HE SAID THAT JIMMY CARTER IS A CONSERVATIVE, A GREAT MANY PEOPLE BELIEVED HIM. WHEN SENATOR SAM SAID THAT JIMMY CARTER ADVOCATES A BALANCED BUDGET, MANY PEOPLE BELIEVED HIM. SENATOR ERVIN AND I HAVE AGREED ON MANY THINGS IN THE PAST, AND DISAGREED ON OTHERS. I DON'T THINK THAT CARTER'S ADVOCATING A BALANCED BUDGET IN 1981 MEANS THE ADVOCATE BELIEVES IN FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY. I HAPPEN TO THINK IT MERELY MEANS THAT THE PRESIDENT-ELECT UNDERSTANDS THAT PEOPLE LIKE THE CONCEPT OF A BALANCED BUDGET, BUT HE DOESN'T WANT TO BE HAMSTRUNG IN HIS SPENDING PLANS BY WORKING FOR A BALANCED BUDGET NOW. HE HAS CONVENIENTLY SET THE DAY OF RECKONING TO COME JUST AFTER THE SECOND AND LAST ELECTION FOR WHICH HE IS ELIGIBLE. THUS THE PRESIDENT-ELECT HAS OBTAINED ALL THE VOTE-GETTING BENEFITS OF

-8-

ADVOCATING A BALANCED BUDGET, WHILE POSTPONING THE RESPONSIBILITIES UNTIL HE IS NO LONGER ACCOUNTABLE TO THE PEOPLE. SENATOR SAM MAY THINK THIS MAKES JIMMY CARTER A CONSERVATIVE, BUT I DO NOT AGREE.

QUITE FRANKLY, I AM AFRAID THAT MOST CITIZENS NEVER BOTHERED TO READ THE PLATFORMS OF THE TWO MAJOR PARTIES. AND SO, WHILE THE SPECIAL INTERESTS KNEW WHAT THEY WERE VOTING FOR, I WONDER IF THE REST OF THE PEOPLE DID.

MOREOVER, PRESIDENT FORD WAS HANDICAPPED BY HIS RECORD IN FOREIGN AFFAIRS. LET'S BE BLUNT ABOUT IT: HE WAS PULLED DOWN BY SECRETARY OF STATE HENRY KISSINGER.

THERE IS A TENDENCY IN THE UNITED STATES TO PLACE FOREIGN POLICY ABOVE PARTISAN DEBATE, AS THOUGH THERE WERE UNIVERSAL AGREEMENT ABOUT THE CONDUCT OF AMERICAN INTERESTS ABROAD. YET, UNDER BOTH PARTIES, OUR FOREIGN POLICY HAS DRIFTED FURTHER AND FURTHER AWAY FROM THE CLEARLY DEFINED OBJECTIVES, CREATING DOUBT THAT THE SURVIVAL, INDEPENDENCE,

-9-

AND THE NUMBER 1 LEADERSHIP ROLE OF THE UNITED STATES ARE AMONG ITS PARAMOUNT PRIORITIES.

SECRETARY OF STATE KISSINGER'S VAUNTED PROGRAM OF DETENTE HAS CONSISTED PRIMARILY OF WITHDRAWING THE UNITED STATES FROM AN INDEPENDENT ROLE, AND COMPROMISING OUR INTERESTS AND FREEDOM. ALTHOUGH NO ONE SEEKS TO INVOLVE THE UNITED STATES IN WAR, KISSINGER'S PROGRAM HAS CONSISTED OF SELLING OUT THE WEST WHENEVER IT MEANT CHALLENGING THE COMMUNISTS TO ANY DEGREE.

THE AMERICAN PEOPLE HAVE SENSED THIS AND REACTED ACCORDINGLY. THE REPUBLICAN PARTY PLATFORM'S "MORALITY IN FOREIGN POLICY" PLANK WAS INTENDED AS A REBUKE TO KISSINGER AND WAS GENERALLY INTERPRETED AS SUCH. IT WAS KISSINGER WHO ADVISED PRESIDENT FORD NOT TO SEE ALEXANDER SOLZHENITSYN, THAT BEACON OF HOPE AND FREEDOM, FOR FEAR OF OFFENDING THE SOVIETS. AND IT WAS KISSINGER WHO DEVISED THE NONSENSICAL THEORY THAT EASTERN EUROPE WAS NOT UNDER SOVIET DOMINATION,

-10-

CREATING THE PITFALL THAT SWALLOWED UP THE PRESIDENT IN THE SECOND DEBATE. HOW MANY VOTES WERE LOST BY THE PRESIDENT'S REMARKS IN THE SWING STATE OF OHIO, WHERE THERE ARE MANY THOUSANDS OF CITIZENS WITH A SECOND HERITAGE FROM EASTERN EUROPE, AND WHO KNOW THE TRUE STORY FROM THEIR RELATIVES LEFT BEHIND? DO YOU THINK THAT MAYBE 4,000 OF THESE AMERICANS SWITCHED TO CARTER AFTER THE SECOND DEBATE? IF SO, IT IS WORTH NOTING THAT A SWITCH OF ONLY 3,539 VOTES WOULD HAVE CARRIED OHIO FOR PRESIDENT FORD, AND, COUPLED WITH MISSISSIPPI OR EVEN SMALL HAWAII, WOULD HAVE WON THE ELECTION.

AND WAS THE PRESIDENT'S POSITION BOLSTERED OR HARMED BY KISSINGER'S FRENETIC EFFORTS TO DESTROY THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT IN THE CLOSING WEEKS OF THE CAMPAIGN? IF IT WERE AN EFFORT TO ATTRACT THE BLACK VOTE IN THE UNITED STATES, THE STARK ARITHMETIC OF NOVEMBER 2 DEMONSTRATES THAT IT WAS SINGULARLY WITHOUT ANY REDEEMING SUCCESS WHATSOEVER.

-11-

WHAT KISSINGER DID WAS TO APPLY ENORMOUS INTERNATIONAL PRESSURES AND THREATS TO A STABLE AND PEACEFUL GOVERNMENT TO BREAK ITS WILL, OPENING UP THE DOOR TO CHAOS AND RUIN. AND THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT, I MIGHT ADD, IS ONE THAT HAS CONSTANTLY AND REPEATEDLY EXTENDED ITS HAND OF FRIENDSHIP TO THE UNITED STATES.

KISSINGER DEALT ONLY WITH SELF-APPOINTED REVOLUTIONARY SPOKESMEN, MANY WITH A CLOSE DEPENDENCE UPON COMMUNIST SUPPORT, MEN WITH NO REAL ORGANIC RELATIONSHIP WITH THE MAJOR TRIBAL DIVISIONS AMONG THE BLACK PEOPLE. A TRANSFER OF POWER TO THE MINORITY OF REVOLUTIONARIES UNDER ANY CIRCUMSTANCES WILL NOT BRING ABOUT MAJORITY RULE; IT WILL BRING ABOUT YET ONE MORE BLACK MINORITY DICTATORSHIP, THE EXPULSION OF WHITE RHODESIANS, AND THE SLAUGHTER OF HUNDREDS OF THOUSANDS OF BLACKS. AND ALONG WITH THE TRAGIC LOSS OF LIFE AND FREEDOM, THE STRATEGIC IMPORTANCE OF RHODESIAN CHROME AND OTHER MINERALS WILL BE LOST TO THE WEST.

-12-

KISSINGER MUST HAVE KNOWN THIS, BECAUSE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE BITTERLY OPPOSED TO MEDDLING IN AFRICA. AN OPINION RESEARCH CORPORATION POLL, TAKEN SHORTLY BEFORE KISSINGER'S INTERVENTION, SHOWED THAT 66% OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE SAID WE SHOULD STAY OUT. YET KISSINGER DEFIED THE AMERICAN PEOPLE AND INTERVENED.

IT IS THE SAME SITUATION WITH KISSINGER'S PLAN TO GIVE AWAY THE PANAMA CANAL. THE PANAMA CANAL IS SOVEREIGN UNITED STATES TERRITORY. UNDER THE U.S. CONSTITUTION, THE POWER OF DISPOSING OF U.S. TERRITORY AND PROPERTY IS VESTED SOLELY IN CONGRESS. THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH CANNOT BEGIN NEGOTIATIONS RELATING TO THE DISPOSAL OF U.S. TERRITORY OR PROPERTY WITHOUT PRIOR INSTRUCTIONS FROM CONGRESS.

WHEN GOVERNOR REAGAN RAISED THIS ISSUE IN THE PRIMARIES, IT ELECTRIFIED THE VOTERS, AND WAS A MAJOR FACTOR IN THE GOVERNOR'S VICTORIES. THIS WAS NOT SURPRISING, INASMUCH AS ANOTHER POLL BY OPINION RESEARCH SHOWED THAT 75% OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE OPPOSED THE SURRENDER OF THE PANAMA CANAL.

-13-

YET KISSINGER CONTINUED TO PRESS THE PANAMA CANAL ISSUE EVEN THOUGH IT WAS BOTH UNPOPULAR AND WRONG. JUST A FEW DAYS BEFORE THE ELECTION, HE SENT AMBASSADOR BUNKER BACK DOWN TO PANAMA TO REOPEN THE NEGOTIATIONS. THINK OF IT--LESS THAN A WEEK BEFORE THE ELECTION, AND HE REOPENS ONE OF THE MOST EMOTIONAL ISSUES IN AMERICAN POLITICS.

AS A RESULT, A U.S. CITIZEN EMPLOYED IN THE CANAL ZONE HAS FILED A SUIT TO STOP THESE ILLEGAL NEGOTIATIONS. I AM PLEASED TO ANNOUNCE TODAY THAT A GROUP OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HAVE JOINED WITH ME AS INTERVENORS IN THIS SUIT TO REASSERT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS OF CONGRESS UNDER ARTICLE IV, SECTION 3, TO HAVE SOLE AUTHORITY OVER THE DISPOSITION OF U.S. TERRITORY AND PROPERTY. THOSE JOINING WITH ME ARE SENATOR JAMES McCLURE, CONGRESSMAN GENE SNYDER, CONGRESSMAN DAN FLOOD, AND CONGRESSMAN LARRY McDONALD. IT MAY BE TOO LATE TO UNDO THE DAMAGE KISSINGER

-14-

HAS ALREADY DONE, BUT AT LEAST WE CAN STOP ANY FUTURE ADMINISTRATION FROM CONTINUING THE PROCESS OF UNILATERALLY SURRENDERING OUR TERRITORY. WE INTEND TO CARRY THIS FIGHT TO THE SUPREME COURT, AND WE EXPECT TO WIN.

YOU CANNOT EXPECT TO DEFY THE WILL OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ON ISSUES THAT ARE REGARDED AS MORAL ISSUES, AND EXPECT TO WIN AN ELECTION. YET PRESIDENT FORD, PURSUING THE CONTORTED LOGIC OF HENRY KISSINGER, ATTEMPTED TO JUSTIFY THESE ACTIONS WITH CAMPAIGN RHETORIC BEFORE A PUBLIC THAT ALREADY DEEPLY SUSPECTS THE KISSINGER NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE SOVIET UNION. YOU CANNOT COMPROMISE PRINCIPLE IN POLITICS AND HOLD THE TRUST OF THE PEOPLE. THE PRESIDENT'S STAND ON PRINCIPLE IN OTHER AREAS WAS SEVERELY COMPROMISED BY THE KISSINGER CONCESSIONS IN FOREIGN POLICY, AND TENDED TO BLUR THE DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE TWO PRESIDENTIAL FRONT-RUNNERS,

-15-

BOTH THE PRESIDENT AND THE PRESIDENT-ELECT APPEARED TO THE ELECTORATE AS AMBIGUOUS AND CONTRADICTORY FIGURES, MAKING THE DECISION BETWEEN THEM DIFFICULT FOR THE CONSCIENTIOUS, AND TURNING THE DECISIVE AUTHORITY OVER TO THE SPECIAL INTERESTS AND THE BLOC VOTE.

IN THE SENATORIAL CONTESTS, WHENEVER INCUMBENT LIBERALS WERE CHALLENGED BY FORTHRIGHT CONSERVATIVES AND MODERATE CONSERVATIVES, THE CONSERVATIVES WON. THUS ORRIN HATCH WON AGAINST FRANK MOSS IN UTAH. HARRISON SCHMITT WON AGAINST JOSEPH MONTOYA IN NEW MEXICO. S. I. HAYAKAWA WON AGAINST JOHN TUNNEY IN CALIFORNIA. MALCOLM WALLOP WON AGAINST GALE MCGEE IN WYOMING. DICK LUGAR WON AGAINST VANCE HARTKE IN INDIANA. FOUR CONSERVATIVE INCUMBENTS, ON THE OTHER HAND, HAD NO TROUBLE RETAINING THEIR OFFICE: HARRY BYRD IN VIRGINIA EASILY TORPEDOED ADMIRAL ZUMWALT, THE LIBERAL; BILL ROTH BEAT HIS CHALLENGER THOMAS MALONEY; AND TWO OTHER CONSERVATIVES, JOHN STENNIS OF MISSISSIPPI AND BOB BYRD OF WEST VIRGINIA WERE

-16-

UNOPPOSED. IN NEW YORK, A SPLENDID CONSERVATIVE INCUMBENT, JIM BUCKLEY, WENT DOWN TO DEFEAT, OPPOSED BY DANIEL MOYNIHAN, A LIBERAL WHO WRAPPED HIMSELF IN TOUGH-TALKING CONSERVATIVE RHETORIC.

WHAT DO WE LEARN FROM THIS? WE LEARN THAT FIVE LIBERALS WERE OUSTED BY CONSERVATIVES, WHILE FOUR CONSERVATIVES KEPT THEIR SEATS. JIM BUCKLEY--IN THE TOUGHEST STATE OF ALL--WENT DOWN TO NARROW DEFEAT. I PREDICT THAT IN THE FORTHCOMING CONGRESS, THE LIBERALS WILL BE MORE LIBERAL, BUT THE CONSERVATIVES WILL BE MORE CONSERVATIVE. THE CONSERVATIVES ALSO HAVE A NET GAIN OF TWO OR THREE SEATS.

THIS IS BY NO MEANS THE MILLENNIUM, HOWEVER, FOR CONSERVATIVES MUST ORGANIZE NOW--NOT IN 1977, BUT NOW, IN THE LAST TWO MONTHS OF 1976--FOR EVEN GREATER VICTORY IN 1978. LET ME ASSURE YOU THAT THE UNION BOSSES HAVE ALREADY BEGUN TO ORGANIZE. THEY HAVE THE ORGANIZATION, THE SYSTEM,

-17-

AND ARE ALREADY RAISING THE FUNDS. I HAVE BEEN TOLD,
FOR EXAMPLE, THAT I AM A MARKED MAN, THAT I HAVE BEEN
SELECTED AS THE NUMBER ONE NATIONAL TARGET IN 1978 BY
ORGANIZED UNION BOSSES BECAUSE OF MY STAND FOR
CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES, AND THE POLITICAL BOSSES IN
MY STATE HAVE ALREADY HELD PRESS CONFERENCES TO ANNOUNCE
THAT THEIR MAJOR GOAL IS TO ELIMINATE ME IN TWO YEARS.
WELL, I SAY, LET THEM COME. MAYBE I'M WRONG, BUT I'VE
GOT TO BELIEVE THAT THE PEOPLE OF NORTH CAROLINA ARE
MORE INTERESTED IN PRINCIPLE THAN THEY ARE IN SPECIAL-
INTEREST POLITICS.

IT IS TIME THAT THE PEOPLE OF ALL THE STATES, THE
WAGE-EARNERS AND THE PRODUCERS WHO ARE THE SOURCE OF OUR

-18-

ABUNDANT LIFE, SHOULD JOIN TOGETHER IN A GREAT MOVEMENT AGAINST GIVEAWAYS AND BLOC VOTING. POLL AFTER POLL HAS SHOWN THAT THE MAJORITY OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE ARE CONSERVATIVE. THERE ARE, INDEED, NUMERICALLY MORE CONSERVATIVES IN THE DEMOCRATIC PARTY THAN IN THE REPUBLICAN PARTY; YET THE LEADERSHIP OF BOTH PARTIES HAS NOT APPEALED TO THEIR LEGITIMATE HOPES AND ASPIRATIONS. I BELIEVE THAT NOW, MORE THAN EVER, THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MUST BE TRANSFORMED TO A BROAD-BASED CONSERVATIVE PARTY WHICH WILL BRING ALL OF THE WORKERS AND PRODUCERS INTO ONE CAMP, AND LEAVE THE SPECIAL INTERESTS AND THE SELF-SEEKERS TO THE LIBERALS.

THE REPUBLICAN PARTY MUST BE RESTRUCTURED TO REPRESENT THE MAJORITY CONSTITUENCY OF WORKERS AND PRODUCERS. THE PRESENT DECLINE OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY SPANS THE PERIOD FROM FORD TO FORD, THAT IS, FROM THE TIME OF THE ELECTION OF JERRY FORD AS MINORITY LEADER IN THE HOUSE--BASED ON A PROGRAM OF SO-CALLED "PRAGMATIC" RESPONSE TO DEMOCRATIC INITIATIVES--

-19-

TO THE DEFEAT OF JERRY FORD AS PRESIDENT TWO WEEKS AGO.

WE NOW HAVE THE FEWEST NUMBER OF REPUBLICAN MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES THAT WE HAVE HAD SINCE THE REPUBLICAN DEBACLES OF 1936 AND 1964. AS RECENTLY AS THE 1970 ELECTIONS, REPUBLICANS HELD THIRTY-TWO GOVERNORSHIPS; AS A RESULT OF THIS YEAR'S ELECTIONS, THEY NOW HOLD JUST TWELVE. THIS PRECIPITOUS DECLINE COINCIDES WITH THE FLIGHT OF MANY REPUBLICAN OFFICEHOLDERS AND PROFESSIONALS FROM DEDICATION TO SOUND PRINCIPLES, AND THE ADOPTION OF AN INEFFECTUAL "PRAGMATIC" PHILOSOPHY. THE PEOPLE'S LOSS OF CONFIDENCE IN POLITICIANS OCCURS IN DIRECT PROPORTION TO THE FAILURE OF THOSE POLITICIANS TO STAND BY THE PHILOSOPHY THEY PROMISE.

IT IS TIME NOW FOR THE PARTY TO RETURN TO CONSERVATIVE PRINCIPLES. CONSERVATIVES REPRESENT THE VAST MAJORITY OF THE PARTY TODAY. LET ME ISSUE THIS CALL: CONSERVATIVES, AND I COUNT MYSELF AS ONE, MUST ORGANIZE TO TAKE BACK THE MACHINERY OF THE PARTY, FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE REPUBLICAN NATIONAL

-20-

COMMITTEE ON DOWN. THE RNC STAFF SHOULD BE THOROUGHLY REORGANIZED TO CHANGE A PAPER-SHUFFLING BUREAUCRACY INTO A TIGHTLY COORDINATED GROUP DEVELOPING ISSUES AND PROGRAMS BASED ON PRINCIPLE. WE SHOULD BE READY TO RE-EVALUATE EVERYTHING CONNECTED WITH THE PAST DECADE OF FAILURE, INCLUDING EVEN THE VERY NAME OF THE REPUBLICAN PARTY ITSELF.

BUT EVEN THAT IS NOT ENOUGH. WE CANNOT ALLOW OURSELVES TO BE A PARTY WHICH IS ACTIVE ONLY IN A PRESIDENTIAL YEAR. WE MUST BECOME A DYNAMIC PARTY NOW. SPOKESMEN SHOULD BE APPOINTED TO SPEAK OUT ON PARTY PRINCIPLES, AND TO CHALLENGE THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION WHEN THE ADMINISTRATION DEPARTS FROM SOUND PHILOSOPHY. WE SHOULD DEVELOP A "SHADOW GOVERNMENT," A CABINET OF COORDINATED SPOKESMEN PREPARED TO USE THE RESEARCH AND MATERIALS GENERATED BY THE REVITALIZED NATIONAL COMMITTEE AND BY CONSERVATIVE, KNOWLEDGEABLE EXPERTS AND INSTITUTIONS PROPERLY ORIENTED TO SOUND PRINCIPLES. WE MUST NOT LET THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION GET AWAY WITH ANYTHING UNCHALLENGED.

-21-

WE MUST GIVE THE AMERICAN PEOPLE A REAL CHOICE RIGHT NOW,
RATHER THAN WAITING UNTIL 1980.

ACCORDINGLY, THE PARTY SHOULD PLAN TO HOLD A SPECIAL
CONVENTION WITHIN THE NEXT TWO YEARS, TO DEFINE THE ISSUES
RAISED BY THE CARTER ADMINISTRATION'S POLICIES, AND TO FOCUS
NATIONAL ATTENTION UPON OUR PRINCIPLES. ALTHOUGH THE CONGRESS
WILL NO DOUBT CONTINUE TO BE THE MAIN FORUM FOR DEBATING
NATIONAL POLICY, WE NEED TO BRING TOGETHER THE PEOPLE FROM
THE GRASS ROOTS, AND FROM THE STATE PARTY ORGANIZATIONS SO
THAT THE CITIZENS AT LARGE CAN SEE OUR PARTY IN ACTION.

FINALLY, WE MUST BEGIN IN EACH STATE TO FIND PROPER
CANDIDATES WHERE THE INCUMBENTS ARE LIBERALS, AND WE MUST MOVE
TO HELP CONSERVATIVE INCUMBENTS IMMEDIATELY. THE BEST WAY FOR
INCUMBENT CONSERVATIVES TO DISSUADE LIBERAL OPPONENTS IS TO BE
READY, EARLY IN THE GAME, WITH APPROPRIATE FINANCING AND
ORGANIZATION. WE MUST BEGIN NOW TO RAISE FUNDS AND TO ORGANIZE.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN, THE ELECTION IS OVER, BUT THE

-22-

ELECTION IS JUST BEGINNING. CONSERVATIVES MUST TAKE HEART
FROM THE GAINS THEY HAVE CHALKED UP, AND THEY MUST BE READY
TO WIN OVER VOTERS WHO THOUGHT THEY WERE VOTING CONSERVATIVE
THIS TIME. CONSERVATISM HAS COME OF AGE, AND NOW THE TASK OF
LEADERSHIP MUST BEGIN.

NEWS RELEASE

Jesse Helms

United States Senator

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE
CONTACT: JOHN CARBAUGH OR CLINT FULLER (202) 224-6342
NOVEMBER 15, 1976

DALLAS: . . . U.S. Senator Jesse Helms of North Carolina today called for conservatives to take back the machinery of the Republican Party.

In a speech to the Public Affairs Club of Dallas, Texas, a non-partisan luncheon group interested in public affairs, Helms said: "Let me issue this call: Conservatives, and I count myself as one, must organize to take back the machinery of the Party, from the Chairman of the Republican National Committee on down. The RNC staff should be thoroughly reorganized to change a paper-shuffling bureaucracy into a coordinated group developing issues and programs based on philosophy.

"But even that is not enough," Helms continued. "We cannot allow ourselves to be a party which is active only in a Presidential year. We must become a dynamic Party now. Spokesmen should be appointed to speak out on Party principles and to challenge the Carter Administration when that Administration departs from sound philosophy."

Developing the theme, Helms called for a revitalized National Committee "with coordinated spokesmen prepared to use the research and materials generated by conservative, knowledgeable experts and institutions properly oriented to sound principle. Education is the name of the game--the people must understand the role their government has played in creating inflation, controlling their lives, and destroying their freedoms. We

Page two

November 15, 1976

must give the American people a real choice right now, rather than waiting until 1980."

In order to clearly lay out positions and philosophy, Helms called on the GOP to hold a special convention. "The Party should plan to hold a special convention within the next two years, to define the issues raised by the Carter Administration's policies, and to focus national attention upon our principles. We need to bring together the people from the grass roots, and from State party organizations so that the citizens at large can see our Party in action," Helms said.

The Helms speech, an analysis of the recent Presidential and federal elections, and a call to action for conservatives, was delivered in the wake of mounting speculation about the future direction that the Republican Party will take after its November loss of the White House.

During the speech, Helms announced that he and a number of Members of Congress have joined as intervenors in a lawsuit which seeks to reassert the Constitutional rights of Congress under Article IV, Section 3, of the U.S. Constitution to have sole rights and authority over the disposition of U.S. property. The suit, initially brought by Canal Zone labor official, William Drummond, seeks to bar the President, the Secretary of State and their negotiators from carrying on any negotiations which would give away U.S. ownership and control of the Panama Canal. Negotiations on other issues would not be barred, only those dealing with the relinquishing of U.S. sovereignty.

Joining with Helms as intervenors are the following: Senator James McClure (R-Idaho); Congressman Dan Flood (D-Pa.); Congressman Gene Snyder (R-Ky.); and Congressman Larry McDonald (D-Ga.).

#####