

Debate Issues [1]

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Debate Issues [1]; Container 79

To See Complete Finding Aid:

http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf

FORD'S ECONOMIC RECORD

Unemployment When Ford entered the White House there were 5 million people unemployed and today there are 7.5 million unemployed - a 50% increase. Unemployment has risen in the last 3 months from 7.3% to 7.9%. There has been no progress against unemployment because the 7.9% rate of unemployment today is the same as it was 20 months ago.

Inflation The 6% inflation rate today is higher than any rate under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy or Johnson. Mr. Ford has cut the rate of inflation from the highest in 50 years to the highest in 25 years. During the entire period from 1949 through 1969 - war years and peace years - the inflation rate averaged only 2% a year.

Private Employment There are fewer private non-farm jobs today (64.2 million in August 1976) than there were when Ford took office (64.5 million in August 1974.)

Deficits Mr. Ford's budget deficit last year of \$65 billion (FY 1976) was the largest single deficit in our 200 year history. (note that the deficit he proposed was \$52 billion) The public debt under Ford is more than one-third of that amassed during the history of our country.

Paycheck The real value of the worker's paycheck is less today than it was in 1968.

Housing starts are lower today (1,387,000 units) than there were in 1968 (1,500,000 units). Housing starts have fallen by 2% - from 1,417,000 units in March to 1,387,000 units in July 1976. The cost of the average new home today is \$16,000 more than it was in 1968.

WELFARE REFORM

Q.: Governor, you've given us the broad outlines of your plan to hold spending within the confines^{of} a balanced budget. But what about the specifics of welfare reform? We've been talking about welfare reform for years, everyone promises to do it, but nothing ever happens. What are your specific plans and what are the costs?

ANSWER:

First, the present welfare system is a mess and an outrage. It encourages people not to work. It demeans recipients. It destroys families. And it wastes enormous amounts of money. We cannot continue as a country to live with the current welfare mess which is wasteful to taxpayers and demeaning to recipients.

--Despite these problems that everyone acknowledges, the Republican Administration has done next to nothing to clean up the mess. Administrative costs have doubled since 1972. A quarter of all welfare payments go to people who are ineligible for the program or who should receive smaller payments. There are 400,000 middle-level bureaucrats who process forms for over 100 welfare programs. These administrative costs drain off 1 dollar out of every 8 dollars intended for those in need. There is a welfare worker for roughly every 10 recipients.

As President, I would propose to solve the welfare mess by first consolidating the maze of programs we now have, ending duplication and overlap. Some families now participate in multiple programs, illegally pyramiding benefits, so that some people receive up to \$10,000 or more, tax free, as a result of getting welfare, food stamps, housing assistance and Medicaid. It should never be more beneficial to be on welfare than to work.

--No one who can work should be permitted to remain indefinitely on welfare. But now about 1.3 million welfare recipients have nothing wrong with them physically or mentally. We need a requirement that they be trained and then offered a job. If they don't take a job, I would not want to pay them any more benefits.

--The vast majority on welfare, who cannot work, should be treated with decency and respect. There should be a single basic benefit that is uniform nationwide, adjusted area by area for variations in the cost of living. We should remove welfare expenditures from local units of government in order to relieve the local property tax burdens from our citizens. (This presently accounts for about \$2 billion). Thereafter, and as revenues permitted, I would phase down and reduce the state share of welfare costs.

--Incentives should be used to encourage the alternative of work instead of welfare for the working poor. These reforms would put people to work who can work, with emphasis on job development in the private sector. (N.B.: There currently is a limited tax credit for the working poor provided by the Long bill). (Also note: the current federal share of AFDC is \$5.6 billion, and the state share is \$5 billion; the local share is \$1 billion. The federal share of Medicaid is \$7 billion; state share is \$6 billion, local share is \$1+ billion.)

--The costs of full welfare reform are difficult to estimate because we must first determine how much money can be saved by eliminating waste in the welfare area. I would hope to save at least \$3 billion through greater efficiency. It is my objective not to spend more than \$4 billion more to implement the program, and some of this cost would be reduced through the increased tax revenues that would come from putting people back to work. And any net welfare costs will be financed only when there are available additional revenues to do so.

--The bulk of the changes that I have discussed can be paid for by tough, unrelenting reorganization of the existing system to eliminate fraud and waste. This is precisely the kind of tough, hard-boiled administration that the Republican Administration has failed to exercise. It all gets back to electing new leadership with new perspectives to take charge of a situation that the Republican Administration has permitted to get totally out of hand.

WELFARE REFORM

QUESTIONS

1. What are your specific plans and what are the costs?
2. We've been hearing about welfare reform for eight years and nothing has happened. What makes you think you will be able to do any better?

ANSWERS

A. Attack Points

1. Present welfare system is mess and outrage.
2. Encourages people not to work, demeans recipients, destroys families and wastes an enormous amount of money.
3. Republican Administration has talked, but done nothing to clear up the mess. Nixon abandoned and repudiated his own reform plan in his first term.
4. Administrative costs have doubled since 1972; administrative costs drain off 1 dollar out of every 8, and a quarter of all payments go to ineligible persons or are excessive.
5. A few participate in multiple programs, illegally pyramiding benefits, so that some receive up to \$10,000 or more, tax free, from welfare, food stamps, housing assistance and Medicaid. Errors in Food Stamp Program are reported to cost \$23 million per month; Supplemental Security Program overpaid recipients \$547 million in first two years.
6. Over 1 million recipients have nothing wrong with them mentally or physically and could work. But program doesn't urge people to work if they can.

B. Positive Points

1. Separate out from welfare system those who are able to work; give them job training and a job; if they refuse, eliminate their payments. Strong work incentives are crucial.
2. For those truly unable to work because of age, health and disability provide uniform benefit substantially funded by federal government, varying only by cost-of-living from area to area.
3. For the working poor, extension of Long tax incentive plan, so never more advantageous to be on welfare than to work.
4. Remove welfare burden from cities to relieve local property tax burden of citizens (\$2 billion) and gradually phase down over period of years state share as revenues permit.

5. Consolidate maze of overlapping programs and agencies and eliminate waste. Increase expenditures to no more than \$4 billion to implement program. Some costs would be reduced through increased tax revenues of working poor and net welfare costs will be financed only when revenues are available.

6. Bulk of changes can be paid for by tough, unrelenting reform of existing system to eliminate fraud and waste (\$3 to \$5 billion per year in Medicaid abuse). Also, as we move toward full employment, fewer people will need welfare payments.

C. Likely Ford Responses

1. In last State of Union Address, called on Congress for cooperation in cleaning up welfare mess. But Congress has done nothing.

2. Congress has failed to act on proposals to improve administration and effectiveness of welfare programs; failed to act on food stamp reform proposals.

3. Congress talks about welfare reform but takes no action.

D. Rebuttal

See above.

Also, attack Ford for failing to provide leadership to bring about reform. Like many Ford proposals, they are sent to Hill and then forgotten. If Ford truly wanted reform, could have given strong support to reform measures, which he has not.

(A)

Master

ABORTION

- - - This is an issue on which I have had to do much soul-searching because of its personal and religious implications. I have given it a great deal of thought.
- - - I recognize that millions of Americans disapprove of abortions. I personally do also. Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies and should never be considered just as one of a number of equally acceptable methods of contraception. But I must make a decision based not simply on my own personal preferences.
- - - I do not believe government should encourage abortions ~~or pay for their cost.~~
- - - I do not support Constitutional amendments to overturn the current Supreme Court ruling on abortions. I fully recognize the right of those who wish to amend the Constitution to do so and I would not impede the exercise of their rights in this regard on this matter.
- - - If within the confines of the Supreme Court ruling we can work out legislation to minimize abortion with better family planning, adoption procedures, and contraception for those who desire it, I would favor such a law.

ABORTION

Q.: Governor, there has been great confusion about your position on abortion. You seem to have changed your position from time to time, indicating that you might favor a partial amendment or bill to ban abortions. Could you please tell us exactly what your position is?

--This is an issue on which I have had to do much soul-searching because of its personal and religious implications. I have given it a great deal of thought. It is a matter on which well-meaning people can disagree. It has moral, ethical, and religious over-tones.

--I recognize that millions of Americans disapprove of abortions. I personally do also. Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies and should never be considered just as one of a number of equally acceptable methods of contraception. We should attempt to minimize abortions through better family planning and adoption procedures. But I must make a decision based not simply on my own personal preferences.

--I do not believe government should encourage abortions.

--But I cannot support Constitutional amendments to overturn the current Supreme Court ruling on abortions. I fully recognize the right of those who wish to amend the Constitution to do so and I would not impede the exercise of their rights in this regard on this matter.

FOLLOW UP QUESTION #1: But Governor, after you met with the U.S. Catholic Conference didn't you indicate that you might support some amendment to the Constitution which would be a partial ban on abortions?

ANSWER :

The bishops indicated to me that their staff was working on alternatives to the present Constitutional amendments to which I expressed objection. I indicated to them that of course I would look over any suggestions they might have. As you are aware, Bishop Bernardine reiterated after the meeting that I had maintained my position--which does remain the same now as before.

FOLLOW UP QUESTION #2: But if you are against abortion why would you not favor a Constitutional amendment against it?

ANSWER :

I am opposed to it personally. I would never ask my wife to have an abortion and would hope others would not either. But if I were elected President, I would have the views of others to respect. I should not attempt to impose my views on such a highly personal matter on those who hold contrary views. A constitutional amendment would have this effect. It would also engender a bitter and prolonged struggle. Nor should one underestimate the influence of strong moral leadership in this area, which might accomplish many of the goals of those seeking an amendment.

FOLLOW UP QUESTION #3: But Governor, during the 1973 legislative session you signed into law and supported a bill which gives a woman a virtually unlimited right during her first six months of pregnancy to an abortion. How does this square with your opposition to abortion?

ANSWER:

It was the original Georgia law which was very restrictive on granting abortions that was struck down by the Supreme Court. Abortions could only be granted if there was rape, possible damage to the fetus, or possible damage to the mother's physical health. Therefore, the State of Georgia was left without any law in conformance with the letter and spirit of the U. S. Supreme Court decision. And as Governor I signed that law so that we would not be in violation of the U. S. Supreme Court and their interpretation of the United States Constitution.

FOLLOW UP QUESTION #4: Governor, your foreward to a book by Dr. Robert Hatcher seems to contradict your opposition to abortion. It says: "Each of us must accept some responsibility for the plight of the five women described in this book. They had difficulty obtaining contraception, abortion, and sex education. Their case histories prod us to consider what we can do. Each chapter concludes with a series of suggestions

for the reader who wants a more active role in making sex education, contraception, abortion, and sterilization more freely available in our society."

ANSWER :

As is clear from the wording of that sentence, I simply indicated that the author in his book was discussing a variety of family planning devices. That foreward clearly did not endorse abortions. Dr. Hatcher, the author of the book, knew of my personal opposition to abortions when I submitted the forward, and he knows that I maintain this position today.

5

FINAL

ABORTION

Questions:

1. You seem to have had several different positions on abortion. What exactly is your position?
2. If the recent lower court decision striking down the provisions of the HEW appropriations act prohibiting the use of Medicaid funds for abortions is affirmed by the Supreme Court, would that change your views on supporting a constitutional amendment? *Doesn't your position discriminate against poor women who cannot afford an abortion?*
3. Didn't your foreword to the Hatcher book advocate abortion?

Answers:

A. Theme

Personally oppose abortions. But because of sharp differences of opinion on moral issue, believe decision should be personal one and government should neither support or prohibit abortions.

B. Attack points

Ford Administration has played politics with this issue.

C. Positive Points

1. Personally disapprove of abortions.
2. Should attempt to minimize need for abortions through better family planning, adoption procedures, and strong moral leadership, influence of which should not be underestimated.
3. Government should not encourage abortions. Support HEW appropriations limitation, but will uphold law of land if it is held to be unconstitutional.
4. Do not support constitutional amendment, but do support right of others to seek such an amendment.
5. On specific question of whether decision striking down limitation on use of federal funds for abortions changes position on constitutional amendment, answer is no.
6. Foreword to Hatcher book did not endorse abortions, but only described fact that book discussed it as an alternative. Author knew at the time that I oppose abortions *and has since said so.*

Note: Suggest that Ford not be attacked on this issue and that nothing be said which could be construed as a change of your position.

ABORTION

Charge: You seem to have changed your position from time to time indicating you might favor a partial amendment or bill to ban abortion. What is your position?

BASIC STATEMENT

--- This is an issue on which I have had to do much soul-searching because of its personal and religious implications. I have given it a great deal of thought. It is a matter on which well-meaning people can disagree. It has moral, ethical, and religious overtones.

--- I recognize that millions of Americans disapprove of abortions. I personally do also. Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies and should never be considered just as one of a number of equally acceptable methods of contraception. We should attempt to minimize abortions through better family planning and adoption procedures. But I must make a decision based not simply on my own personal preferences.

--- I do not believe government should encourage abortions.

--- But I cannot support Constitutional amendments to overturn the current Supreme Court ruling on abortions. I fully recognize the right of those who wish to amend the Constitution to do so and I would not impede the exercise of their rights in this regard on this matter.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION #1: But Governor, after you met with the U.S. Catholic Conference didn't you indicate that you might support some amendment to the Constitution which would be a partial ban on abortions?

ANSWER: The bishops indicated to me that their staff was working on alternatives to the present Constitutional amendments to which I expressed objection. I indicated to them that of course I would look over any suggestions they might have. As you are aware, Bishop Pernardine reiterated after the meeting that I had maintained my position -- which does remain the same now as before.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION #2: But if you are against abortion why would you not favor a Constitutional amendment against it?

ANSWER: I am opposed to it personally. I would never ask my wife to have an abortion and would hope others would not either. But if I were elected President, I would have the views of others to respect. I should not attempt to impose my views on this matter on those who hold a contrary view. A Constitutional amendment would have this effect.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION #3: But Governor during the 1973 legislative session you signed into law and supported a bill which gives a woman a virtually unlimited right during her first six months of pregnancy to an abortion. How does this square with your opposition to abortion?

ANSWER: It was the original Georgia law which was very restrictive on granting abortions. Abortions could only be granted if there was rape, possible damage to the fetus, or possible damage to the mother's physical health. It was this law which the U.S. Supreme Court struck down in its abortion decision. Therefore the State of Georgia was left without any law in conformance with the letter and spirit of the U.S. Supreme Court decision. And as Governor I signed that law so that we would not be in violation of the U.S. Supreme Court and their interpretation of the United States Constitution.

FOLLOW-UP QUESTION #4: Governor your foreward to a book by Dr. Robert Hatcher seems to contradict your opposition to abortion. It says: "Each of us must accept some responsibility for the plight of the five women described in this book. They had difficulty obtaining contraception, abortion, and sex education. Their case histories prod us to consider what we can do. Each chapter concludes with a series of suggestions for the reader who wants a more active role in making sex education, contraception, abortion, and sterilization more freely available in our society."

ANSWER: As is clear from the wording of that sentence, I simply indicated that the author in his book was discussing a variety of family planning devices. That foreward clearly did not endorse abortions. Dr. Hatcher, the author of the book, has known my personal opposition to abortions.

ABORTION

I believe abortion is wrong. I do not believe government should encourage abortion. The efforts of government should be directed toward minimizing abortion.

I do not support constitutional amendments to overturn the Supreme Court ruling on abortion. However, it would be inappropriate for any citizen to be deprived of the right to seek an amendment to the constitution.

The approach I would favor would be one in which we could work out, within the confines of the Supreme Court ruling, a legislative program to minimize abortion with better family planning, adoption procedures, and contraception for those who believe in its use. If I am elected, I will do everything I can, through moral persuasion, through my actions as President, under the laws which I would be sworn to enforce, to minimize the need for abortion.

I oppose the use of federal funds for abortion. However, I am aware that the courts have been requiring Medicaid, for example, to pay for this service. I would have to comply with and carry out the laws of our country, but I don't favor the use of federal money, including funds in a possible national health insurance program, for abortion. I would like to see us as a nation reach the stage where no one is ever forced to obtain an abortion because she could not obtain proper family planning.

Abortion is the result of the failure of measures to prevent unwanted pregnancies. Abortion should never be considered just one of a number of equally acceptable means of contraception.

As Governor of Georgia I obtained the first line item appropriation for family planning in the history of the state. I created by executive order the Special Council on Family Planning to spearhead the implementation of a comprehensive, voluntary, family planning program throughout the state.

The Georgia Medical Consent Act was amended to allow all females regardless of age or marital status to receive medical treatment for the prevention of pregnancy.

Although we have 159 counties in Georgia, it became one of the few states in the nation with family planning clinics operating in every county health department. Participation in family planning programs increased by 200 percent just during the first two years of my administration.

I believe my record as Governor and my personal inclinations equip me to insure a more productive role for the government in this area.

179
9/8

(A)

Official

DEBATE TECHNIQUES

Continuously Applicable Suggestions

1. You are addressing the American people, not engaging in a college debate. Speak to them and not to Ford, *except when and if directly addressing a statement or question to Ford.*

2. Utilize as often as possible your broad themes--leadership, competence, making government responsive, the need for vision and compassion, strict moral standards, outsider--so that the TV audience comes away with an impression that you stand for a limited number of discernible principles.

3. Give clear, crisp, decisive, straightforward answers. The American people most of all want someone who is decisive and unequivocal. Don't worry about trying to please everyone with a particular stand on a question. You will please the most people by simply being clear and decisive. Your long, thoughtful answers may lose the audience and make them think you are being evasive; be as succinct as possible. Ford's main objective will be to portray you as vague, fuzzy, and contradictory. This impression must not come across.

calm

4. Where possible, try in your answers and in your comments to his answers to preempt his major charges (inflation, big spender, experience) before he can make them.

5. Wherever possible in your answer, attack the Republican record of neglect, mismanagement, waste, and recession. You and the Democratic Party look to the future. The GOP is afraid of the future.

drift

SPECIFIC DEBATE SUGGESTIONS

6. Keep a cool, polite but vigorous and not deferential demeanor. Ford will come on strong and forcefully to show he is a take-charge guy. You must likewise be forceful. The American people are looking not so much at the specific positions you take as for the qualities they want in their next President--competence, seriousness, coolness under fire, leadership, forcefulness, knowledge, and vision. Do not under any circumstances get testy, argumentative or querulous.

7. Many of the arguments which Ford will make against your suggestions for national health insurance (which Truman proposed 25 years ago) and welfare reform and jobs (inflationary, cost too much, etc.) are identical to the same charges Nixon made against JFK's suggestions for Medicare and aid to education. From time to time it would be useful to state that the Republican charges haven't varied in years and that Nixon was making the same charges--equally groundless--against JFK. Moreover, the comparison with

the 1960 debate is inevitable. In both style and position on issues we would hope to invoke JFK while Nixon would hang around Ford's head. The issue now, as then, is progress vs. stagnation, a compassionate government vs. an unconcerned one. By indicating that Ford's defenses are the same as both Nixon and the GOP have always made, ~~it throws Ford on the defense~~ ^{ones that} without a direct attack. _{will be put on}

8. Ford will attempt to prove his competence by spouting details of programs, new initiatives, and specific dollar figures. He will try to show you don't even know the cost of your proposals (one of the things that killed McGovern was he did not know the cost of his own welfare program--we cannot get caught in the same trap). We must counter by using enough statistical data to show our grasp of the issues, ~~and we should use figures to show first phase in costs of programs.~~ _{and use facts to be authoritative} ^{where safe,}

9. In addition to statistics, give as many personal examples from your campaign trips as possible to illustrate your points. This shows concern and understanding of the day-to-day problems of ordinary citizens. Also, rather than saying 7.9% unemployment, the highest this year, mention this means 7,500,000 who have no job. Personalize their plight.

OCCASIONAL DEBATE SUGGESTIONS

10. Occasional humor can be very effective.

11. On occasion, you might gently indicate in your comment to Ford's answer that you will answer the question directly since he failed to do so.

12. An occasional very brief answer, even a ^{simple} yes or no, adds variety and emphasizes decisiveness _{and personal calm.}

13. An occasional display of indignation is appropriate. ~~But~~ it should be directed only at the subject matter, never displayed in such a way that it may seem to apply either to Ford or the questioner.

14. Humility is an important ingredient. If your position on an issue has changed (e.g. your support in 1972 for a busing amendment) frankly state that you have thought it through and with additional study and facts have come to a different conclusion. Do not be defensive and try to show, for example, you always opposed the Vietnam War. Virtually everyone in the U.S. changed ^{his} ~~their~~ views on this (and other issues) as further facts developed. To do otherwise can also trap you on past inconsistent statements.

15. Recognize that there will be follow-up questions, which will try to pin you down on specifics, costs, and on financing.

SPECIAL TECHNIQUES

16. Wherever possible tie Ford, in a polite way, to the GOP, which is in great disfavor. JFK did this very well with Nixon, ^{tying} ~~tying~~ himself to the forward, concerned tradition of Roosevelt, Truman, etc. and stating that Nixon was a very effective leader of the GOP which had fought every social advance ~~from aid to education to Medicare~~ for the last 25 years. ~~This is equally if not more so apropos now, since Ford was minority leader and~~ ⁹ ~~as~~ traditional a Republican ~~as there was~~ (he opposed Medicare, etc.), and is limited by his ties to the special interests which dominate the Republican party. This can be your most effective weapon. Ford himself is personally liked, but the party which nominated him, and which he has served since 1948, is greatly disliked.

17. Never say "I don't have knowledge on this" or the like. ^{"I don't know."}

18. To emphasize your decisiveness, try whenever possible to state your ^{one sentence} conclusion to the question at the beginning and then elaborate. You have a tendency to give your rationale at the beginning and your conclusion at the end.

19. Refer to the Republican Administration rather than the Nixon-Ford Administration (Caddell polls show people do not feel Ford should be blamed for Nixon's mistakes) or the Ford Administration (which gives him too much legitimacy.)

20. Be aware that you will often be "on camera" for reaction shots, even when you are not speaking. Your facial reactions will be important. Kennedy's continued poise is believed to have been a plus for him.

21. Refer to Ford as either Mr. Ford or, where possible, my Republican opponent.

22. Do not "Me Too" in your comments on Ford's answers. Nixon made the mistake of frequently agreeing with his opponent's views ("Much of what you say is correct"). Even if Ford says something with which you agree, when it is your turn for a comment, simply repeat your own ~~policy~~ formulation.

ADDENDUM

23. You might want Pat to work on the outline of a closing statement, which will be very important. Given the expected low voter turnout and the high audience we expect this would be an ideal time to make a get-out-and-vote pitch.

23. Above all, be sure that on each question you begin by making your point, succinctly, and then briefly elaborate. Don't be trapped in the context of an unfriendly question.

PRELIMINARY COMMENT SECTION

DEBATE TECHNIQUES

1. You are addressing the American people, not engaging in a college debate. Speak to them and not to Ford, except when and if directly addressing a statement or question to Ford.

2. Then the shift of body and gaze will heighten the confrontation.

3. Because much of the Carter vote is "soft" and the undecided vote is large -- among northern urban voters unfamiliar with or uneasy about a Southerner repeatedly charged with being evasive, inconsistent and untried -- the debates represent both an enormous peril and an enormous opportunity. Be thoroughly rested that day -- and thoroughly prepared.

4. Utilize as often as possible your broad themes -- leadership, competence, making government responsive, the need for vision and compassion, strict moral standards, outsider -- so that the TV audience comes away with an impression that you stand for a limited number of discernible principles.

5. Give clear, crisp, decisive, straightforward answers. (Now and then, a simple "yes" or "no" can be masterful and memorable.) The American people most of all want someone who is decisive and unequivocal. Don't worry about trying to please everyone with a particular stand on a question. You

will please the most people by simply being calm, clear and decisive. Your long, thoughtful answers may lose the audience and make them think you are being evasive; be as succinct as possible. Ford's main objective will be to portray you as vague, fuzzy, and contradictory. This impression must not come across.

6. Where possible, try in your answers and in your comments on his answers to preempt his major charges (inflation, big spender, experience) before he can make them. Whatever the wording of the question, use the opportunity to say what you want to say, to state both your position and the weaknesses of the Ford-Republican record.

7. Wherever possible in your answer, attack the Republican record of neglect, drift, mismanagement, waste, and recession. You and the Democratic Party look to the future. The Republican Party is afraid of the future. Call your opponent "Mr. Ford" or "My Republican opponent," not "President Ford"; and to the maximum extent speak of the "Republican Administration," not the "Ford Administration" or "Nixon-Ford Administration." Attack the Administration's record over the last two years, where possible, not merely the last eight.

8. Keep a cool, polite but vigorous and not deferential demeanor. Ford will come on strong and forcefully to show

he is a take-charge guy. You must likewise be forceful. The American people are looking not so much at the specific positions you take as for the qualities they want in their next President -- competence, seriousness, coolness under fire, leadership, forcefulness, knowledge, and vision. Do not under any circumstances get testy, argumentative or querulous, even when directly attacked or challenged. Your coolness under fire will be a critical item.

9. Many of the arguments which Ford will make against your suggestions for national health insurance (which his "idol" Truman proposed 25 years ago) and welfare reform and jobs (inflationary, cost too much, etc.) are identical to the same charges Nixon made against JFK's suggestions for Medicare and aid to education. From time to time it would be useful to state that the Republican charges haven't varied in years and that Nixon was making the same charges -- equally groundless -- against JFK. Moreover, the comparison with the 1960 debate is inevitable. In both style and position on issues we would hope to invoke JFK while Nixon would hang around Ford's head. The issue now, as then, is progress vs. stagnation, a compassionate and responsive government vs. an unconcerned one. By indicating that Ford's defenses are the same ones that both Nixon and the GOP have always made, Ford will be put on the defensive without a direct attack.

10. Ford will attempt to prove his competence by spouting details of programs, new initiatives, and specific dollar figures. He will try to show you don't even know the cost of your proposals (one of the things that killed McGovern was he did not know the cost of his own welfare program -- you cannot get caught in the same trap). You must counter by using enough statistical data to show your grasp of the issues. Where safe, you should use figures and use facts to be authoritative.

11. Demonstrate competence and knowledgeability through repeated use of specific, dramatic facts and comparisons and examples. Demonstrate compassion and understanding by citing the plight of real people. Demonstrate experience with specific references to your specific needs as Governor, naval officer and small businessman. Rather than saying 7.9% unemployment, the highest this year, mention that this means 7,500,000 who have no job. Personalize their plight. (Only 4.9 million unemployed when Ford took office.)

12. Occasional humor can be very effective. But the humor should be directed at oneself, not other people.

13. On occasion, you might gently indicate in your comment to Ford's answer that you will answer the question directly since he failed to do so.

14. An occasional very brief answer, even a simple yes or no, adds variety and emphasizes decisiveness and personal calm.

15. Always make use of your right of reply. Never say "No comment" or promise an answer later. But an occasional one-word or one-sentence comment on a long, rambling Ford answer can be effective. Where a longer explanation is necessary, place your one-sentence conclusion at the beginning of your answer instead of the end.

16. An occasional display of indignation is appropriate. But it should be directed only at the subject matter, never displayed in such a way that it may seem to apply either to Ford or the questioner. But if anyone, the questioner. Both you and Ford are more popular than the correspondent. Beware of appearing too deferential or agreeable to the point of passivity. Be vigorously assertive, firm, forceful and positive; take the initiative, avoid being on the defensive (regarding the Democratic Congress, for example, or alleged inconsistencies in your past statements). Do not water down responses to gain the public votes. Your optimum political objective in these debates is to shore up those already leaning your way.

17. Humility is an important ingredient. If your position on an issue has changed (e.g. your support in 1972

for a busing amendment) frankly state that you have thought it through and with additional study and facts have come to a different conclusion. Do not be defensive and do not try to show, for example, you always opposed the Vietnam War. Virtually everyone in the U.S. changed his views on this (and other issues) as further facts developed. To acknowledge a change of your opinion can demonstrate humility. To do otherwise can also trap you on past inconsistent statements.

18. Recognize that there will be follow-up questions, which will try to pin you down on specifics, costs, and on financing, and may refer caustically to any evasions in your initial answer.

19. Wherever possible tie Ford to the Republican Party and its posture of drift, neglect and opposition. The Republican Party is in great disfavor. JFK did this very well with Nixon, tying himself to the forward, concerned tradition of Roosevelt, Truman, etc. and referring to Nixon as a "very effective leader of the Republican Party" which had fought every social advance for the last 25 years. Ford was Minority Leader and a traditional Republican (he opposed Medicare, etc.), and is limited by his ties to the special interests which dominate the Republican Party. This can be your most effective weapon. Ford himself is personally liked, but the party which nominated him, and which he has served since 1948, is greatly disliked.

20. Never say "I don't have knowledge on this" or "I don't know."

21. To emphasize your decisiveness, try whenever possible to state your one-sentence conclusion to the question at the beginning, and then elaborate. You have a tendency to give your rationale at the beginning and your conclusion at the end.

22. Refer to the Republican Administration rather than the Nixon-Ford Administration (Caddell polls show people do not feel Ford should be blamed for Nixon's mistakes) or the Ford Administration (which gives him too much legitimacy).

23. Be aware that you will often be "on camera" for reaction shots, even when you are not speaking. Your facial reactions will be important. Kennedy's continued poise is believed to have been a plus for him. Be careful not to smile in response to Ford while he is speaking. Appear respectful and attentive.

24. Refer to Ford as either Mr. Ford or, where possible, my Republican opponent.

25. Do not "Me Too" in your comments on Ford's answers. Nixon made the mistake of frequently agreeing with his opponent's views ("Much of what you say is correct"). Even if Ford says something with which you agree, when it is your turn for a comment, simply repeat your own formulation.

26. To show his forcefulness Ford might even turn and point at you challenging you with vigorous physical gestures. Stay cool, and do not acknowledge the attack in your response.

27. Above all, be sure that on each question you begin by making your point, succinctly, and then briefly elaborate. Don't be trapped in the context of an unfriendly question.

28. Your closing statement should not be argumentative, petty, or partisan, but an eloquent call for a change from the status quo. The Republicans have been given their chance. It is time for fresh, new leadership.

29. Try to avoid, or at the very least, play down "political" questions -- i.e. questions concerning staffs, budgets, travel plans, polls, strategies (are you having trouble with Catholics, labor, etc.?), relations with party leaders, etc. People are suspicious of "politicians" who deal in such matters. Suggested line of answer: "Mr. Reasoner, you may disagree, but I think the American people don't care that much who is the better politician -- they want to judge a man by his skill at governing, not campaigning -- issues, not politics. I assume Catholics (Jews, labor, city people, blacks) will respond the way everyone else does to a tax system which is unfair, a government out of control, etc."

30. Put everything in the conditional tense (If I am elected) so that you do not appear to take the election for granted.

something with which you agree, when it is your turn for a comment, simply repeat your own formulation.

23. Above all, be sure that on each question, you begin by making your point, succinctly, and then briefly elaborate. Don't be trapped in the context of an unfriendly question.

24. Try to avoid, or at the very least, play down "political" questions — i.e. questions concerning staffs, budgets, travel plans, polls, strategies (are you having trouble with Catholics, labor, etc?), relations with party leaders, etc. People are suspicious of "politicians" who deal in such matters. Suggested line of answer:
"Mr. Reasoner, you may disagree, ~~but~~ I think the American people don't care that much who is the better politician — they want to judge a man by his skill at governing, not campaigning — issues, not politics. I assume Catholics (Jews, labor, city people, blacks) will respond the way everyone else does to a tax system which is unfair, a government act of control, etc."

25. Put everything in the conditional tense (if I am elected) so that you do not appear to take the election for granted.

Overall Carter Theme (Elaboration)

Theme A: Vision

"Education for work, citizenship, and a humane, fulfilling life in the 21st century"

The governor should be future-oriented and forward-looking, specifying that education should prepare today's kindergarteners and first-graders for (1) jobs in the 21st century--the year 2000 and beyond; (2) citizenship in a democracy that promotes just and decent government; and (3) coping with the stresses on family and personal life caused by a rapidly-changing economy and society. Emphasis on treatment of children and youth, their parents and the education profession with dignity and respect.

Future-Oriented -- a Vision

Our present political leadership

fails to recognize that the acceleration of change means by definition the swift arrival of a future that is radically different from the present.

To meet the demands of this future, we must redefine our approach to learning. We must help learners learn to cope with real-life crises, opportunities, and perils. We must strengthen the individual's ability to anticipate and adapt to change. The learner must have the opportunity to do more than receive and store data.

Therefore, education is an investment in the future. Not only a humanly-sound investment but an economically sound one as well. Every dollar in federal investment in education yields six dollars in national income.

Education for Work in the 21st Century

The future economy will require a lifetime of learning and re-learning. There will be many shifts in occupations, perhaps even more than now. We should begin by early exposure to the world of work, work experience programs and youth participation programs in the junior high and high school levels, and provisions for retraining as the economy changes.

Education for the future must prepare those 60% who do not go on to college and the 50% of college students who drop out before graduation. Adequate counselling is needed.

Education for Citizenship

Better teaching of civics. More real-life experiences for young people in government and other public institutions. Government internships and work experience opportunities.

Humane Life

Multi-cultural education.

Education that deals with morals and values, and ethical questions. Educators must not only train students skilled in science and math but also those skilled in human relations who will understand and accept those different from themselves.

Theme B: Carter as management-oriented, results-oriented educational policy-maker.

1. Practical, management-oriented policy-maker:

a. ^{THE} Long-range goal of ^{the} Carter administration is establishment of a Department of Education to ^{the} ~~numerous~~ educational programs found in about 70 federal agencies and departments.

b. Until the department can be established, incremental steps will be taken to improve management and streamline existing bureaucratic practices. These include consolidation of the education and work programs and the various advisory councils that deal with this area; increasing the planning and the management capacities of the states and local school districts.

c. Monitoring the effectiveness of existing programs.

d. Recruitment of effective, talented leadership for the educational bureaucracy. (Note: There have been 6 changes in the Commissioner of Education job in the past 4 years; have been 3 HEW Secretaries in 4 years; 3 National Institute of Education directors in 3 years.)

2. Carrying on the federal tradition of serving children and youth with special needs. The economically-disadvantaged, handicapped, and children from non-English speaking environments. Reaffirm belief in equality of educational opportunity.

3. Protection of diversity and local control in education. Reaffirm the importance of responsiveness by each school district to its own community. (Reminder that the governor was once a school board member himself.)

4. Service to states and local areas should be provided by the federal government:
 - a) Assistance in implementing court decisions regarding aid to handicapped and non-English speaking students, court decisions regarding equalization of educational spending; and desegregation.
 - b) Helping districts improve the quality of education by identifying promising practices in local areas and facilitating their application to new and appropriate settings. Not an initiation of a lot of new programs.
5. Effective public participation in federal educational decision-making at all levels. Appointment to advisory committees of parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, and even some young adults. Use of recommendations of those advisory committees-- not just shelving their reports.
6. Effective planning for the future.

By 1985 will be 6 million fewer students pre-K thru 12th grade than there were in 1970. This will require major adjustments at all levels. Ironically, unless inflation is halted, we may have to spend even more to educate fewer students.

OVERALL CARTER THEME

(Summary)

Should be a combination of ^a visionary ^{approach}, with a vision of the future needs of education for the 21st century, and a practical, management-oriented approach to federal policy-making in education, within the tradition of local control.

^{CARTER}
As visionary, should stress the theme, "Education for work, citizenship, and a humane, fulfilling life in the 21st century."

^{CARTER}
As practical policy-maker, should emphasize "more effective delivery of educational services, within the tradition of local control of education, under federal policies that are just, humane, and sensitive to the needs of children and youth, their parents, and those who manage educational institutions and teach."

Overall Carter Theme (Elaboration)

Theme A: Vision

"Education for work, citizenship, and a humane, fulfilling life in the 21st century"

The governor should be future-oriented and forward-looking, specifying that education should prepare today's kindergarteners and first-graders for (1) jobs in the 21st century--the year 2000 and beyond; (2) citizenship in a democracy that promotes just and decent government; and (3) coping with the stresses on family and personal life caused by a rapidly-changing economy and society. Emphasis on treatment of children and youth, their parents and the education profession with dignity and respect.

Future-Oriented -- a Vision

Our present political leadership

fails to recognize that the acceleration of change means by definition the swift arrival of a future that is radically different from the present.

To meet the demands of this future, we must redefine our approach to learning. We must help learners learn to cope with real-life crises, opportunities, and perils. We must strengthen the individual's ability to anticipate and adapt to change. The learner must have the opportunity to do more than receive and store data.

Therefore, education is an investment in the future. Not only a humanly-sound investment but an economically sound one as well. Every dollar in federal investment in education yields six dollars in national income.

Education for Work in the 21st Century

The future economy will require a lifetime of learning and re-learning. There will be many shifts in occupations, perhaps even more than now. We should begin by early exposure to the world of work, work experience programs and youth participation programs in the junior high and high school levels, and provisions for retraining as the economy changes.

Education for the future must prepare those 60% who do not go on to college and the 50% of college students who drop out before graduation. Adequate counselling is needed.

Education for Citizenship

Better teaching of civics. More real-life experiences for young people in government and other public institutions. Government internships and work experience opportunities.

Humane Life

Multi-cultural education.

Education that deals with morals and values, and ethical questions. Educators must not only train students skilled in science and math but also those skilled in human relations who will understand and accept those different from themselves.

Theme B: Carter as management-oriented, results-oriented educational policy-maker.

1. Practical, management-oriented policy-maker:

a. ^{THE} Long-range goal of ^{THE} Carter administration is establishment of a Department of Education to ^{the} ^{NUMEROUS} educational programs found in about 70 federal agencies and departments.

b. Until the department can be established, incremental steps will be taken to improve management and streamline existing bureaucratic practices. These include consolidation of the education and work programs and the various advisory councils that deal with this area; increasing the planning and the management capacities of the states and local school districts.

c. Monitoring the effectiveness of existing programs.

d. Recruitment of effective, talented leadership for the educational bureaucracy. (Note: There have been 6 changes in the Commissioner of Education job in the past 4 years; have been 3 HEW Secretaries in 4 years; 3 National Institute of Education directors in 3 years.)

2. Carrying on the federal tradition of serving children and youth with special needs. The economically-disadvantaged, handicapped, and children from non-English speaking environments. Reaffirm belief in equality of educational opportunity.

3. Protection of diversity and local control in education. Reaffirm the importance of responsiveness by each school district to its own community. (Reminder that the governor was once a school board member himself.)

4. Service to states and local areas should be provided by the federal government:
 - a) Assistance in implementing court decisions regarding aid to handicapped and non-English speaking students, court decisions regarding equalization of educational spending; and desegregation.
 - b) Helping districts improve the quality of education by identifying promising practices in local areas and facilitating their application to new and appropriate settings. Not an initiation of a lot of new programs.
5. Effective public participation in federal educational decision-making at all levels. Appointment to advisory committees of parents, teachers, principals, superintendents, and even some young adults. Use of recommendations of those advisory committees-- not just shelving their reports.
6. Effective planning for the future.

By 1985 will be 6 million fewer students pre-K thru 12th grade than there were in 1970. This will require major adjustments at all levels. Ironically, unless inflation is halted, we may have to spend even more to educate fewer students.

DRUGS

Q.: Governor, many American families are deeply troubled by the increase in drug traffic. Many---apparently including your own---have had direct personal experience in their own families. Can you share your observations with us on this problem?

ANSWER:

As Mrs. Carter and I have indicated, our sons told us they had tried marijuana. And they stopped. We are thankful that our family was strong and close enough so that we could talk it out.

--Other families have experienced far more trying things. For families who have worked for their children's futures, and who have high hopes for them, any kind of drug problem is a wrenching and sometimes tragic experience.

--For the victims of drugs there can only be compassion. For those who traffic in drugs, and for those who are involved in their illicit manufacture, there should be swift, sure and severe punishment. For they are committing murder just as surely as if they are placing a gun at their victims' heads.

--This is a problem for all levels of government, as well as for society in general. But within the powers of the Presidency, I would do everything possible to stop drug traffic from foreign countries...to prosecute and imprison

those in organized crime who control much of the drug traffic... and to get drug pushers off our streets and out of our schools and into prison where they belong.

--I favor stiff mandatory sentencing for any offender convicted of trafficking in narcotics. I also favor high bail for drug pushers and speedy court processes to get these people off the street.

ELDERLY

Question

1. What would you do to assure the future stability of Social Security (SS) financing?
2. What improvements would you make in Medicare?
3. What programs do you have for elderly?

Answers

A. Attack Points

1. No comprehensive policy or leadership. No sensitivity to despair and destitution of elderly. Viewed as mere statistics in the effort to reduce spending and reduce taxes for special interests.

2. Sought to impose a limitation of 5% on guaranteed cost of living increases for SS recipients. Ford proposed increase \$6.6 billion in SS tax contribution rate, which would go into effect January, 1977.

3. As Congressman, voted against SS increases and establishment of Medicare and Food Stamps (now used by the 3.3 million elderly living in poverty.)

4. Sought to increase hospitalization costs for Medicare recipients. Proportion paid by Medicare has decreased from 46 to 38% under Republicans.

5. Failed to exempt elderly from proposed reduction in Food Stamp eligibility and proposed cuts in Meals on Wheels serving 300,000 elderly.

6. Failed to enforce Age Discrimination in Employment Act.

7. Medicare costs rose 19% this year -- after a 13% increase last year.

B. Positive Points

1. Must be comprehensive policy for aging. Would be developed under direction of Counselor on Aging I would add to Office of President. Policy will be compassionate to the special requirements of senior citizens, so that they can live with dignity and respect.

2. Stabilize financing of SS by improving economy, modestly raising wage base over long period of time but not raising contribution rate, and stabilizing "replacement rate," rather than leaving both wages and benefits subject to inflation adjustments,

so a worker today would receive the same % of his income upon retirement as today's senior citizen receives.

3. Liberalize the SS earnings limitation, which now penalizes retirees supplementing their SS income.

4. Encourage an end to mandatory retirement.

5. Tough crime control measures to protect elderly in cities.

6. Bring rising Medicare costs into line by instituting a prospective reimbursement plan for hospitals, so costs are established in advance. Consolidate Medicare into national health care program. Emphasize home and preventive care.

7. Federal aid to assist mass transit systems in providing reduced fares to senior citizens.

c. Likely Ford Responses

1. Reduced inflation, the greatest enemy of those on fixed incomes, from 12 to 6 percent.

2. Proposed that SS benefits be expanded to full cost-of-living increase, which became effective this year as a result of this initiative.

3. Proposed reforms to protect SS fund, but Congress failed to act.

4. Proposed catastrophic health insurance program for those on Medicare, but Congress failed to act.

5. Signed amendments to Older American Act that will enable delivery of comprehensive meals and services to elderly at community level.

D. Rebuttal

1. Ford plan for catastrophic coverage would have cost 97% of all Medicare recipients \$1.3 billion more each year, while it would have benefitted only a small minority.

2. While Ford supported giving President discretion to give SS recipients full cost-of-living increases, has not exercised that discretion, and instead has proposed only 5% increases.

3. Return to attack and positive points above.

REPUBLICAN PARTY FUTURE

Q.: Governor, you presently enjoy a comfortable lead in the Harris and Gallup polls. If the outcome is similar on election day, won't the Republican party be near extinction? What does this portend for our two-party system?

ANSWER:

As you can imagine, the least of my worries just now is that I might win by too big a margin in November.

--I believe the reason for their deterioration is that the Republican Party since Herbert Hoover has been unresponsive to the average American and has been responsive only to big business.

--It is unfortunate that the Republican party is at present under the control of a very small group of people who are bent on excluding moderates and others, and who restrict themselves to a big-business mentality. We see evidence of this in the Republican administration's policies of the past eight years, in this year's Republican platform, and in the people who control the party apparatus at the state and local level. I do not believe, though, that the Republican party will go out of existence. I expect moderate elements to become more active and for the Republican party to undergo the same internal ferment and change that already has taken place in the Democratic party. The two-party system, in my judgment, is still viable. I'll be more than happy to see the GOP regroup, beginning about December 1980.

--The present deadlock and drift in national government was not anticipated by the constitution. Presidential leadership is needed to make our system work. This means the President must set out an agenda . . . cooperate with the Congress to assure passage of sound programs . . . But it also means that if I am elected President I will not hesitate to veto legislation which I believe to be against the public interest. Many of the vetoes were against bills benefiting only a few. I did this as governor of Georgia; I would do it as President of the United States. But we cannot afford to have government by stalemate for four more years.

--Unlike any Presidential candidate in recent years, I won the nomination of my party almost totally on my own, without the support of any organized special interest or group. That means I will be able to come to the White House free of obligation to anyone, except the people.

--Beyond that, we have constitutional checks and balances built into our system quite apart from the two-party system.

--The greatest danger to our country now is the stagnation and stalemate in our economy and the lack of the efficient government our people deserve.

ETHNIC PURITY

Q.: During the primary period, you made a remark concerning "ethnic purity." You subsequently clarified it. That episode aside, how do you see the future? Are people going to be able to live together peacefully? What about the future of our neighborhoods, and, specifically, of civil rights in this context?

ANSWER:

First, let's have a sense of perspective.

--Enormous change: Over the past 30 years there have been vast migrations of people...changes in our living and transportation patterns...the impact of television and rapid communication...violence, crime and drugs...our tragic involvement in Southeast Asia and the divisions that were caused by it...a constitutional crisis and the debasement of the Presidency itself. How many countries could come through it without falling apart? In my judgment, very few. But we have done it.

--Patriotism and confidence still there: Our 200th birthday this summer saw a wonderful outpouring of hope and love among our people. The Mars landing demonstrated again our enormous technological capability. Whether it's in Miami, Chicago, Los Angeles, Boston, or New Orleans, my travels have shown me that the American people have not lost their belief in themselves. They have no reason why they should.

--Look to present day situation, and the future, not to 50's and 60's: You asked about civil rights and people living together. Perhaps we hear less about civil rights because we've entered a new, more mature phase in which the problems of black people, and of other minorities, have come to resemble those of the rest of the society---the need for jobs, the need for housing, the need for better education and health care. And it is on these problems---rather than on fighting legalized discrimination in the courts and legislatures, as in the 60's ---that efforts must now be concentrated. Discrimination still exists, everywhere, but the vast majority of Americans are on the side of fair play.

--Other kinds of discrimination: I'm a South Georgia farmer, the Democratic candidate for President. My background wouldn't have let me do it only a few years ago. I've travelled the country for two solid years. Yet nowhere has anyone shouted "redneck" or "Cracker" at me. That kind of courtesy wouldn't have been present in the past. But there is still discrimination against Southerners in some places and against Americans of Spanish, Italian, Polish, Jewish, Asian, and native-American heritage. We've got to change that. It isn't right. But we're always moving forward.

--Neighborhoods and living together: Given the changes that have been made, I think most Americans are ready to welcome any neighbor who is law-abiding, who will contribute to community life, who is a good citizen---after all, that is

what we came to America for, to make the best life we could for ourselves. Some people say neighborhood life doesn't make sense anymore. I say we need it more than ever. We should take pride in our neighborhoods...in our cultural and religious heritages. We are all the stronger for it.

--Optimism: There's a lot of strength here and a basic decency. Our best days still lie ahead.

FORD'S GENERAL RECORD AS PRESIDENT

Q.: Only two years ago America seemed to agree that it was highly important to restore public trust and confidence in the Presidency, and to remove some of the unseemly pomp from the office. Hasn't President Ford done that? Why should you replace him after such a short time?

ANSWER

--Mr. Ford's sincerity is not at issue. He is a sincere person. But leadership, competence, and performance are at issue. On those matters judgment must be relatively severe. He is a man who has spent almost his entire adult life, unfortunately, in Washington, serving the Republican party. This Republican Administration's opposition to change and solutions to our problems is the same as the approach of every Republican leader since Hoover.

--Issues of trust and confidence not forthrightly addressed: Mr. Ford vetoed Freedom of Information Act amendments to open up government . . . failed to sign an executive order requiring financial disclosure by high officials . . . refused to enforce his own existing regulations prohibiting compliance with attempts of certain Arab countries to tell U.S. companies that, in order to do business with the Arabs, they had to discriminate against

Jews until Secretary of Commerce was cited for contempt of Congress . . . nominated Nixon White House aides (Flanigan, Haig) to high diplomatic posts . . . tried to weaken sunshine legislation passed by Congress.

-- Equally important, public trust and confidence also related to competence and performance. We expect our Presidents to be honest. Practically every one beside Nixon was. This is itself hardly the sole basis for meriting the office. Trust and confidence cannot be fully restored unless the American people believe in the competence of the President to have a vision of the past. This Administration is shot through with people of the Republican past.

--The Washington bureaucracy has continued to grow, top-heavy, unresponsive: there are 302 separate agencies--there were in 1975 1,267 advisory committees which required 1,350 man-years of federal staff support and cost a total of \$52 million. Most of these should be abolished, and we would still be getting enough advice.

--As the people of the country know, Mr. Ford's record on the economy is just plain awful:

Unemployment. When Ford entered the White House there were 5 million people unemployed and today there are 7.5 million

unemployed--a 50% increase. Unemployment has risen in the last 3 months from 7.3% to 7.9%. There has been no progress against unemployment because the 7.9% rate of unemployment today is the same as it was 20 months ago.

Inflation. The 6% inflation rate today is higher than any rate under Presidents Eisenhower, Kennedy, or Johnson. Mr. Ford has cut the rate of inflation from the highest in 50 years to the highest in 25 years. During the entire period from 1949 through 1969--war years and peace years--the inflation rate averaged only 2% a year.

Private Employment. There are fewer private non-farm jobs today (64.2 million in August 1976) than there were when Ford took office (64.5 million in August 1974).

Deficits. Mr. Ford's budget deficit last year of \$65 billion (FY 1976) was the largest single deficit in our 200 year history. (Note that the deficit he proposed was \$52 billion). The public debt under Ford is more than one-third of that amassed during the history of our country.

Paycheck. The real value of the worker's paycheck is less today than it was in 1968.

--It is true that Mr. Ford has not personally abused the constitution or disgraced the office of the Presidency. But until recently, that was expected of any President. The issue in this election is leadership, competence, and performance. Without these abilities trust and self-confidence in this country cannot return.

FUZZY ON ISSUES

Q.: I know you feel that you're unfairly charged with being evasive or misleading on a number of issues. But why does this charge arise so frequently? What would cause people to reach such a conclusion? Aren't you fuzzy on the issues?

ANSWER:

(No matter when this question comes up, lean back, smile, and say, "I thought you'd never ask." If it's the first question, it's even funnier.)

Partly, I think that comes up mostly as a political charge, and usually is raised by people who have run out of other things for which to criticize me. Certainly, I don't think it comes from anyone who has taken the time to read and analyze what I have said--publicly--on any issue.

--But partly, I think, it stems from something else. Most public issues are becoming more and more complex, and incapable of quick, easy answers. My answers to questions are sometimes complicated because the problems we face are complicated.

--We've learned you can't run this country by slogans. Just to put on a button with the first letters of the slogan "Whip Inflation Now" may have been clear-cut and not fuzzy, for example, but it didn't help explain our economic problems very well. And it didn't do anything to solve them, either.

I don't have a simple, easily defined ideology of the right or the left--and I just don't think hard questions can be answered with simple slogans.

--I've been across this country countless times for the past twenty months, and I've taken more questions in more forums from more people, reporters and correspondents than anyone else. I've never ducked a question, and I've always tried to give responsible, thoughtful answers.

MONDALE

Q.: The Republicans charge that you are really a free-spending liberal in Plains clothing, and that the final proof of it is your selection of Senator Mondale as your running mate. He is identified in the Senate as a consistent supporter and sponsor of spending programs and as Mr. Busing. How would you respond to that charge?

ANSWER:

I don't attach labels to people and I don't think the American people do.

--Mondale: Senator Mondale is an able and extremely dedicated public servant who is fully capable of occupying the Presidency itself. I respect him. That is why I asked him to be my running mate. I would be worried if Senator Mondale and I agreed on every point. I don't want that in a Vice President or in anyone else in my administration. But I do think that both of us have a basic commitment to the well-being of the average family...to openness and honesty in government... and to finding practical solutions to the country's problems.

--Free Spending charge: On that score, I think you need only look at my private and public record. In four years as Governor of my state, I had four budget surpluses. Before that, as a businessman and farmer, I met a payroll and made a reasonable profit. I am a strong supporter of--and, as President, would implement---the concept of zero-base budgeting

(that is, starting from the ground up in reviewing government budget plans rather than simply continuing spending levels of previous years). I also support the concept of the sunset law, in which programs are terminated automatically after a certain number of years, (except contributing programs like social security) and must be renewed and reauthorized before we can spend any more money on them.

--I also have pledged that I would phase-in new programs such as national health insurance in such a way that we could balance the budget by the end of 1980. The most inefficient, spending taking place in the country today is that being devoted to paying for the costs of unemployment and the Republican economic stagnation. So I don't take that kind of political charge very seriously. Nor, in my judgment, do the American people. It's the same charge Richard Nixon made in the debates 16 years ago against President Kennedy...made by Thomas Dewey against Harry Truman...and by Herbert Hoover against Franklin Roosevelt.

PARDONS

Q.: Would you have pardoned Mr. Nixon? Would you now pardon Mr. Ehrlichman, Mr. Haldeman and lesser figures who did not receive pardons? What about even smaller fry who already have completed prison terms---and Mr. Liddy who received an exceptionally long term while his superiors escaped more lightly? What about your call for pardon of draft evaders?

ANSWER:

No, I would not have pardoned Mr. Nixon at the very least until the full truth about criminal activities committed under his Presidency had been disclosed through the judicial process. Nor would I have attempted, to be most candid, to block efforts by the Congress to investigate the Watergate offenses prior to the 1972 election. Nor would I have supported the dismissal of Special Prosecutor Archibald Cox. Mr. Ford did both those things.

--The other Watergate figures: Yes, these people clearly have been treated more harshly than those whom they served. Yet their own offenses were serious ones. We cannot take lightly any action which imperils the integrity of the democratic process or of the Presidency itself. And that is exactly what they did. I think each American needs to make his own personal judgment on this matter. I would not pardon them. I won't comment further on it ---some of these cases are still before the courts.

--Draft evaders: By the act of accepting a pardon, an individual in effect acknowledges his legal guilt. This is true for draft evaders as well as for Mr. Nixon. In making a decision to pardon, a President must bear in mind whether the best interests of the nation would be served. In the case of draft evaders for the Vietnam War, I believe it would be. In the case of Mr. Nixon, for the reasons I have cited, I believe it was not.

(N.B.: Do not raise either of these issues unless they are directly addressed to you. If Mr. Ford addresses the issue, your comment on it should be brief, respectful and matter-of-fact).

and gasoline costs 30¢ a gallon.
as pointed

CARTER POINTS TO MAKE

1. Sweeping the House of Government Clean.

1. If you don't clean house when you move in, you won't clean it two years later. President Ford has already been in office for 800 days--nearly as long as President Kennedy. What has Mr. Ford done to reorganize the government and cut the costs and waste and unresponsiveness in Washington? Not only has he done nothing--he hasn't even made a serious attempt to get the statutory authority necessary to undertake reorganization. The revelations of pervasive, blatant fraud and mismanagement in major programs like Medicaid, food stamps, housing, and others appear more and more frequently with each passing week. But we don't hear so much as a response from the White House, and we are not going to get any action to solve these problems as long as this caretaker Republican administration stays there. 2. If I am elected, I will take a new broom to Washington and sweep the house of government clean. And I won't wait two years to begin.

1 point

2. Inflation.

1. Economic statistics are complicated and hard for everyone to evaluate. But there is one recent figure which every shopper will understand all too well--the wholesale price index jumped almost one percent in September --which is about ten percent on an annual basis. The Republicans have deliberately held the economy back, tolerated unconscionable unemployment and stagnation, because they say all this is necessary to stop inflation. The result is that double-digit inflation is once more just over the horizon. My policy is that of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson--strong growth, low unemployment, and low inflation maintained by vigilant and active monitoring of the big corporations and industries which can raise prices at will. President Kennedy had the courage to stand up to U.S. Steel in 1962, but U.S. Steel has a different kind of relationship with the current resident of the White House. General Motors announced record profits in 1975 and promptly raised its prices for new cars by more than seven percent. There wasn't a word from the White House.

2 points

3. Unemployment and Deficits.

1. For every added one percent of unemployment, the federal government loses \$16 billion in revenue from lost taxes and added expenditures for welfare and unemployment insurance. That means that unemployment is not only a tragedy for the families where fathers and mothers have no jobs. That \$16 billion is the

was possible in 1968 -- when hamburger cost

the average working person has gone back -
wards -- he or she can't buy as much
food or shelter or leisure with it as

equivalent of almost \$300 for every family in the country, employed or unemployed. I will cut the deficit by putting this country back to work -- and by getting people off welfare and back on the tax rolls.

4. Tax Relief Plan

1. President Ford's tax relief plan is like an insurance contract. When you look at the fine print, you will see that it won't really provide \$250 for every person, or \$1,000 for every family of four, as he implies. It will only reduce the taxes they pay on that last \$250 or \$1,000 of income. That would be \$700 in tax-savings for a family earning \$110,000, but only \$ for a family earning \$8,000. The savings for low and middle income plan would actually be less than the new and higher social security taxes which he wants to impose, effective next January. So from the individual taxpayer he will be taking more with one hand than he gives with the other. The only taxpayers who will really benefit from President Ford's concern about high taxes will be corporate taxpayers and the people who own them. Corporations now bear only about one seventh of the total income tax burden, although twenty years ago they accounted for one fourth. President Ford's tax plan proposes ten all-new loopholes which would cut the corporate tax contribution by still another twenty percent.

5. Balancing the Budget

1. I am not a big spender and I never have been. As a businessman I had to balance a budget and meet a payroll. As Governor, I always had a budget surplus. 2. We can balance the federal budget only by putting the economy back to work at full capacity, putting people back to work so they become taxpayers instead of tax-dependents. Last year alone we spent about \$17 billion, or roughly \$300 for each family in the land, for increased unemployment benefits and welfare costs generated by the Republican recession. The Republicans say it is too expensive to put people back to work. The truth is, it is too expensive not to.

6. Government Morality

1. The Republicans often excuse the lack of any notable achievements over the past two years by pointing to the difficult circumstances under which President Ford took office. But for a truly creative leader, those difficult circumstances would have been an opportunity, not a roadblock or an excuse for inaction. That's the way it was with President Roosevelt in 1933, with Harry Truman in 1945, and with President Johnson in 1964. Watergate was not replaced by reform, but with a return to business-as-usual. President Ford has written no new code of ethics into law and he has opposed the efforts of Congressional leaders to do so. The Calloway affair and other widely publicized cases are just the tip of an iceberg. The laws against conflicts of interest in the bureaucracy have been filed away and forgotten in this Administration, as a long series of studies by the Comptroller General have shown. I have announced a code of ethics for the federal government and campaigned for it over the past two years. If elected, I will enact that new code through executive orders which I will issue

(which subsidize the princely life-style of the corporate rich)

own the fair share of the responsibility for paying for government.

3. My tax plan will cut down on loopholes for 50 hours, first class air tickets, and greens fees at golf clubs. My plan will aim toward giving the corporate and stock

myself, and through new legislation. *f* Most important, I will enforce the law and require rigid adherence throughout the federal government.

7. Knocking down the Charges

(To be said on first Carter rebuttal or the first time that Ford makes his ritual charges that the Democratic Platform will cost \$100-\$200 billion in new programs; that Carter will raise taxes for all people making over \$14,000; and that Carter will abolish mortgage interest deduction.) *f* President Ford has just repeated charges that he and his speechwriters must know are in error. *f* To night I will respond just this once *f* — our time is better spent on the real issues of leadership and policy than retracing the same ground to correct the factual record.

f 2. Response

f First, as I have said throughout my two-year campaign, I will introduce no new programs except to the extent permitted by new revenues produced increased economic growth -- growth, by the way, that we will have under a Democratic Administration. *f* I will not raise taxes for lower and middle-income taxpayers. *f* I will give them tax relief. *f* Second, my tax reform program will only raise taxes for the rich who can take advantage of the loopholes I will eliminate -- that's why the Republicans are desperate enough to keep repeating this charge, based on a mistaken transcription. *f* Third, I would not eliminate the home mortgage interest deduction, *f* as I ~~have~~ made

~~clear in a speech in New Hampshire in February when my position was origi-~~

~~nally distorted — in my tax position~~

~~paper issued during the primary campaign~~

~~and in my presentation to the Democratic Platform Committee in June, to name a few occasions.~~

CARTER POINTS TO MAKE

I. Sweeping the House of Government Clean.

1. If you don't clean house when you move in, you won't clean it two years later.

--President Ford has already been in office for 800 days -- nearly as long as President Kennedy.

--What has Mr. Ford done to reorganize the government and cut the costs and waste and unresponsiveness in Washington.

--Not only has he done nothing--he hasn't even made a serious attempt to get the statutory authority necessary to undertake reorganization.

--The revelations of pervasive, blatant fraud and mismanagement appear more and more frequently with each passing week.

--The Medicaid program is being eaten alive by vicious fraud, waste, and neglect--\$3-\$5 billion annually from the federal share alone --

--but no action--HEW still has only 69 investigators to cover an estimated 40,000 cases of fraud per year--obviously impossible

--a Senate Committee recently showed that one high HEW anti-fraud official is on the take himself and accepted thousands in cash and a fancy new car to help place a \$900,000 computer contract

--HEW has authority to hire one-third more investigators--haven't done it--obviously paring medicaid spending and getting it to the needy and not the exploiters is not a management priority of this administration -- that might disturb some well-entrenched special interests.

--Social security administrative costs are only one percent of payments. Welfare administrative costs are twelve times as much -- if welfare were as efficient as social security, \$2 billion would be saved each year.

--If welfare were as efficient as social security, \$2 billion savings each year.

--We don't need one welfare bureaucrat for every six beneficiaries, but that is what we have now.

--We need political leadership with the political courage to fight for the reform of welfare that everyone knows is needed--and that is what I will do.

--But we don't hear so much as a response from the White House, and we are not going to get any action to solve these problems as long as this caretaker Republican administration stays there.

2. If I am elected, I will take a new broom to Washington and sweep the house of government clean. And I won't wait two years to begin.

II. Inflation

1. Economic statistics are complicated and hard for everyone to evaluate. But there is one recent figure which every shopper will understand all too well--the wholesale price index jumped almost one percent in September--which is about ten percent on an annual basis.

--The Republicans have deliberately held the economy back, tolerated unconscionable unemployment and stagnation, because they say all this is necessary to stop inflation.

--The result is that the average working person has gone backwards--he or she can't buy as much food or shelter or leisure with it as was possible in 1968 -- when hamburger cost per pound and gasoline sold for 30¢ a gallon.

--Worse, double-digit inflation is once more just over the horizon.

2. My policy is that of Presidents Kennedy and Johnson--strong growth, low unemployment, and low inflation maintained by vigilant and active monitoring of the big corporations and industries which can raise prices at will.

--President Kennedy had the courage to stand up to U.S. Steel in 1962, but U.S. Steel has a different kind of relationship with the current resident of the White House.

--General Motors announced record profits in 1975 and promptly raised its prices for new cars by more than seven percent. There wasn't a word from the White House.

III. Unemployment and Deficits

1. For every added one percent of unemployment, the federal government loses \$16 billion in revenue from lost taxes and added expenditures for welfare and unemployment insurance.

--That means that unemployment is not only a tragedy for the families where fathers and mothers have no jobs.

--That \$16 billion is the equivalent of almost \$300 for every family in the country, employed or unemployed.

2. I will cut the deficit by putting this country back to work -- and by getting people off welfare and back on the tax rolls.

3. My tax plan will cut down on loopholes which subsidize the princely life-style of the corporate rich, like deductions for \$50 lunches, first class air tickets, and greens fees at golf clubs. My plan will aim toward giving the corporations and then answers their fair share of the responsibility for paying for government.

IV. Tax Relief Plan

1. President Ford's tax relief plan is like an insurance contract.

--When you look at the fine print, you will see that it won't really provide \$250 for every person, or \$1,000 for every family of four as he implies.

--It will only reduce the taxes they pay on that last \$250 or \$1,000 of income.

--That would be \$700 in tax-savings for a family earning \$110,000, but only \$_____ for a family earning \$8,000.

--The savings for low and middle income plan would actually be less than the new and higher social security taxes which he wants to impose, effective next January.

--So from the individual taxpayer he will be taking more with one hand than he gives with the other.

2. The only taxpayers who will really benefit from President Ford's concern about high taxes will be corporations and the people who own them.

--Corporations now bear only about one-seventh of the total income tax burden, although twenty years ago they accounted for one-fourth.

--President Ford's tax plan proposes ten all new loopholes which would cut the corporate tax contribution by still another twenty percent.

V. Balancing the Budget

1. I am not a big spender and I never have been.

--As a businessman I had to balance a budget and meet a payroll.

--As Governor, I always had a budget surplus.

2. We can balance the federal budget only by putting the economy back to work at full capacity, putting people back to work so they become taxpayers instead of tax-dependents. Last year alone we spent about \$17 billion, or roughly \$300 for each family in the land, for increased unemployment benefits and welfare costs generated by the Republican recession.

--The Republicans say it is too expensive to put people back to work.

--The truth is, it is too expensive not to.

VI. Government Morality

1. The Republicans often excuse the lack of any notable achievements over the past two years by pointing to the difficult circumstances under which President Ford took office.

--But for a truly creative leader, those difficult circumstances would have been an opportunity, not a roadblock or an excuse for inaction.

--That's the way it was with President Roosevelt in 1933, with Harry Truman in 1945, and with President Johnson in 1963.

2. Watergate was not replaced by reform, but with a return to business-as-usual.

--President Ford has written no new code of ethics into law and he has opposed the efforts of Congressional leaders to do so.

--The Calloway affair and other widely publicized cases are just the tip of an iceberg. The laws against conflicts of interest in the bureaucracy have been filed away and forgotten in this Administration, as a long series of studies by the Comptroller General have shown.

3. I have announced a code of ethics for the federal government and campaigned for it over the past two years.

--If elected, I will enact that new code through executive orders which I will issue myself and through new legislation.

--Most important, I will enforce the law and require rigid adherence throughout the federal government.

VII. Knocking Down the Charges

(To be said on first Carter rebuttal or the first time that Ford makes his ritual charges that the Democratic Platform will cost \$100-\$200 billion in new programs; that Carter will raise taxes for all people making over \$14,000; and that Carter will abolish mortgage interest deduction.)

1. President Ford has just repeated charges that he and his speechwriters must know are in error.

--Tonight I will respond just this once.

--Our time is better spent on the real issues of leadership and policy than retracing the same ground to correct the factual record.

2. Response --

--First, as I have said throughout my two-year campaign, I will introduce no new programs except to the extent permitted by new revenues produced increased economic growth -- growth, by the way, that we will have under a Democratic Administration.

--I will not raise taxes for lower and middle-income taxpayers.

--I will give them tax relief.

--Second, my tax reform program will only raise taxes for the rich who can take advantage of the loopholes I will eliminate-- that's why the Republicans are desperate enough to keep repeating this charge, based on a mistaken transcription.

--Third, I would not eliminate the home mortgage interest deduction as I made clear in a speech in New Hampshire in February when my position was originally distorted -- in my tax position paper issued during the primary campaign -- and in my presentation to the Democratic Platform Committee in June, to name a few occasions.

UNEMPLOYMENT, GETTING AMERICA BACK TO WORK

The Republicans charge that Jimmy Carter's job program is too expensive, that it will lead to huge budget deficits, trigger a new round of inflation, and that it demonstrates once again how Carter is just another liberal, big-spender, big-government Democrat.

Basic Statement

1. Democratic vs. Republican approach

-- Republicans know only one way to fight inflation and that is to put people out of work. They don't understand our economy or our people. Their policy of stop and go economics has led us from one crisis to another. For example, at the beginning of the worst recession since the Great Depression, Mr. Ford proposed a tax increase that would have totally wrecked the economy. He now proposes an increase in the social security tax next January.

-- The Republicans believe it is too expensive to put people back to work. This is a striking example of why new leadership is desperately needed . . . because the facts prove that it is too expensive not to put people back to work. As long as our economy drifts and stagnates, all other efforts to move America forward are crippled.

-- The Republican unemployment record is a tragedy . . . for the nation and for the millions of Americans and their families who have suffered the crushing blow of losing a job. In 1968, when the Democrats left the White House, 2.8 million Americans were out of work. In August 1976 this number stood at 7.5 million, an increase of nearly 5 million persons.

2. Republican Record

-- When Mr. Ford took office, unemployment stood at 5.5% or 4.9 million Americans. In less than nine months, the unemployment rate soared to 8.9%. Even Herbert Hoover took over a year to get unemployment soaring. Despite Republican claims of a vigorous economic recovery, unemployment has risen for the past three months in a row and now stands at 7.9%. The level of unemployment today is higher than at any time between the Great Depression and the inauguration of Gerald Ford . . . Indeed, unemployment is almost two full percentage points higher today than during the Republican recession of 1960 when John Kennedy debated Richard Nixon.

-- There are actually fewer workers employed in private non-farm jobs today than there were when Mr. Ford took office two years ago. (N.B.: 64.5 million in August 1974 vs. 64.2 million in August 1976; the increase of jobs that Ford claims has occurred primarily in the public sector and agriculture.

-- The human and economic costs of unemployment are staggering. People who are out of work can't pay taxes and the drop in federal tax receipts has produced the highest budget deficits in history. Mr. Ford's deficit of \$65 billion last year was larger than the total deficits under Presidents Kennedy and Johnson. Extra welfare and unemployment compensation payments due to unemployment increased federal expenditures by at least \$17 billion last year. Losing a job is a social cancer that contributes to crime, alcoholism, broken families, and the loss of personal dignity and self-respect.

3. Carter Employment Policy

-- The first step out of this morass is to rededicate ourselves to the work ethic and the belief that all able should be working, paying taxes, leading productive lives. Republicans have clearly rejected this idea, despite their rhetorical claims to the contrary. Instead of moving forward with positive employment programs, the Republican Administration has sat back and watched the costs of welfare, food stamps, and unemployment insurance increase by no less than \$23 billion between 1974 and 1976--almost \$400 out of the pocket of every American family.

-- The fundamental question: Can't we devise better ways to use these huge sums of tax money . . . ways that put people to work . . . cut the welfare, unemployment and food

stamp rolls . . . and that move toward a balanced federal budget? That's why we need new leaders with new perspectives to move America forward.

-- We must focus on steady economic growth that provides good jobs in the private sector. No more stop and go economics . . . such as the engineered Nixon recession of 1970 . . . the election year prosperity of 1972 . . . the tight money and high interest rate policies of 1973 . . . the WIN tax increase proposal of 1974.

-- We need improved coordination of national economic policies, particularly with respect to the Federal Reserve, so that interest rates can lead to a more stable economy.

-- These general economic policies must be supplemented with employment programs targeted to pockets of high unemployment. For example, the recent jobs bill (The Public Works Employment Act of 1976), vetoed by Mr. Ford but overridden by Congress, will provide 300,000 jobs for teachers and firemen in Detroit, Los Angeles, Miami, Buffalo, and across the nation. Even the President's own party could see that this veto was bad judgment.

-- We need a youth employment program to take teenagers off the streets, train them, and put them in productive jobs. I believe the Civilian Conservation Corps we had during the

depression was a good investment. When you realize that it costs an average of \$12,000 to put people in prison, which is where many of the unemployed youth will go, it is clear that putting our youth to work is a good investment.

-- We need an expanded employment incentive to encourage the private sector to hire and train persons now unemployed so that they can become permanently employed. By creatively using Federal dollars as leverage to encourage the private sector to hire and train the unemployed, I believe we can put people to work for less than the cost of keeping them on unemployment compensation. (N.B.: The cost of this program for 500,000 people is about \$1 billion, or a cost-per-job of about \$2,000. This is about half the cost of keeping people on unemployment compensation or welfare. Don't use unless pressed).

-- We need encouragement by the federal government to private industry to prevent layoffs through a bonus built into the unemployment compensation tax. (N.B.: The entire employment package would cost \$5-6 billion, far less than the \$17 billion for welfare and recession costs. Don't use unless pressed).

Possible question #1

"Mr. Carter, you have made jobs one of your top priority items. Your Republican opposition charges that this is just another example of fuzzy liberal thinking . . . more government, higher taxes, more spending by Congress, higher rates of inflation. How do you respond to these charges?"

-- We're going to attack unemployment and inflation at the same time because you can't make any progress by attacking them separately.

Possible follow-up question

"But you haven't made clear why these policies wouldn't produce another round of inflation. Isn't it true that when unemployment drops, inflation begins to climb? Won't your jobs program lead to another inflationary spiral that will penalize every American, both those holding jobs and those out of work?"

Response

-- The Republican notions about inflation and how to control it are completely inside out and upside down. We need only recall that in the midst of the highest unemployment levels since the Great Depression we experienced an annual inflation rate in excess of 12 percent. By the same token,

we have done best against inflation during periods of vigorous economic growth and high labor productivity.

-- During the Kennedy and Johnson administrations, we had low unemployment and low inflation. The economy grew at an annual rate of 4.5%, unemployment averaged less than 5%, and inflation was held to about 2%. These years totally contradict those Republican critics who say that it is impossible to have low inflation and low unemployment at the same time.

-- Our soaring inflation rates of recent years were caused primarily by the quadrupling of oil prices, two devaluations of the dollar, the great Russian grain robbery of 1972, rising commodity prices, and monopoly pricing in certain sectors of the economy. None of these causes of inflation were affected by Republican go-slow, no-recovery, no-jobs economic policies.

-- As President, I would follow a totally different course than Mr. Ford in controlling inflation. I would put people back to work. I would establish a food reserve program to protect farmers and consumers against wild swings in food prices. I would strengthen and enforce the anti-trust laws to achieve real price competition. I would ask leaders of business and labor to cooperate in exercising voluntary

restraints on wages and prices, and we would provide standards against which to measure performance. And I would vigorously oppose any major price or wage increase that could not be justified. It's time we had a President once again who wasn't afraid to speak out publicly on such critical issues that affect that pocketbooks of every American family.

Possible follow-up question #2

"Mr. Carter, Secretary Simon has criticized your proposal that the President be able to appoint his own Chairman of the Federal Reserve Board. He says that if politicians ever get hold of the money supply, the road to economic disaster will be ahead. In light of this comment, do you want to stick to your proposal or do you want to reappraise it?"

Response

-- The reason why I think the President should be able to appoint his own Chairman of the Federal Reserve is that I believe we have to have coordinated budget and credit policy in order to attack problems of unemployment, inflation, and economic stagnation effectively. We can't have a situation where the President and his advisors are moving in one direction and the Federal Reserve is moving in another.

-- What we need, and what we're going to have if I am elected, is a situation in which the President and his economic advisors, the congressional leadership, and the Chairman of the Federal Reserve can sit down together and work out in harmonious fashion a consistent set of economic policies. We haven't had that during the past eight years and the results are very clear.

-- However, I think the Federal Reserve Board should maintain its independence from the Executive Branch. The Chairman of the Federal Reserve is appointed for a four-year term but not necessarily at the same time as the President. That doesn't make sense. I think that, subject to Senate confirmation, the President ought to be given the power to appoint a Chairman of the Federal Reserve who has economic views broadly compatible with those of the President. Once appointed, the Chairman could not be removed by the President. I should also point out that Arthur Burns, the present Chairman, has testified before Congress that he has no personal objection to this basic principle. And I'm certain that even Secretary Simon would agree that Chairman Burns is not about to propose anything that would subject the Federal Reserve to what he labels as political pressure.

NUCLEAR PROLIFERATION

(NOTE: Ford is expected to make a formal announcement of his proliferation proposals -- probably before the debate. This answer will be revised as needed if he makes that announcement.)

QUESTIONS

1. You have criticized the Ford Administration for failing to take a strong stand on proliferation of nuclear weapons. The President has announced (or let it be known he intends to announce) several new initiatives, including a meeting of nuclear suppliers in London. Doesn't this deal adequately with the problem?

2. Several reputable international groups have recently come out with reports which conclude that proliferation of nuclear weapons, and widespread plutonium recycling are inevitable. Aren't your programs to curb these developments unrealistic?

ANSWERS

A. Attack Points

1. The horror of the widespread availability of nuclear weapons is becoming increasingly real: Pakistan, Brazil, Egypt, South Korea, and Taiwan have all expressed strong interest in acquiring the capability to make the bomb. An international peace organization recently reported that as many as 35 countries could have the capability to make the bomb in nine years. During the two years of Ford's Presidency we have failed to halt three major steps backward on the proliferation issue. India exploded a nuclear device. France has agreed to sell a plutonium reprocessing plant to Pakistan, and West Germany has made similar arrangements with Brazil.

2. Ford has shown us that he cares more about protecting the interests of the nuclear industry and a handful of multinational corporations than he does about limiting the spread of atomic weapons. He and Kissinger fought legislation which would have required the U.S. to take positive steps to control nuclear proliferation. Ford was unwilling to support even a watered-down bill unless Congress agreed to go along with his \$8 billion subsidy to encourage multinational corporations to get into the nuclear fuel business.

3. Reports leaked to the press indicate that Ford will advocate yet another industry bail-out -- a \$1 billion proposal to buy

up a half-completed privately owned nuclear fuel reprocessing plant. Even the Wall Street Journal described this proposal as "perfectly awful."

4. Reports of new Ford initiatives have been seeping out of the White House -- now that Congress is safely adjourned and legislation to hold him to his word is impossible. Ford seems now to be advocating many of the same proposals which he and his deputies lobbied against all summer. But Ford will not come out of the White House and put his proposals on the public record where they can be analyzed and reviewed. Some of the proposals he purportedly will make are the very same actions which I advocated last May in a speech at the United Nations and again in San Diego in September.

B. Positive Points

1. As nuclear engineer, I understand both the benefits of nuclear power and the grave risks it presents. I have set forward a 4-point program to move this country into a position where it will take the lead in stopping the spread of nuclear weapons:

A. Negotiating a comprehensive test ban treaty with Soviet Union for a 5 year period, requiring an end to all nuclear testing for that period.

B. Enforcing international safeguards on the handling and processing of atomic wastes.

C. Providing technical knowledge or fuel supplies only to those nations agreeing not to produce atomic weapons, to submit atomic waste to international controls, and to sign the nonproliferation treaty.

D. Removing our own atomic weapons from such countries as South Korea.

2. The special interest of the nuclear industry and the multinational corporations will not be allowed--as they have in this Administration--to interfere with these steps.

3. In addition, I am committed to developing a sound domestic energy policy to minimize our need for nuclear power and will emphasize helping other countries find alternatives to nuclear power to meet their energy needs.

DEFENSE

"How may the Defense budget be cut?"

Basic Statement

1. Surely in the second debate, and quite possibly in the first, the question of the defense budget is going to come up. The Republican attack will attempt to either force you to hedge on the figures and percentages you have previously used concerning defense reductions, or else try to portray you as someone who is proposing cuts that would weaken the national security, a la McGovern. (We have seen clear examples of both types of attacks in the last few days.)

2. This line, while based on a clear and cynical misrepresentation of your position and of the facts concerning the defense budget, does require a careful reply which can convey to the viewer that you know exactly what you are talking about, and your opponent does not. This issue can be turned around to your advantage, to reinforce other main themes of the debates, such as government reorganization, inefficiency, and your own experience in the Navy and as a manager/governor. Ford will try to put you on the defensive; there is no reason to allow this to happen.

3. The following is an outline to stress in addressing this issue:

The first responsibility of any President is to assure the safety and survival of our nation. I do not want to see

our national strength continue to erode, our reputation continue to decline. As President I would restore to our nation the sense of pride and strength which has always been so important to us and to the rest of the world.

To do this requires a strong national defense. As a former Navy officer and nuclear engineer, I have experience in this field. I know the military. I was one of them. I respect them and I want to see them restored in pride, in toughness, in stature. As President, I would return to the very basics of what our military must stand for in our society.

What concerns me deeply now is that so much of present military establishment is just plain fat, waste, and mismanagement. If the present Administration does not know that, then they are not even aware of what is going on within their own government. Any American man or woman who has ever served in the Armed Forces knows full well that there is waste everywhere.

I have called for savings of about 5% in our defense budget. (Try to move from dollar amounts to percentages.) Five cents out of every dollar. We all know that can be done, without any reduction in the strength of our nation. I would never do anything to weaken our nation, but I would never continue wasteful practices and sloppy mismanagement and confuse it with a strong national defense.

Let me give you some examples of what I have in mind -- examples that could be multiplied by hundreds:

Where is the waste?

-- it's in more than 1300 people in the Defense Department working on public relations.

-- it's in the hundreds of thousands of manhours devoted to lobbying Congress at taxpayers' expense.

-- it's in the personal servants for Generals and Admirals -- 1700 four years ago, and now cut by Congress to under 400.

-- it's in the "grade creep" that gives us more (?) Generals and Admirals than we had in World War II, with six times as many people under arms as we have now; and which pushes up the cost of manpower throughout the services.

-- it's in cost overruns on weapons systems that would be intolerable in private industry. And that is simply bad management and ineffective leadership;

-- one plane, the C-5A, was supposed to cost \$2.2 billion; it overran by \$2 billion (and the Pentagon transferred the man who blew the whistle); and now it will cost more than a billion more to fix the wings. This is a plane that proved its importance during the Yom Kippur War; but we should have had it for a fraction of the price.

-- the 45 major weapons programs the Pentagon is building have already overrun by \$13.4 billion.

-- it's in gold-plating, and in buying weapons more appropriate to the last war than to America's future;

-- I have already said I will take a hard look at the B-1 bomber next January. This will cost \$1.5 billion this year, and at least \$24 billion for the total program. This year, that money could go instead for 6 submarines or 10 destroyers or 100 tactical aircraft or 3000 tanks -- or not be spent at all and stay in the pockets of the taxpayers. And there are cheaper ways to do the job of the B-1.

-- a single nuclear strike cruiser costs the same as four conventionally-powered Spruance class destroyers, which would give us a more effective Navy against the threats we face in the future.

-- it's in the laxity in the way budget decisions are made. A senior official responsible for making basic decisions about weapons systems in the Pentagon (Malcolm Currie, DDR&E) took vacations at a hunting lodge run by a major defense contractor; and he is still on the job. No wonder we can't get the hard, tough decisions we need, when this kind of thing is tolerated.

-- it's in non-competitive contracting that keeps us from getting the best product, at a cost far above what we have a right to expect -- and the taxpayer pays the difference.

-- it's in training, where the ratio of instructors and support personnel to those people being trained is only 2.2 to one. For secondary schools the comparable figure is 15-1. For colleges the figure is 19-1.

-- it's in travel between posts and rapid turn-over of manpower, which means that one-sixth of U.S. military personnel at any time are not where they can do a job, at a cost of billions of dollars.

-- and it's in duplicated programs in the different services; in overlapping research and development, and overlapping support.

So let's stop being fooled into believing that we are getting better defense just because the budget goes up, and start asking tough questions about the way the money is spent, and what we really need to do. And let's stop neglecting areas that we really do need -- like a Navy of smaller, faster ships that meet today's demands -- let's stop robbing these programs in favor of outdated doctrines and programs.

The answer is real leadership -- Presidential leadership. That is a leader who will appoint a strong manager at Defense; who will give positive direction and gain positive control, instead of leaving it to bureaucrats and inter-service log-rolling. This is the leadership America deserves and demands; and I believe I can provide it.

"But wouldn't defense cuts mean a loss of jobs?"

1. It is an acknowledged fact that each dollar spent in the civilian economy does more to create jobs, and to put extra people on the payrolls of the nation, than the same dollar spent on defense.

2. I do not believe that we can only have full employment in this country through wars or preparation for wars. The first man who said that was Karl Marx; and I'm surprised that President Ford agrees.

3. I want all the defense we need; and I want people to have a chance to do useful, productive work that will do the most for our economy.

4. It is about time we had real Presidential leadership to see that when any defense contract comes to an end, for whatever reason, working people will continue to have productive work to do. This Administration has done virtually nothing about it; and that must be changed.

DANGERS OF ONE-PARTY GOVERNMENT, ARBITRARY EXERCISE OF
PRESIDENTIAL POWER

One-party government -- a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress -- means an absence of controls over congressional spending and the danger of uncontrolled presidential power.

-- This is the same tired argument that Richard Nixon used against John Kennedy, that Herbert Hoover used against Franklin Roosevelt. It's their final argument that is trotted out when everything else has failed.

-- It's my view that the overriding danger faced by the country today is the stagnation and stalemate in our economy, and in our efforts to give Americans the kind of responsive, well-organized, and efficient government they deserve and that they are demanding. This situation results from the absence of national leaders who have a clear, specific, and realistic plan for moving America forward.

-- The issue is not one-party government; rather it is who is better able to end the waste of taxpayers' money in the executive branch, who is better able to get America back to work, who is better able to represent the needs and interests of average working families in this country, instead of just looking out for special interests and the privileged.

My opponent's position is, above all, a guaranteed formula for continuing the drift, stalemate, and stagnation of the past eight years.

-- Our system of government simply cannot work without presidential leadership. With respect to Congress, presidential leadership means setting out the agenda for national action. It means cooperation to assure the passage of sound programs. And it means resolute discipline to prevent and where necessary to veto legislation which reflects the power of special interest lobbies, not the public interest. But the system cannot work when the President sits passive at his end of Pennsylvania Avenue.

-- That is the nature of the stalemate we have now.

-- Time after time, major legislative issues have been raised, debated, and acted upon, while the Republican administration remains silent, or speaks with more than one voice, or completely reverses course and goes back on its word. That has happened on antitrust reforms to open up the economy and on Watergate reform legislation to assure open government.

-- This kind of deadlock and drift was not contemplated by our Constitution.

-- What we have had the past two years are a series of often conflicting economic proposals by my Republican opponent and a failure to move decisively in getting people back to work, or reforming the executive branch, or beginning to implement a nationwide health program. The average citizen has ended up with the worst of all worlds . . . high unemployment, high prices, high budget deficits, continued bureaucratic waste and bungling, and a stalemate between the legislative and executive branches.

-- The only way out of this impasse is to elect new leaders who can bring to Washington new ideas, new perspectives, and a new sense of urgency for making our government work . . . that is the best and only way for solving our problems in both the executive and legislative branches.

-- I have already announced that all new proposals will be consistent with the goal of achieving a balanced budget by the end of 1980. If we achieve an economic growth rate of 5.5% over this period, we will be able to balance the budget and still have approximately \$60 billion in additional revenues to use for phased, step-by-step beginnings in such areas as health. If Congress elects to move beyond these guidelines and exceed this recommended level of new spending, I would not hesitate to veto such legislation. But the key

is getting our economy moving again, getting people back to work, getting serious about eliminating bureaucratic waste in the executive branch. And that is precisely what the Republican Administration has been either unwilling or unable to do.

-- There are two principal ways to prevent the abuse of presidential power in the future. First, not only must the President himself be trustworthy but the President must seek out and appoint trustworthy people. During my years as Governor of Georgia, I sought out people from all sections of the country for high executive positions and they conducted themselves in a totally trustworthy manner. There was never a hint or allegation of scandal or wrongdoing during my administration. Second, you must provide regulations and practices that insure an open administration, one free of potential conflict of interest, with full financial disclosure by all executive officers, with regulatory officials not tied to the interests being regulated and forbidden for a period of time from joining regulated businesses after they leave government service. I would meet with ordinary citizens on a frequent basis and with sunshine provisions that insure open procedures of government, and with a prohibition against the acceptance of any gift by a government employee. The

President himself must be available to the press and public on a regular basis, and this same standard applies to Cabinet officers. I commit myself and my Administration to these strict standards of openness and accountability.

-- These standards are not being applied today, in some areas. For example, the General Accounting Office has on 11 occasions reported to Congress that existing regulations governing financial conflict of interest are not being enforced. And there are shocking instances where government officials moved directly to business firms they supposedly were regulating while in government service, such as the instance where the U.S. negotiator in the Department of Agriculture left in the middle of the negotiations over the Russian grain sale to join the large grain exporting firm that realized over \$240 million from the deal. Nor would I have an administration that would permit an employee of a major oil company to receive a \$90,000 severance check before going to work for the Federal Energy Administration. Those kinds of outrageous practices will end in a Carter Administration.

-- Finally, unlike any presidential candidate in recent years, I won the nomination of my party almost totally on my own, without the support of any organized special interest

or group. This fact is very important because it means I will go to the White House free of special obligations to anyone, except the people.

Possible question #1

"Mr. Carter, public opinion polls in recent years have revealed that many voters deliberately split their tickets between presidential candidates and persons running for the House and Senate. A major reason for this is their belief that you can't trust politicians so you had better elect the candidate of one party to be President and provide a majority of the other party in Congress . . . to keep an eye on each other. Since it is almost certain that Democrats will control the next Congress, isn't it likely that a lot of voters will want your Republican opponent to be President, to avoid the dangers of one-party government. What can you say to people who feel this way? Doesn't recent history suggest the wisdom of this kind of ticket-splitting?"

Response

-- The Republicans have had light years to apply this argument and all we've had is stalemate and recession.

-- As I did when I was governor of Georgia, I will object to any legislation I feel is irresponsible.

-- We have too many problems to build in disharmony in our government.

-- There are enough constitutional checks and balances built into our system of government to avoid abuses.

-- Our most sustained period of progress has been when we've had a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

-- My commitment to a balanced budget by 1981 is a firm one.

-- The politics of fear and timidity should not be permitted to obstruct progress.

Possible follow-up question:

"You have stressed the need to provide positive leadership as the best way to control Congress, rather than the more natural way of having a Republican President to keep the lid on a Democratic Congress. You may have very specific ideas of what Congress ought to do and not do, but what assurance is there that Congress will follow your lead? Isn't it just as likely that Congress will continue going its own way, passing spending bills, and then you will be in the very difficult position of having to decide whether or not to sign them. In many ways, your position would be more difficult than Mr. Ford's. Isn't it likely that, in the end, you would just cave in and sign the legislation?"

Response

-- First, I have stated very clearly my guidelines for initiating new programs that will require substantial federal expenditures. I believe this is a sensible and fair way to proceed and I believe it will permit a sensible and balanced legislative program. So I do not anticipate that a stalemate, such as we have today, would develop between the two branches of government. But I am very concerned that in our efforts to put people back to work and to begin some long overdue efforts, such as national health insurance, that we do not also permit the kind of inflation that has occurred during the past eight years. So I must restate my determination to oppose legislation that would prevent us from achieving the goal of a balanced budget by the end of my first term.

-- Second, my record as Governor indicates that strong executive leadership can produce very significant legislation in the public interest, such as statewide mental health program and complete reform of the financing of public education. My record also shows my capacity to oppose and resist legislation that is clearly not in the public interest, that is primarily special interest legislation.

-- Third, I expect to be an active President in relation to Congress. I also recognize the constitutional equality between the two branches and I intend to respect that equality. But history suggests that those Presidents who have been most successful in their relations with Congress have enjoyed broad public support of their objectives. In other words, if the people believe the President is on the right track, Congress has gotten the message and a productive and positive relationship has been developed. I expect to be this kind of President, one who listens to the people, who takes their problems seriously, and one who acts to do something about these problems. This kind of leadership that merits broad public support will, in my judgment, provide an environment for very positive and responsible relations between the executive and legislative branches.

Possible question #2

"Mr. Carter, your Republican opponent--Mr. Ford--has stressed the fact that a Democratic victory in the presidential race will create a very dangerous situation in Washington, namely, that all checks on a free-spending Congress will have been removed. He suggest that your victory in November will mean that no one will be around to keep the lid on Congress

and its natural tendency to spend large amounts of money. It's clear that people are concerned about Congress in this respect. Wouldn't your victory mean an end to all discipline and control over Congress?

Response

-- Anybody who would say that doesn't know me very well. I stood up to irresponsible legislation when I was governor and I would do no less as President.

Possible follow-up question:

"Mr. Carter, you've told us about your plans for not moving forward with new spending programs if it means an unbalanced budget by the end of your first term. You've also pointed out that a 5.5% growth rate will produce a budget dividend of about \$60 billion. But this is a very vigorous rate of growth, rarely achieved in our history. What happens if our growth rate slips below 5.5% annually, down to 2% or 3%, for example. Won't that leave you in a very difficult position in terms of holding down congressional spending?"

Response

-- First, I cannot agree with your hypothetical example. I feel strongly that we can achieve a 5.5% annual growth rate without excessive inflation. This is exactly what President

Kennedy and President Johnson achieved during the early to mid-1960s. We are still coming out of a very deep recession and I see no reason whatever why we should not expect a sustained and vigorous rate of growth, given the proper mix of policies.

-- But let's assume the worst, suppose the growth rate does slip, as you suggest. What then? Well, in those circumstances we would necessarily have to cut back somewhat on our legislative plans, as I have indicated. We would have to slow down the rate of expansion of certain programs. We would phase-in programs in a more deliberate way. But, in my judgment, we could begin with dealing with the welfare mess and begin the initial stages of a national health security program, for example. And that is a great deal more activity than has taken place during the last eight years of Republican government.

Possible question #3

"Mr. Carter, if we have learned anything about American government in the past decade, it is that unrestrained and unchecked executive power in the White House can lead to very grave abuses and problems, specifically our entry into the Vietnam war during the Johnson Presidency and the Watergate

crimes committed by Mr. Nixon and his associates. Don't we need the extra check of the legislative and executive branches being controlled by opposing political parties? And if the Democrats are almost certain to retain majority control of Congress, where does that leave you as a Democrat running for the Presidency? Aren't there very real dangers in one-party government?"

Response

-- The Republicans have had eight years and produced nothing but stalemate and recession.

-- There are sufficient checks and balances built into our system of government to prevent abuses.

-- We have too many problems to build in additional disharmony in our government.

-- Our most sustained period of progress has been when we've had a Democratic President and a Democratic Congress.

COST OF DEMOCRATIC PLATFORM AND BALANCED BUDGET

Despite conservative rhetoric, Jimmy Carter is a traditional big-spending liberal Democrat, as indicated by the cost of his proposals, such as national health insurance and welfare reform, and the price tag of the Democratic Platform which would add \$100 to \$200 billion to the federal budget.

Basic Statement

Democratic vs. Republican Approach

-- I am not a big spender and never have been. We can move forward. We can have a balanced budget by the end of 1980. The average budget deficit over the last eight Republican years is four times larger than the average deficit during the Kennedy-Johnson years. Mr. Ford's budget deficit last year of \$65 billion was larger than the total deficits in the Kennedy-Johnson years.

-- During these Republican years economic growth averaged only 2%, compared to the 5.5% annual growth rates we achieved in the mid-1960s after President Kennedy's economic policies took hold. The plain fact is that the \$230 billion in budget deficits accumulated during the low-growth, recession, high-unemployment Republican years are the largest in the history of the United States.

-- Republican charges are exaggerated political scare rhetoric and they know it. It's exactly the same as Franklin Roosevelt's opponent in 1936, saying that we couldn't afford social security. Or Mr. Dewey telling President Truman we couldn't have health care. Or Richard Nixon saying in 1968 that we couldn't afford aid to education. Every major social advance of the past two generations has been preceded by a Republican charge that it couldn't be done. The people know better.

2. How to Pay for New Initiatives

-- My campaign is based on the belief that new leaders with new perspectives and new ideas can get America moving forward once again. There is simply no reason to settle for this mediocre Republican record.

-- The Democratic Platform makes it very clear, and I have stressed this fact repeatedly, that our goals in the areas of human need, such as health and cleaning up the welfare mess, cannot be accomplished immediately. This means carefully phasing in programs as revenues and budget savings permit and consistent with our goal of a balanced budget by the end of 1980. My economic advisors believe that such efforts can generate budget funds of about \$60 billion.

-- Last year alone we spent \$17 billion, or roughly \$300 for each family in the land, for unemployment benefits and welfare costs brought on by the Republican recession. With

a positive program to get our economy moving again, we can dramatically reduce these recession-related expenditures and obtain substantial additional revenues by putting our unemployed back to work. With these extra revenues we can begin on an orderly, careful, balanced and non-inflationary basis to phase in national health insurance, to clean up the welfare mess, and get the country back to work.

-- As a farmer, businessman and governor, I've always had a balanced budget.

-- Zero-base budgeting and the sunset concept will assure careful review of each program.

We've been losing about \$3 billion a year in Medicaid through mismanagement and fraud. Waste in government is incredible.

3. Kennedy Debates

-- The standard Republican response, whether the year is 1936, or 1960, or 1968, is that it can't be done. My answer is to look at what John Kennedy achieved after he took office. . . . in the face of exactly the same Republican charges. Once President Kennedy's economic policies took hold, our country had an average growth rate of 5.5%, one of the highest, sustained growth rates in our country's history. Budget deficits were small (down to \$1.5 billion in 1965), inflation was held to 2%, compared to the present rate of 6% to 7%, and we cut

unemployment to 4%, down from the 6% when Kennedy took office. In 1960 John Kennedy promised to get America moving again and he delivered on that promise. I make the same pledge in 1976 and I intend to deliver.

4. Limiting the Cost of New Programs

-- The cost of the proposals I support will be no greater than the \$60 billion budget dividend generated by steady economic growth. I have no intention of going to the White House with an expensive bill for new federal programs that cannot be paid for. Only in conjunction with these budget earnings will new initiatives be phased in. If there are insufficient funds, new initiatives will have to be more modest or phased in over a longer period of time. Because I believe we should promise only what we can afford, I will not propose any new programs that cannot be paid for within the context of budget responsibility. I intend to hold government expenditures to 20 to 22% of our total national income, which is less than the proportion today. I do not intend to raise taxes to pay for any new programs.

QUESTIONS ON BIG SPENDING

Possible Question #1

"Mr. Carter, one of the basic Republican themes of the campaign is that your conservative rhetoric is just for political purposes and that, in reality, you are little different from the big-spending Democrats in Congress. They also point to the Democratic platform and charge that implementation of its proposals would cost between \$100 and \$200 billion and that this would trigger huge budget deficits and a new wave of inflation. How do you respond to this charge? How do you propose to pay for all these new programs without busting the budget and setting off a new round of inflation?"

(See basic statement):

- GOP deficit record
- Usual GOP charge
- Democratic accomplishments under Kennedy-Johnson
- Phasing-in as revenues permit
- Saving recession-related costs
- Zero-base and sunset savings

Possible Follow-up Question #1

"Mr. Carter, to blunt the charge of your being a big spender, you've said you would phase-in big new programs and that you would hold spending to a level that would be consistent with a balanced budget by the end of your first term. But what you haven't told us is what these beginnings would cost. The Republicans charge that national health insurance would cost \$80 to \$100 billion. You seem to suggest that it would cost a great deal less because you would begin the program more slowly. Can you tell us exactly what you plan to do in the area of national health insurance and what this would cost?"

--The average American is now paying \$550 per year for medical care. But many parts of the country have inadequate facilities of care. And each American family lives with the knowledge that doctor and hospital bills could bring bankruptcy.

--The vital first step in a workable national health care system is to get control of waste and hold down runaway costs by implementing present laws to abolish duplication of services, to eliminate expensive services of little or no

benefit, and to make certain that health services are provided by appropriate personnel in the least expensive and most humane setting. We would then phase-in the program as revenues permit, in order of priority and need.

--For the past eight years the Republican Administration has done next to nothing in stopping this outrageous scandal in the Medicaid program. So we would start with this essential period of preparation by enforcing existing regulations and by implementing the cost controls and hospital-auditing contained in the legislation sponsored by Senator Talmadge.

Possible Follow-up Question #2

"Please define the first steps and priority in phasing-in a national health insurance program."

(To be answered only if pressed hard and escape is impossible).

--We would combine parts A (Standard hospital) and B (optional physician) in the Medicare program and eliminate the monthly premium payments of \$7.20 for the elderly. (This can be accomplished for about \$2 billion).

--Next, assuming that our economic policies were on track, and revenues permitted, we would probably proceed to universal catastrophic coverage. (A cost of between \$5 and \$6 billion).

--I would then give the most serious consideration to moving toward substantial health benefits for mothers and children (up to 18 years of age). This is a very cost-effective program that will cover 67 million children and 4 million expectant mothers. (N.B.: A completely comprehensive program for mothers of children would cost \$15 billion, counting Medicaid savings, with less cost for a lesser program).

--I believe this general outline supports my position that it is possible to make a good solid beginning in building a national health care system within the goal of a balanced budget by the end of my first term. The 60 billion extra dollars that I have forecast will give us the fiscal leeway we need to move forward in this area.

--Finally, I believe from the bottom of my heart that we must begin. I believe that we can and that my program will cost what we can responsibly spend on health care within the strict confines of a balanced budget. The Republican Administration has not done enough to correct the scandal in the Medicaid program, to contain health costs (hospital costs up 18% last year...121% since GOP took office in 1969), and to make a responsible beginning toward a national

health care system that will improve the health and security of our people. (Don't use the dollar numbers at all unless pressed directly).

Possible Follow-up Question #3

"All well and good, Mr. Carter, you've given us the broad outlines of your plan to hold spending within the confines of a balanced budget. But what about the specifics of welfare reform? We've been talking about welfare reform for years, everyone promises to do it, but nothing ever happens. What are your specific plans and what are the costs?"

--First, the present welfare system is a mess and an outrage. It encourages people not to work. It demeans recipients. It destroys families. And it wastes enormous amounts of money. We cannot continue as a country to live with the current welfare mess which is wasteful to taxpayers.

--Despite these recognized problems, the Republican Administration has done next to nothing to reform the present system. Its efforts to eliminate efforts have failed. Administrative costs have doubled since 1972. A quarter of all welfare payments go to people who are ineligible for the program, or who should receive smaller payments. At present there are 400,000 middle level bureaucrats who process forms for over 100 welfare programs. These administrative costs drain off 1 dollar out of every 8 dollars intended for the poor. If our

welfare system was administered only as efficiently as our social security system, we could save more than \$2 billion per year from lower administrative costs.

--As President, I would propose to solve the welfare mess by first consolidating the maze of programs we now have, ending duplication and overlap. Some families now participate in multiple programs, illegally pyramiding benefits, so that some people receive up to \$10,000 or more, tax free, as a result of getting welfare, food stamps, housing assistance, and Medicaid.

--These reforms would put people to work who can work -- with emphasis of job development on the private sector, through tax incentives and other subsidies.

--No one who can work should be permitted to remain indefinitely on welfare. But now about 1.3 million welfare recipients have nothing wrong with them physically or mentally. We need a requirement that they be trained and then offered a job. If they don't take a job, I would not want to pay them any more benefits,

--The vast majority on welfare who cannot work should be treated with decency and respect. There should be a single

basic benefit that is uniform nationwide, adjusted area by area for variations in the cost of living. We should remove welfare expenditures from local units of government in order to relieve the local property tax burdens from our citizens. (This presently accounts for about \$2 billion). Thereafter, and as revenues permitted, I would phase down and reduce the state share of welfare costs. Tax credits for the working poor should be used to encourage the alternative of work instead of welfare (N.B.: There currently is a limited tax credit for the working poor provided by the Long bill). (Also note: The current local share of AFDC is \$1 billion; the state share is \$5 billion; federal share of Medicaid is \$7 billion; state share is \$6 billion, local share is \$1+ billion.)

--Most of these reforms can be funded by streamlining and cutting out waste and overlapping. A system as efficient as social security can save \$2.3 billion per year. Eliminating errors in the food stamp program can save \$23 million per month. The Supplemental Security Income (SSI) program has overpaid recipients by \$547 million in its first two years.

--As we move toward full employment, the costs of welfare, food stamps, and unemployment insurance will decline. Between 1974 and 1976 the costs of these programs rose by some \$23 billion and this will provide additional resources to implement my welfare proposals.

--In short, I believe that my proposals can be implemented for a maximum expenditure of \$2 billion. The bulk of the other changes that I have discussed can be paid for by tough, unrelenting reorganization of the existing system to eliminate fraud and waste. It all gets back to electing new leadership with new perspectives to take charge of a situation that the Republican Administration has permitted to get totally out of hand.

Possible Follow-Up Question #4

"Governor, isn't your welfare reform program simply a warmed over version of the McGovern \$1,000 'demogrant?'"

--No. My program is built around the idea of putting everyone to work who can work. As I remember McGovern's program, it was designed simply to pay each family a certain amount of money. I do not think that those who are capable of working should be paid not to work if they refuse jobs or training. My program would be based on a strong work test, coupled with education, training and employment for people who can work. For adults who were caring for children full-time, or who are disabled, and for the 8 million children who cannot be expected to work, I would propose a fair, compassionate benefit standard.

POPULIST

Q.: Governor, you have sometimes been described as a populist. Would you define that term for us? Is it an accurate description of you and your philosophy of government?

ANSWER:

--I would avoid pinning any label to myself.

--Populism has had many connotations throughout our history. As you know, the word is derived from populus--- people---and has variously been attached to movements and leaders that have been generally identified with the ordinary citizen rather than with a social or economic elite. Certainly, in my own part of America, populism has long and deep roots. In some cases, though, populism has been attached to people that have been excessively divisive and, in some cases, racially biased. None of these certainly fits my situation.

--I don't think the term "populism" lends itself to precise definition any more than such terms as "liberal" or "conservative." I've avoided those labels too.

--If I had to describe myself and my outlook, I'd more likely choose words such as moderate...activist...hard-working...unbiased and fair-minded...patriotic...determined. Those words would seem to have more useful application than so-called ideological labels in understanding how I might conduct myself as President.

--People are tired of labels. They want results not slogans.

MISMANAGEMENT

Jimmy Carter has made the issue of government mis-
management one of the major themes of his campaign. Given
his professed ignorance of the federal bureaucracy, and
his single term as Governor of a small rural state, how can
he believe himself to be qualified to manage the federal
government?

Basic Statement

- I. Being an outsider to Washington is an advantage in my attempt to bring better management to Washington.
 - A. I owe nothing to special interests and thus I don't have to
protect the status quo in Washington.
 - B. I've had experience at the state level trying to get action from the federal government - the delays, the paperwork, the conflicting policies, and the lack of understanding.
 - C. As a governor I've had experience bringing efficiency
and higher service standards to the Georgia judicial
system, the GBI and the Department of Human Resources.
 - D. I've been a farmer and a businessman and a naval
officer so I've learned how to handle people and to manage money.

II. If I'm elected I expect this experience and background will help me bring significant changes in the way government serves people.

A. First I intend to completely reform the wasteful way in which government runs social programs.

1) Medicaid: The Medicaid program, to cite one example is a continuous scandal of waste, error and fraud. In many cities Medicaid mills operate openly out of store fronts, dangerously over-treating patients and fraudulently over-charging the government. Senate investigators estimated that Medicaid doctors performed hundreds of thousands of unnecessary surgical procedures in 1974, that may have caused as many as 1700 deaths. One man was given x-rays to diagnose a bunion; one woman who sought treatment for a child with a cold, wound up receiving treatment for herself and all five of her children at a cost of \$100. Some doctors in New York receive more than half a million dollars a year in Medicaid payments.

The Department of HEW, which is charged with policing the program, has done little or nothing to remedy the situation, which is estimated to be costing the government

as much as \$3 billion per year. Though there are an estimated 40,000 cases of fraud in the Medicaid program each year, the Department of HEW has only 69 investigators, one-third fewer even than there are slots available.

2) Other Examples: This pattern of mismanagement is repeated everywhere. According to the GAO, the food stamp program is wasting \$23 million per month. The Supplemental Security Income program has paid out \$547 million in overpayments during its first two years. The Department of Housing and Urban Development has lost \$2.1 billion in foreclosed mortgages, and is spending \$400,000 per day to maintain them.

3) Need for change: Year after year the scandals appear in the paper. I believe that they don't have to happen, and that government can be run efficiently. We need to redesign our welfare system so that it is cheap to administer and hard to cheat. We need to rigorously enforce our restrictions on fraud and overcharging. We need to take the best of our experience with government--the efficiency of the Social Security System, the thoroughness of the IRS, the respect for the recipient of the Veterans

Administration, and the friendliness of the Agricultural Extension Service--and combine them to build systems that work to benefit people rather than cheating taxpayers.

B. In addition to ending the waste and fraud, we need to end the delays, the policy conflicts and the lack of direction that the huge federal bureaucracy seems to thrive on now.

1. Delay: In 1963 the Chicago and Northwestern Railway applied to the Interstate Commerce Commission to acquire parts of the Chicago, Rock Island and Pacific Railroad. After 50,000 pages of testimony, 100,000 pages of exhibits, and 13 years they are still waiting for an answer. Meanwhile the Rock Island has gone bankrupt. The ICC example may be extreme, but there is not a state or local official in the nation who has had to deal with the federal government who cannot tell his own story of waiting for an answer from Washington.

2. Policy Conflict: In 1975, while the EPA was pressuring industries burning coal to switch to cleaner oil and gas, the FEA was requiring the same utilities to switch from short supplies of oil and gas to more plentiful coal.

3. Pledge: We still don't have a coherent national energy policy, or a transportation policy or an education policy. We still can't get timely decisions from the federal government. If I'm elected president I intend to enunciate clear, firm coordinated national policies. I intend to demand uniform speed of response standards from federal officials.

C. Finally, and perhaps most importantly in achieving better management, we must restore the integrity of our personnel system so that it attracts the most highly qualified men and women into government and retains them.

1. Conflicts of Interest: We must put an end to the cozy relationships and conflicts of interest between the regulators and the regulated. Of the 45 appointees to the regulated industries over the past five years, more than half have come from the regulated industries.

2. Political Rather than Merit Appointees: We must replace unqualified political appointees with individuals of the highest quality, regardless of party. In the two years of the Ford Administration we have seen 15 dis-appointed Republican office seekers resurface in positions of high responsibility in government.

III. I believe that we can improve the efficiency of government,
and restore the spirit of those who serve it. Our goal
should be to run government with the fiscal conservatism,
the efficiency, and the spirit of public service that
characterizes the best of businesses.

Our goal should be to have a system which allows civil
servants to serve out their careers with same dedication
and idealism that brought them to government.

Follow-Up Question #1:

President Ford recommended that 59 social service categorical grant programs be consolidated into 4 block grants, but his recommendations were rejected by Congress. If the interlocking relationships between Congress, the special interests and the agencies stopped President Ford, why should you do any better?

ANSWER

The Administration's consolidation program was really an excuse to cut out vital programs, such as health services for the elderly, preventive health care, assistance for the handicapped, and vocational education. The Administration's proposed cuts in aid would mean sharp reductions in critical local services or even higher local property taxes for millions of Americans. Consolidation should never and will never succeed if it is used to hurt the people most in need. There is wide support in Congress for a consolidation of programs, so long as the new programs are fair.

Secondly, if a President wants legislative support for his program, and if he wants it to be effective once enacted, he will do what this Administration has failed to do: involve the mayors and governors in a full consultative relationship in developing new approaches.

Reorganization and elimination of wasteful programs will not be easily accomplished. It will require strong Presidential leadership, based on a cooperative relationship with Congress. The Administration has met neither of those conditions.

Follow-Up Question #2:

Most of the categorical grant programs that create so much red tape for state and local government were Democratic initiatives; the movement toward revenue sharing and more local control has been a Republican thrust. Can you really turn this around and make this a Democratic issue? Aren't you running against the history of your own party?

ANSWER

First, two prominent Democrats (Walter Heller and Joseph Peckman) initially proposed the concept of revenue sharing, which is the strongest action Washington has taken to return decision-making power to the states. The Democratic Party can take pride in its history of providing for those truly in need. The Republican position has simply been that important programs benefitting millions of Americans should be cut out. The answer is not a wholesale repudiation of our commitments, but rationalizing our government, trimming and eliminating in areas of overlap and waste.

In many cases, the problem is not so much the program itself--Medicaid is an example--but the fact that programs have been wastefully administered.

Democrats, like Republicans, have made mistakes. What's important is a commitment to leadership to take advantage of our experience, including the mistakes, to make the system work again.

Follow-Up Question #3:

The purpose behind the categorical grants, which were Democratic programs, was to meet critical national objectives. Aren't you really talking about cutting back on our social commitments -- commitments which have always represented what the Democratic Party stood for?

ANSWER

No. When money is wasted in red tape and bureaucratic morass, it's not the poor that benefit. Efficiency means channelling more money to the poor. An efficient welfare system would save up to \$2 billion in administrative costs alone. Reducing waste in other programs would achieve similar benefits.

The Republicans have been using the rhetoric of efficiency as a cover for simply ignoring pressing national needs. We are committed to meeting those needs, but we can only do so if we are equally committed to making our programs more efficient.

COMMENTS: FORD/CARTER DEBATE--
September 23, 1976

From my notes of the debate it seems apparent that you should have been credited as the "winner" (assuming that the form of debate used can have a winner). Unfortunately the "average" listener was not taking notes that night and later made a judgment on what he or she could remember.

Going into the debate Jimmy Carter, "the candidate," was clearly the underdog against Gerald Ford, "the President." However, Jimmy Carter "the candidate" could have emerged Jimmy Carter "our candidate"; the candidate whom the people could trust to get the job done and done right. What happened? Why isn't the man who "won" on paper also the "winner" in the eyes of the people?

As I see it style was the key factor Thursday night. Admittedly Ford is not a man of tremendous style, but he was relaxed enough and programmed enough to look as if he were in control of the situation. When the cameras first zoomed in on the debate the Carter smile was missing. The man who had been kidded about his plastic smile, the man who had won over many people with his down home way, appeared tense and scared. Before the first question there was not a smile from Jimmy Carter.

This tenseness did not fade with the asking of the first question. Your face seemed drawn. Your clarification of your stand on various issues seemed far too programmed and memorized. Had the television stations not told the audience that there were no prompters, one would have thought you were reading the answer off of cue cards. In contrast the Ford rebuttal seemed more spontaneous and a bit more relaxed.

When Ford was asked his first question on taxes, the response was smoother, Ford seemed confident and in control of the situation. Your rebuttal was in a better tone from your previous question. While responding to Ford's answer to the tax question you appeared to relax and seemed to be emerging once again the Jimmy Carter we had watched campaign all year.

Unfortunately, this state of mind did not last. When you were asked your second question on what programs would have to give in order to balance the budget, you reacted in much the same way you had to the first question. Until you were asked about the energy crisis, the fourth question, there were two Carters (stylistically) participating in this debate: a tense, hard-looking, scared Carter answering questions and an alert, self-assured, confident Carter refuting Ford's answers. Your

confidence did seem to build as the debate progressed but the damage to the Carter image had already been done.

Your answer to the second question on the budget needs some reworking. The budget is a complicated issue to begin with. Many people find it difficult to understand how the budget works. Since the primary thrust of most questions about the budget concern themselves with the cost of your proposed programs, your answers would flow better if you began by explaining the assumptions used to figure the cost of your proposed programs and the assumptions used to determine what future revenues will be available to fund these programs. For example, instead of saying "If we assume" in the middle of the answer, you should begin with "Assuming the programs I have proposed would cost \$ _____. Now assuming ... we should have a \$60 billion surplus by 1981."

As it was your answer in the debate left even those who have some understanding of the budget wondering if you would really be able to initiate the programs on the Democratic platform or if we would only have a \$5 billion to \$15 billion surplus by 1981 as the Republicans claim.

Your response to Ford's answers on amnesty lacked force. There was a tendency on your part to look down at the podium (or so it appeared on television) and you began to mumble when defining your terms (pardon and amnesty). Since the thrust of your response depended on the distinction between a pardon and amnesty you should have begun with the definition of terms and related those definitions to your position on the issue. The statement on the need to equalize the crime system provided a very positive conclusion for this response and could have been picked up later in the concluding remarks.

If it is possible to work with the cameramen it would be helpful to ask that the cameras not move back and to the far right for long-range shots. When they did this Thursday night the chair behind you always came into view. Aesthetically this is not good. The cameramen did not get this sort of picture when they took long-range shots of Ford. I don't see a need to have the chair behind the podium anyway. The only time you used it was during the 28-minute break and hopefully that will not happen again.

To debate successfully requires a good memory or an ability to take good notes. When a speaker chooses to take notes he must also remember to put the pen down before speaking, otherwise it begins to distract the audience's attention. Instead of

listening, the audience spends part of their time trying to figure out what type of pen Jimmy Carter is using. A pen moving in the air during your speech also diminishes any impact that could be obtained by using hand gestures.

One thing that could have easily given your image a boost in the eyes of the television audience would have been to talk to Ford during the break. Can the bitterness between two men run so deep that friendly, causal words cannot be exchanged? With so many newspaper pictures of the Carter family going to church the 28 minute silence between yourself and Ford seemed to contradict the previous image.

Once the technical problems were solved your closing remarks for the response to Ford's sixth question appeared inadequate. When a audio problem such as this occurs, time should be spent to prepare a complete concluding sentence to use when (and if) the program goes back on the air. To pick up with the end of a sentence loses all impact for the listener. In this case, the conclusion of the sentence made no sense. Apparently you had begun another sentence after my audio had gone off. So on my tape I have the beginning of one sentence and the ending of another. Even if the sentence as a whole had made sense, after 28 minutes I doubt if many people even remembered what the first half of the sentence had been.

It was unfortunate that you lost both flips of the coin and had to go first on both the opening and closing statements. To have been the last speaker on the program might have helped in terms of the primacy/recency affect. Even so, I found your closing remarks to be far too prepared and inappropriate for the situation. Many of the phrases sounded too familiar. For me at least, there was a tendency to check the tape recorder, pour a glass of lemonade, etc., all because I felt I was hearing a speech I had heard before. Your closing remarks should have been split into two parts. The first two minutes could have been an overall refutation of what Ford had said during the debate. For example, you could have commented on the contradiction between Ford's rebuttal on the budget question (Carter question #2) where he said he'd give the surplus revenues to the people in the form of tax reductions and his statement at Vale where Ford said that in his next administration there would be increased emphasis in five areas: jobs, housing, health, improved recreational facilities and crime. Ford had also said earlier that we must cut \$1 federal spending to give \$1 tax relief. If he plans to give \$10 billion tax relief in his next administration it becomes a bit difficult to emphasis additional programs.

Then you might have talked about the Ford position that the pardon of Nixon was just (question #2) but we need tougher sentencing in our penal system (question #3). Or the various areas for change that Ford through out on question #3 (reduce home down payments, drug abuse programs, increase in education) but no hint on how he would change these programs. This first two minutes could have been concluded with an explanation of Ford's misunderstanding of the consolidation of government issue (i.e. how Ford does not comprehend that one can condense the number of programs, add more people in that program or other programs in other than administrative positions, and thereby give more "services" for the same or less money.) Ford continued to try to boil this overall argument down to the number of people employed by the federal government and not the nature of the structure even in his closing remarks.

After making these or similar direct concluding remarks you should have concluded with a prepared statement, but preferably not one used a great deal in previous campaigning. A new idea or a new way of saying some of the old ideas will remain in the minds of the audience longer than the same old campaign jargon. As it was people are remembering far more of Ford's closing remarks. They remember the direct statements he made about what you had said in the debate. They also remember his closing remarks about the way it is in America. On the other hand most people just remember that Jimmy Carter said close to the same things he's been saying all along.

Sybil Goodnight
8906 Ewing
Evanston Ill
60203

X4