

## **Debate Issues [7]**

Folder Citation: Collection: Records of the 1976 Campaign Committee to Elect Jimmy Carter;  
Series: Noel Sterrett Subject File; Folder: Debate Issues [7]; Container 79

To See Complete Finding Aid:

[http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign\\_1976.pdf](http://www.jimmycarterlibrary.gov/library/findingaids/Carter-Mondale%20Campaign_1976.pdf)

SOME NOTES ON ISSUES

In our national surveys we have also been looking at in-depth attitudes toward a number of issues. An attached memo from my partner John Gorman deals with a number of the questions about the economy and the relation between Ford, Carter and the Democratic Republican Parties. In a few pages here, I would like to merely comment on some of the general issue findings that supplement his memo.

When we asked voters what was the major problem facing the United States today, we found results similar to those we received after the Democratic convention. Economy, recession, depression headed the list with 18 percent of the responses; followed by jobs and unemployment at 16 percent; inflation, high food prices, 12%. When one passed beyond the economic issues, we found that the whole issue cluster of moral decay, poor leadership, poor politicians, lack of values, etc. ranked second. That question also included concern about corruption and lack of honesty and crookedness in government, which was high. Following that was the whole area of government spending, waste, government, reorganization, and general governmental problems, which formed the third issues cluster. These are much the results that we have seen in past surveys.

We also gave voters a list of various issues and asked them to rank each issue on a scale from 1 to 5, meaning not very important at all, to very, very important, and tell us how they ranked each issue. The results were as follows:

## ISSUE INTENSITY

### PERCENTAGE SAYING "VERY, VERY IMPORTANT"

Corruption in government	49%
Unemployment	46%
Inflation, cost of living	44%
Crime & Drug Abuse	43%
Mismanagement of the federal government	40%
Help, aid to the elderly	37%
Strong national defense	35%
Deficit spending by the federal government	35%
Moral decay	32%
Health care	31%
Energy	24%
Foreign policy	23%
Problems of the cities	22%
Gun control	22%
Environment	21%
Busing	20%
Abortion	18%

As we can see, the list was headed in intensity with government corruption, unemployment, inflation, and crime. What is interesting is that none of the issues broke the 50% mark for being very, very important. Normally, we would expect to see several of these issues

in the 50-60% category. This may suggest in part that the public is less concerned or less intense over specific issues as we enter this presidential year than they are on larger questions, as they have been on specific issues in the past. We also asked voters to review the list again, and tell us which issue the government should work on first and which on second. The results were as follows:

		<u>1st</u>	<u>2nd</u>
GOVERNMENT SHOULD WORK ON	Inflation	31%	47%
	Unemployment	15%	30%
	Crime	10%	21%
	Corruption in government	8%	19%
	Mismanagement of government	5%	17%
	Government spending	4%	10%

From this list we can see that inflation on first choice was more than double that of unemployment, which indicates just the rise in that issue and that concern for voters. Previously we had seen those issues running about equal.

We also asked voters which of these issues the president could do the most about and which he could do the least about, and to again rate them in order. The results were as follows:

	<u>1st &amp; 2nd</u>
PRESIDENT CAN DO MOST ABOUT: Inflation	27%
Foreign Policy	23%
Mismanagement of government	22%
Corruption in government	22%
Unemployment	19%
Spending	18%

We can see from this list again inflation tops the list of what the president could do the most about, followed by foreign policy, and then a jump for government spending. When we asked voters what the president could do least about, moral decay ranked first, problems of abortion ranked second, and problems of the city ranked third.

We also asked a series of questions about alienation. We found some very interesting responses to the statement "Is the country heading in the right direction or seriously going in the wrong direction?" We found 24% said it was going in the right direction, 64% said it was going in the wrong direction. On some of the alienation questions: That most politicians don't really care about people like me, we found that 45% of the voters agreed, 41% disagreed. The rest were not sure. Finally, on the question that "the Republicans make the economy good in election year, and hurt it the other three years in order to get re-elected - the leap-year prosperity argument - we found that almost a majority, 48% of the voters agreed with that, and about 37% disagreed. The balance undecided.

We tested a number of specific issues questions on the electorate. On the question of whether the government could be reorganized or whether that was not really possible, again we found an overwhelming percentage, 86% who did believe that government reorganization was a realistic possibility. Only 5% who felt it wasn't.

On the question of "did people favor guaranteeing everyone a job" we found our highest percentages yet this year, 67% in favor, 26% oppose. We also asked those who favor, if they would still favor the proposition if it meant the government creating jobs for people, and here we found an agreement of 78% to 14%. In a different vein, we found that by an 88 to 7% margin, people believed that those on welfare who could work should be forced to accept jobs or be cut off welfare.

We tested Jimmy Carter's statement that restoring trust was the major issue of 1976, and we found an astounding 76% of the voters who agreed with that statement, and 19% disagreed.

On the question of national defense, we found our highest percentages in recent years, 44% favoring expanding of our defense, and ~~27% keeping just as it is, and 19%~~ saying we could spend less. There has been a steady trend this year for increasing defense spending and we find it in this statement.

We asked people on the question of health care whether we should keep health care as it is, which drew 16%, institute a small system for catastrophic illness, which drew 26%, and a guaranteed national health care system that guaranteed everyone as much health care as he or she really needed, 33%, or have a totally nationalized health care system, where hospitals were nationalized, doctors licensed, prices controlled, etc. 17%. The last two solutions, guaranteed national health care for everyone, and total nationalization add up to 50% of the electorate favoring those propositions. When we asked people whether they would be willing to have their taxes raised to pay for a health care system which would guarantee

everyone as much health care as he or she needed, we found that 47% said that they would, 43% said they would not, 11% were not sure. Even though it is a slight plurality in favor, this is down from numbers we had seen in the past. We also asked some questions about abortion. We asked people whether they would favor a constitutional amendment to outlaw abortion, we found 32% in favor and 54% opposed, with 14% undecided. We found a plurality of the Catholics also opposed abortion. On the statement we asked people, if they would ever agree to vote for a candidate who supported abortion, we found 20% agree and nearly 70% who disagree. As we saw earlier on the intensity scales, abortion ranked at the bottom in terms of intense issues, and barely came up in the open-ended issues. So while it's an issue of high visibility and great importance, perhaps, to those who make it visible, it is not a wide-reaching issue in the Presidential election.

In your opinion, what has been the  
outstanding success of the Ford  
administration?

	<u>August 1</u>	<u>Today</u>
Keeping country from falling apart, brought back even keel	7%	5%
Generally good job on economy, improved economy	7	4
Curbed inflation	6	5
Bringing honesty and integrity back to government	3	5
Standing up to Congress on veto policy	2	1
Keeping peace	2	3
Ending Vietnam War	2	2
Foreign policy, foreign affairs, Kissinger	2	4
Generally good job, strong leadership	2	3
Everything	--	--
Hasn't done anything	18	23
Helped aged, promised to help elderly, and increase Social Security	1	--
Other	7	7
Don't Know	38	34

In your opinion, what has been the major failure of the Ford Administration?

	August 1	Today
Nixon Pardon	14%	8%
Generally poor job, hasn't done much, poor leadership	6	2
Too mild mannered, no initiative, weak, etc., inconsistent, doesn't act independently	6	6
Poor job on unemployment	5	8
Foreign policy, foreign relations, Mid-East, etc.	4	4
Failure to curb inflation, cost of living	4	10
Generally poor job on the economy	4	4
Veto policy, vetoing Congressional bills	4	2
Hasn't pulled people together, misinformed or misunderstanding the mood of the U.S., lack of direction	3	-
No rapport with Congress - can't communicate	3	5
Too pro-big-business, not for the people	2	1
Domestic policy	2	-
Trying to give work to welfare people	1	-
Carrying on Nixon administration, a Nixon man	1	2
Everything, hasn't done anything good	2	4
Nothing (and other positive comments)	2	4

Major failure of the Ford administration (continued)

	<u>August 1</u>	<u>Today</u>
Not helping people, not for the people, not for the poor, not for the middle class	-	2
Hasn't lowered taxes, high taxes/government over-spending, etc.	-	2
Busing, issues, stands	-	1
Other	7	8
Don't know	30	27

9/16/76 - Dole - Boston, Massachusetts

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

Well, I don't belong to any organized group. I'm a Republican, and I'm very happy to be here. (APPLAUSE) I got my alphabet wrong. I thought this was an AFL meeting, so I'm very happy to be here too. (APPLAUSE) You can always tell me apart from Senator Mondale, he'll be with George Meany (Applause). Many people ask me how I was selected; more are asking me every day. But I said the president flipped a coin and when it didn't come down, he thought I was the obvious choice. So that happens in the contracting business now and again. But we're very pleased to be here. We've been in the New York State all day. Anybody here from New York. Good. We saw more people than that so I . . .

We made five stops in New York, ending in New York City and it's a great experience for us, and the Vice President with us, Vice President Rockefeller. We were just around to see how a vice president really does it once he's in. On the job training, and it's a nice airplane. I noticed that the first thing. He showed me everything but his checkbook. It was a short flight, so we didn't have time to go into those things.

I want to bring greetings from the President of the United States. I know this is a non-partisan group so I'm just going to tell you the truth. I guess it's fair to say that I'm running with President Ford. It's fair to say that we believe we have an all-American strategy. We're not going to rely, as

you said, on an accent, Joe. We believe that how we believe and how we feel and what we might do for the next four years is what you'd like to hear me talk about at least for a while. We've been traveling now across the country now almost daily since the 19th of August. That was the <sup>night</sup> that the President called our room, and I was right next to John Conally's suite and on the theory that he might have gotten the wrong number, I accepted before I identified myself. (APPLAUSE)

I had a letter from Kansas last week. I had made a speech, and I thought it was pretty good, and it said, "I heard your speech last night on the radio. Believe me, you're no idiot. I am for ever having voted for you." So that's sort of what happens from time to time. I was asked at the airport by someone with a recording machine. I thought it might have been a radio station. It might have been just somebody there wanting to talk with me. He said, "How do you expect to do any good coming to a meeting like this?" I thought this was a pretty first class meeting, but right.... I said, "Well, I don't know. I understand that they are a very fine group." The inference was that since you all didn't belong to some labour union, I was wasting my time in Massachusetts. Now, I don't have any quarrel with labour unions. I have quarrels with labour leaders who have a great deal of influence. Someone once asked George Meany to be President, and he said, "Why step down?". (APPLAUSE)

I don't know Governor Carter's latest positions, because we've been flying all day. (APPLAUSE) But as I've been standing here looking at some of the traveling press, I just believe this might be the crowd for the bear story.

And I'll tell it very quickly and then get on because there's a curfew at midnight, for politicians. This bear walked into a bar in some state that noone here ever came from, and ordered a beer and plunked down a five-dollar bill on the counter and the bartender was a little bit puzzled, but he rushed back to the cooler, took the beer out, the cap off, put it on the counter and rushed back to the boss and said to the boss, "A bear just walked in and gave me five dollars for a bear. What should I do?" He said, "Well, give him back a nickel. He won't know the difference". So he put a nickel on the counter, but after a while, he just couldn't stand it any longer, so he walked around from the bar, and took a stool next to the bear and he said to the bear very seriously, "You know, we don't have many bears in here." And the bear said, "I don't suppose you do at \$4.95 a bottle." (APPLAUSE)

I want to bring you greetings also from Hubert Humphrey. I saw him yesterday in Washington. I said Hello, and about an hour later, I said Goodbye. And I guess the moral is that you can learn a lot if you can listen. Then I went on to the Chamber, and Senator McGovern was making a speech, and he said, "Gentlemen, let me tax your memories." And Kennedy jumped up and said, "Why haven't we thought of that before." (APPLAUSE) The President was coming tonight, but I stold his jokebook.

Well, seriously. They gave me the wrong speech. This is a farm speech for tomorrow, but otherwise we're fairly well organized, and I know you're all concerned about dairy price support, and so are the cows. A different kind of support than

what you probably have in mind. It is a very great honor to be here, and I think I should perhaps mention my southern strategy. My wife, Elizabeth, is from North Carolina. She told me for the benefit of the Massachusetts folks who might be present to mention that she spent nine years in Harvard Law School and then graduated. Well, she was here a long time, and hasn't graduated. No, she did go to Harvard, and in addition she has some other qualities, but there have been a lot of statements lately by Governor Carter that the President is spending too much time on the job, that he's hiding in the White House. Well, I don't think that's right. Peanuts don't grow in the White House, that's right. (APPLAUSE)

Would you buy a used peanut from Jimmy Carter? You have to go back a few years, some of you weren't here then, but I want to make that perfectly clear. . . I don't think running around the country necessarily qualifies one to be President, or for that matter, vice president either. But I can understand why Mr. Carter is doing more talking than the President. He has a lot more explaining to do. They finally agreed on the format for the debates. They'll be three, so that he can explain all of his positions on each issue on separate nights. (APPLAUSE) Now I think the President understands how the government works, and he understands and he knows that the Congress is in session. And his first obligation to the American people is to be in the White House and to be on the job, and once the Congress leaves, then it's safe for him to leave. That is just about how bad the

Democratic Congress is. (APPLAUSE) Some of the democrats thought Commonsightess was a suit with three vests. Others thought they'd never tried it; they thought it would taste good. Others just voted on it on orders from higher up. Well, I voted against that legislation right down the line last year. (APPLAUSE) In fact, I didn't know at the time that it was quite that bad. Next time I'll read it. But the point is this. It would have become law if the President had not vetoed it. That's a fact. (APPLAUSE) And he had said from the very beginning that the Situs Picketing Bill would have to be coupled with genuine reform of collective bargaining in the construction industry. He also said that the Situs Picketing and Bargain Reform package would have to have the support of both Management and Labour. The bill that arrived on his desk did not meet these criteria, and he refused to sign it, and I believe he showed considerable courage in taking action he believed to be right, and I believe this group feels the same way. (APPLAUSE)

(Microphone slips) This has been constructed by the Associated Builders. Those non-union jobs. . . I think you all remember the time the President vetoed this bill. There were great predictions that the veto would create chaos in the construction industry, but look at what happened instead. Two-thirds of the 2,800 contracts up for negotiation were settled, strike activity was at its lowest point in five years and first-year wage settlements were averaging about 1.1% less than in 1975. The veto did not create chaos in the industry. It prevented chaos in the industry. (APPLAUSE) And anyone or anybody who believes

that legalizing secondary boycotts in the construction industry will lead to peaceful labour relations just doesn't understand what those relations are all about. (APPLAUSE) And I would number that misconception as just one among many that Mr. Carter had about the way our economy works. The health of the construction industry is the traditional barometer of the health of the economy. The construction industry is one of the first to be damaged by inflation. Inflation forces costs up as everyone here knows and buying down. The report earlier this year showed that 85% of the nation's families were priced out of the new housing market, and this is a disturbing statistic. The purchase of a new home is just not an economic stimulant. It is rather a stabilizing force in our society. It gives a buyer a real stake in his community. It makes him a concerned participant in the civic and social activities that structure and guide our lives and makes him feel that he has a real tangible piece of the American pie. We have to get the cost of homes in reach of those who want to buy them, and the way to do that is to hold down building costs. And one way to do that is to control inflation throughout the economy. President Ford has done this, stopping the spiral of inflation which began in 1966 and reached a nightmarish 16% along the way. Another way is the President's new housing program, announced last night in Ann Arbor, Michigan, which will reduce down payments and bring monthly cost of home ownership in the line with family income. And I say this very sincerely. I'm in the Congress. I'm on the Budget Committee. I'm on the Finance Committee. I know the pressures on the President of the United States from all of us in Congress, the Republicans, Democrats and Independents. The

President has held the line. President Ford has stabilized the economy and moving forward once again, the economy is moving in the right direction. Housing starts are up. Plant construction is not up yet, but that will follow. And the President has proposed tax incentives to Congress for companies to put new plants and equipment in labour market areas where unemployment rose above 7% in 1975. That would provide a boost for the construction industry. It would reduce and help reduce further unemployment. It would be done without increasing inflation. But as about 70 other pieces of legislation the President has sent to Congress, they refuse to act. And they've failed to act. And they'll be no action this year because we're about to adjourn.

And I just think that's another example of the Presidential initiative sent to the Congress by President Ford where the Congress has turned their back on President Ford. Perhaps, as I have suggested before, when they lose in November, they'll be a more tractable group next year. (APPLAUSE)

Now we've had the New Deal, and the Fair Deal and the Fast Deal, and we're about to have the ORDEAL if Carter's elected. (APPLAUSE) You'll be smiling all the time you're going down. And just let me say that we have a choice to make in November. Now I trust that there are Democrats in this audience, and I trust that there are Independents, and I trust that there are Republicans. There went a Democrat . . . There may be others. They're falling by the wayside right and left. (APPLAUSE)

Now I don't want to attack . . . Well, I guess I do. Sort of a dilemma. You don't know whether to do it or not. And

I've been debating that with myself for three weeks, and maybe it's a little early. We'll wait a while. But I think we've had evidence the past forty years of what happens when Congress of one party, the liberal democrats I'm referring to in the Congress, control that Congress for 40 out of 45 years, controlled by and largely by organized labour leaders, not the rank and file working man, but by labour leaders. And if we want to turn the White House over to George Meany, you just sit on your hands until November, and that's going to happen. We need your help. We want you to go to work.

(APPLAUSE)

And there is a lot more at stake than Common Sense Legislation. Oh, they'll get that too, if they have Carter. But you're going to get a lot, lot more, and it's going to be passed on to your children and your grandchildren in the form of higher taxes and more and more spending and more and more government. And I say that with all the sincerity I can muster. If you look at the Democrat platform and study it very carefully, there's not one new spending program or increased spending program. There are not five. You couldn't guess how many. There are 65, 65 new or expanded or increased spending programs in the Democrat platform. We picked up five, five out of 65 would cost this country, you as taxpayers for more inflation over \$100 million, and that's a lot of money. That means about \$760 in taxes to the average householder, and that's a lot of money. And this is a man who talks about compassion, who talks about streamlining government and in that same Democrat platform, he's not creating one new agency or expanding one new agency; he's creating or expanding or increasing

22 new agencies, and this is a man who talks about streamlining government and said he did it in Georgia. And I say as Democrats yes, and Republicans yes, and Independents yes, let's take a look at the record. Let's take a look at what the candidate says. Let's take a look at what President Ford has done. And I say this with all the sincerity I can muster. I was in Lexington Kentucky, the other day talking to a Chamber of Commerce group. I said to the Chamber of Commerce group, and I used to tell this to my Chamber friends, please don't endorse me, I've got a tough race. Because that's all they ever did. I remember one time in my race they sent me a list of Chamber of Commerce managers in my Congressional District. 19 out of the 43 had moved. They didn't know it. Now, we're always tagged with big business and the Chamber of Commerce and all these other people who don't do much except write nasty letters if you don't vote right. And I say there's more at stake. And I say to this group in the kindest way that I can, We Need Your Help. Can't make contributions this year. That's been taken care of by the Federal Government.

But you can knock on doors. You can talk to people. And you can talk about a philosophy. Joe, I can't be your geographical neighbor, but I want to be your philosophical neighbor. And that's what this country is all about... Not where we live, but how we believe. So take a hard, hard look at the candidates. (APPLAUSE)

Now, Governor Carter is trying to straddle the differences and he is endorsed by the liberal party in New York last week and still he professes to be a conservative. They had a liberal on the airplane, some dignitary from the New York Liberal

Party, and he signed some pledge, or whatever you sign when you get their endorsement. Then he says he's really a conservative. He doesn't want any inflation. He wants to balance the budget. He wants all these things at the same time writing a platform as I've indicated would cost more and more money for the American taxpayer. He also goes around saying well, he wouldn't push repeal of 14-B or Common Situs Picketing, but he'd be glad to sign it. Well, that's real leadership, real leadership. And he'll get real leadership from the Democrat Congress. They'll pass anything and he'll sign anything and you're going to pay the bill. And if you pass on before you pay the bill, your children are going to pay the bill.

So I just suggest that we need leaders in this country. And President Ford has demonstrated that capacity. He has the confidence. He has the experience. And he's a kind, and a decent and a compassionate man, who's concerned about everyone in this room, and everyone in this state, and and everyone in this land. And I would hope that you'll keep that in mind. (APPLAUSE)

Mr Carter fusses about Mr. Ford's vetos. He also says he hasn't read the legislation. He hasn't had time. He's so busy talking to Mr. Meany and other labour leaders, getting his orders by the week or by the day, or by mail. I don't know how they're coming. But they're coming. And get ready. And if businessmen and businesswomen and families of businessmen and businesswomen don't go out and work, we're going to reap the whirlwind on November 2nd. That's really what it's all about. Organized labour has been very effective. They don't need to support candidates. They're going to go out now and have these "bi-partisan registration drives". Have they been in here tonight?

No, they're not going to be in here. I just suggest that Mr. Carter's choice of the peanut as his personal hallmark is prophetic. It always reminds me of Charles Schultz' wonderful Peanuts cartoon. You can draw all sorts of parallels between Mr. Carter and poor Charlie Brown, most of all the grandiose schemes that never quite work out. But the most compelling similarity is in the end no one believes either of them can be taken seriously. (LAUGHTER AND APPLAUSE)

I've sort of jumped around on this speech, I think I've covered all of it-- let's see. (LAUGHTER) There's probably more than I had. But the economy is returning to good health. President Ford has held down the growth of government spending. He's done that by refusing to sign irresponsible legislation. He's not heartless-- He's not against education, against children, against feeding anyone. But he has a broad responsibility. We need reform, in some of these areas. Governor Carter said, and I almost cried when he said that in the coronation in New York, he said our national tax system is a disgrace. It was so good I turned up the television. It really hits you right here. You talk about all those loopholes for the rich, I wonder if the investment tax credit is a loophole. He took forty-one thousand dollars off his taxes last year with the investment tax credit. I like the investment tax credit. But let's don't be a demagogue, let's don't run around the country saying one thing and then take advantage of it. Is that a loophole, or is that an incentive? That's all it's all about, just tell them to have Mr. Carter tell us-- I believe in the investment tax credit. He really does. It saved him forty-one thousand dollars in 1975. And that's fine. They needed some new peanut equipment. (LAUGHTER)

I just want to say in conclusion, I think the most important question in this year's election is which man is most qualified by training and by experience and by his own expressed vision of the future, to be responsible for the great engine of the economy. I think the free enterprise system has given us a means to defend ourselves, we must remain a free people. It's given us a means to provide a nation of 220 million people with more opportunity, a better education, better health, better nutrition, a better social and cultural environment, and a free-er political environment than any other nation of comparable size in the history of the world.

Now if we don't cripple that system, and if we trust that system, and let it work, we're going to continue our record of achievement. But if we try to manipulate the system or hobble the system or hamstring the system, if we try to harness it to serve individual political ambitions rather than to serve the whole nation's economic interests, I believe we'll find it will soon falter and fail to function at all. And I say as honestly as I can, I have no quarrel with Governor Carter and Senator Mondale, I think Senator Mondale deserves a hundred percent ADA rating, and that's not the American Dairy Association. (LAUGHTER), That's the most liberal group in America. But he's

9/16/76

PAGE 12

a fine, bright, articulate man. We have different philosophies. And Mr. Carter said his philosophy was compatible with Senator Mondale's. And I want to leave you with one thought. You may be a Democrat, you may be a county chairman somewhere as a Democrat, you may be an independent, you may be a frustrated Republican, but philosophy is the name of the game. And that's what it's all about. And you have an obligation to find out what I believe, and what President Ford believes, and what Governor Carter believes, and what Senator Mondale believes. When you turn on those debates in the first one will be - what, in about a week?-listen very carefully, listen to those positions. Sure, I'm partisan. I want President Ford to win. Not just because I'm a republican, because I believe he offers the best hope for America. (APPLAUSE). And we need (APPLAUSE)... (END OF TAPE)

## Conclusions and recommendations

In viewing the survey data from August, and after extensive analysis, one major conclusion comes forward. More than anything else the electorate has not really decided on what basis to determine their vote in 1976. The electorate seems to move with some volatility back and forth between candidates and does not seem to be rooted by any single, strong conviction or determinate in casting about. The voters, despite their tendency to put greater faith and judgment in Jimmy Carter, don't give him the vote margin that they give him on perception. With issue intensity down and party loyalty down, the electorate seems to be able to float rather freely to the candidates as they like them. The single most critical need for the Carter campaign is to take control of the definition of the general election of 1976. It requires taking the initiative in setting forth to the public the themes with which we want them to make their judgment for President. It is ironic that John Kennedy used the theme "let's get America moving" in 1960. For it is clear from our data that that theme is far more applicable in 1976 to the current situation than it was in 1960. In a broad sense, Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale must articulate a similar message to the American people; that they are fresh, articulate leaders who have vision and strength and leadership to both unify and move the country forward. They must be

able to articulate that the country has stagnated, but that they have the wherewithall and the vision to once again move it in a positive direction. If the election in the eyes of most voters is determined on those questions and the questions of basic qualities and competence, then Jimmy Carter will win by a fairly healthy margin.

However, at the moment this election is not necessarily turning on those questions. If the question turns on "who do you like the most" or "who is a good person", then Gerald Ford has just as much, or perhaps even a slightly better chance to be reelected than Jimmy Carter. If the election is going to come down on the question of simply inflation and government spending, and Congressional spending and waste, i.e. if the Republicans are able to seize the initiative and put Jimmy Carter in the context of the Congress, the Republicans again have a chance to win the election. However neither of those contingencies need necessarily come true, and it is far more likely that the Carter campaign would be able to define the election and call the tune by which the electorate makes its early and final decisions. One unknown factor, which I'll speak to in a moment, is the debates, which could have a tremendous impact on the shape of the election. ~~However, first and foremost, it is necessary~~ that Jimmy Carter take the initiative in defining the election and more importantly find a theme that he can articulate in a consistent manner to the American people everywhere he goes.

To date, it has been my sense that the candidate has tended to struggle - arguing a position in one place, and trying a different issue and argument in another place - as he has travelled in August. I have perceived no sense that he has found his stride or the major theme that he wants to thrust before the electorate. This is what I think more than anything else, that needs to be determined. As I said earlier, I think that the theme ought to be shaped around the question of moving the country and the question of leadership and vision and promise for the United States. For it is on those questions that Jimmy Carter is on strongest ground, and Gerald Ford on weakest.

Nonetheless it is crucial, whatever that theme, and whatever the definition of that theme, that certain points be incorporated into whatever thrust is made. These sub-themes of larger issues really come from both our strengths and countering our weaknesses. To that end I thought I would list a number of those that I felt important to be incorporated into our thrust in a positive way, those that should be attack vehicles, and finally, some of the issues that we expect the Republicans to hit us on and perhaps ways to counter them.

## SUB-THEMES - POSITIVE

1. Government responsiveness, government reorganization - trust. As we found in the regression analysis, making the federal government responsive is the first and most significant of the factors influencing vote. That was one of our main themes in the primaries and was really tied to government reorganization. As I have pointed out in the Issues Memo, the belief that trust in government is the major issue in 1976, draws a great deal of support. It is my feeling that we need to tie together a major issue that talks about making the government responsive, deals with reorganization and gives some examples of the need, and the fact that we cannot make the government responsive to deliver services to people or lead the country or lower taxes - particularly again, lower taxes, given its importance in the regressions - until we can also reorganize the government and make it efficient. These are grounds where we have the strongest leads over Ford. If we structure it properly we can also encompass dealing with keeping taxes down and lowering taxes as a factor which really relates to spending. This would also help our problem with the Congress and perhaps with the slightly developing liberal issue. What we ought to be articulating is who can better make the government responsive to people, who can better reorganize, who can better reduce waste, who can better restore the trust of the people in the government and make it an instrument of the people's will. Again, these are all strengths

of ours, and they should be the first and foremost of the sub-themes that relate to whatever general definition of the campaign we want to apply. These should be hammered at every stop, every visit, every state, during this campaign.

2. Anti-Washington. While it is impossible to wave the ~~bloody shirt~~ as we often did in the primaries, being from outside Washington, as we are now the leader of our Party and in a sense the protector of Democrats seeking reelection, it is still an issue that I believe that we can deal with in a different and yet mature fashion. Gerald Ford and Bob Dole have been in Washington forty-four years combined, and their accomplishments are not very much. Indeed, we can argue that Jimmy Carter is really coming from the country, that he was not nominated as the establishment candidate, that he is the person who can make the Congress and the people in Washington move in a different direction, that he can make them work together with him to bring changes. However, what we're also stressing is that he brings a new perspective, and that he's essentially from ~~outside, not inside~~ of Washington, and only that perspective can change Washington, move the Congress, and eventually move the country. Altogether it means both stressing a negative view to Washington, and yet at the same time indicating that he's able to effectively lead the Congress and others there in getting things done. It's a tricky proposition, but one that I think we are capable of executing.

3. Not over-promising. This was a point that when

made late in the primaries had a tremendous impact on the electorate, particularly a discussion of the platform. Given the fact that the Republicans will attack us as being a big spender or for programs that will amount in the hundreds of billions of dollars, it is important that we stress it's part of our new ethic that Democrats and people coming to Washington ought not to over-promise the people what they will accomplish and what can't be accomplished. This can be tied to credibility, trust, etc. But it is a point that we ought to make in trying to protect ourselves from being attacked, as a traditional liberal Democrat.

4. Unifying the country. We should be willing to utilize,

even somewhat blatantly, our perceived strength at unifying America. Much of this comes from the perception that Jimmy Carter as a deep southern governor has been able to unify, to win in the north, to unify blacks and whites, and to bring the Democratic party together. We ought to point to those things, and point to the fact that unless the country is unified nothing much will be accomplished; ask the question of the electorate who do they believe can better unify America - Jimmy Carter with what he has done or Gerald Ford with what he has done. Again we ought

to stress that constantly and really play on our southern strength.

5. The economy. This is perhaps the toughest and maybe ~~the most important~~ sub-theme other than government reorganization. Regression analysis shows that questions of inflation and managing the economy are important. Since the convention our party has lost some its important additional margin in those areas and Gerald Ford has run close to us in those areas. It seems clear to me that we should be able to emphasize unemployment - our concern with it, our feeling that something should be done and the importance of that, particularly in the northern industrial states with Catholic voters who have been hardest hit on that issue. At the same time we need to begin to deal with inflation and the general question of managing the economy. To this end we ought to utilize party, the Republican record in general on unemployment and inflation, and perhaps the argument of leap-year prosperity and the Republican manipulation of the economy. I suspect that if we hammer at the economy hard and directly on three or four major points that we will succeed in opening up a gap between ourselves and Gerald Ford. Despite the rise in the economy at the moment, Ford does not get a lot of credit for it and if we exploit the issue, we should be able to speak to their weaknesses on the issue

rather than to what Ford perceives as a strength: Unless we are able to do this with the economy, we run the risk again of a closer election defined by Ford along the lines of holding back spending, of controlling inflation, and keeping taxes down. Concern for average people. Because it is personally one of our good strengths and also a good party strength, we ought to also stress that we are the condidacy and the party concerned about average working people, middle-class suburban Americans, and the the other side is the tool and the disciple of big business and large interests. We are perceived to be more concerned about average people than Gerald Ford, our party is, and we ought to utilize this, particularly in blunting the Republican message that they are protecting the country from the Democratic party's ambitious programs. The electorate must be presented the question of which candidate and which party they believe best understands their problems and their concerns, and is willing to act upon them. Time for a change. Almost a majority of the electorate agrees that it is time for a change, it is an argument that is quite strong with our own voters and is one we ought to articulate as we go around. We ought to point out the Republicans have had their chance, that the country is stagnated, and that we need a change, both a breath of fresh air and a different perspective, and a different leadership in Washington in 1976.

8. Crime, welfare, cities. We ought to pound the Republicans consistently on issues like crime and their mistakes, welfare, the waste in welfare spending, the same with Medicaid. Medicare waste. Even though the Republicans tend not to be in favor of those programs we want to point out that not only are they not in favor of them, but they generally administer them poorly. If services aren't delivered the money is wasted, and again this gives us a way of hammering back at government effectiveness, responsiveness, and efficiency in reducing waste-- all arguments in our behalf, all arguments that help reduce the chances that we can simply be tagged as a stereotype liberal. I also suspect the Republicans would have difficulty dealing with this kind of issue.

9. The South. In the southern areas, we should begin thinking about an almost blatant chauvinistic appeal for southern support to make a southerner president. We ought to consider this both in our media and to some extent in our campaigning where it is viable. Some of the southern states are not moving along as strongly as they should, and I think that in the end this is one way to hold and to preserve the entire region if necessary.

Attack themes

1. Not attack Ford, rather party. It is clear from watching August that we have a problem in attacking Gerry Ford on substance. It is clear that attacking him on personal matters is a mistake because of his general popularity. However, even when we hit him on issues or substantive issues it appears to some extent as a personal attack. It is my feeling that what we ought to do is not mention Gerald Ford at all specifically, but rather attack the whole concept of the Republican party, both of its tenure in office and refer to the Republican administration. Senator Mondale has a very effective phrase when he says "this is a very Republican ticket, and a very Republican platform." I think we can get almost as much ground out of attacking the Republican party and by inference attacking Ford, by referring to the Republican administration, and by inference the Ford administration, as we can from attacking it directly. What it frees us from is getting into the arena of attacking Ford personally and gives us a lot more room and a lot more flexibility. At the same time it accentuates the party difference, which is important for us, particularly with undecided voters and voters who've been moving away from our own party and the liberal ideology. All in all, I think it is crucial that we make this conscious and direct change, at least for Jimmy Carter. Under no circumstances should

11

~~we again attack Ford as a pawn of Nixon or the Nixon-~~  
~~Ford administration. It is clear from the survey~~  
data that that does not work, I suspect it backfires -  
the public is overwhelming in not associating Ford in  
an attack sense with Nixon. They have already equated  
the pardon and the appointment, and our harping on this  
association I think is probably a negative, and the  
surveys suggest that. Finally, in terms of an attack  
we ought to constantly raise the question of what are  
the Republicans and what is this administration specifi-  
cally doing to help people or what have they specifically  
accomplished. We can point out that President Johnson  
and President Truman, even when they inherited office  
for two years, were able to accomplish a lot more.

It is interesting that the voters cannot think of much  
of what Ford has accomplished, and in order to accentuate  
again his lack of accomplishments and leadership, we  
ought to raise that question time and time again to  
think of what they've accomplished, and the realization  
of how little it really is.

2. Waste. As I mentioned before, we ought to attack Medi-  
cald, drugs, crime, all the kinds of defense, all kinds  
of abuses in spending and waste and mismanagement that  
have existed in the federal government. Again it postures  
our conservative image, it suggests where we plan to save  
money, and it puts them on the defensive on issues that

they would normally try to be on the offensive with.

3. Taxes. It is clear from the regression analysis that this is crucial, there is no reason why we cannot raise the question of what they've done to taxes in the country, to spending and to deficits, and to the Ford budget of \$387,000,000,000. The Republicans clearly will try to lay this on the Congress, but again I think we can raise the point that if the ship sinks you don't blame the crew, you blame the captain. We ought to point out that their budget is full of waste, find specific examples, and point out that this has really hurt taxes. In the same vein of course we can deal with tax reform and the inequities of the tax system and given its importance to voters, it is something that we should be conscious of raising as an issue.
4. Big business. Again we can deal with Republican give aways to big business at the same time as the average people, unemployed, the normal tax-payer and others are being hurt. The examples from the issues area are legion and again this is a good issue to attack the Republicans on and it is a normal partisan issue for Democrats and one that we should emphasize.
5. Ford in the White House. I think that the Republicans may be making a mistake in keeping Ford in the White House. Ford's strength is his personality, not his job performance. Even though they believe he's a bad campaigner, I believe that that's a result of trying to campaign in a primary against an opponent whom you

don't disagree with very much. I suspect Ford would be tougher general election candidate and a better one than he was in the primaries. As long as they want to keep him, however, in the White House, all they do is accentuate his bad job performance. If this goes on for any period of time we ought to begin to hit Ford on hiding in the White House, trying to manipulate at the last minute government programs and press releases - trying to indicate that he's doing a job. We also can stress the fact that he's rehearsing and practicing for debates, which is something the public keeps mentioning in our surveys in a negative way. And he's unwilling to come out and face and talk and deal with the people, and that the person that's President ought to spend his time out talking and meeting and offering himself to the public. I think this is a contrast we can use for a while, and at the point that Ford does come out of the White House we can take credit for having forced him to come out. This may not develop if they campaign early, but it is one point for possible consideration on our side.

Issues they will hit us with :

1. #1 to 2,000,000,000 programs. It is clear that the Republicans are already working on trying to put a budget figure on the Democratic platform to say that Carter's selection would result in the budget going up one hundred to two hundred billion dollars. They will try to label us as the big spender, as the pawn of the Congress, and as we have seen from the data, there is some feeling that we do bear some responsibility in that area. That is another reason for us to go on the assault on government re-organization, government responsiveness, waste, social program waste, etc., to try to counter this. We also need to think of a direct way in which to diffuse that argument and explain both our phasing in and cautiousness to programs and to increased spending.

2. The Congress. We are not the establishment candidate. We were not nominated that way, and there is no reason to act in that vein. While we all realize that, as the nominee of the party, Jimmy Carter is responsible for certain functions of the Congress and established political groups, I think since the convention we have looked very much like a conventional politician and less like the candidate that voters chose in the primaries. As quickly as possible we need to put some distance between the institution of the Congress and between political institutions and again campaign on our own as an essentially

new and fairly anti-establishment figure. This does not mean we have to desert individual congressmen since of course they campaign against Congress and Washington themselves. It means that we need to avoid the institution since I suspect that that is a no-win battle. On the positive side of course we can argue that our election will allow for the first time in years a Presidency that can work with and lead the Congress as opposed to one that only locks horns and battles with the Congress resulting in the country stagnating and nothing much being accomplished.

3. Vagueness. It is clear that the Republicans are going to attack us for being vague wishy-washy, always changing positions. It is a perception that lingers, it is one that appears to be growing again and it is clearly one that hurts us, particularly now with independents and with the liberals who are reluctant to support us. In part we can counter this I think, by pointing to a lot of the Ford flip-flips whether on common situs picketing, Scalesinger, foreign policy in his own platform, and a number of other specific incidents where Ford has taken one position and then reversed himself or changed his mind under pressure, or whatever. He has tended to do this on substantive issues I suspect it is what has lent some credence to the idea that he himself is vague and indefinite. And the more we can use that as a foil for our own problems, the better off we will be. In

addition there are some specific things that we can do that I will suggest in the next section of recommendations.

### Recommendations

The following is a short list of specific recommendations that I think we ought to consider for the campaign. Most of these come specifically from the survey data and I will just really enumerate them.

1. Schedule people events. I think there's a general concenses that we need to move away as quickly as possible from the image of doing only fund raisers, group events, and large gatherings. Part of our strength in the primaries is the sense that Jimmy Carter is concerned and understands individual problems. We should attempt to schedule cameo individual meetings with small groups of real voters or conversations with voters to give credance to the fact that Jimmy Carter is concerned about those individuals. Also, it allows to credibly build up a file of people and their problems so that during the debates with Ford, Jimmy Carter can specifically point to Mrs. Smith in Milwaukee and her problems with taxes or whatever, and what the federal government has not been able to do. Or Mr. Brown in Cleveland who can't get his Medicaid check, or whatever, to show that we can relate our larger concept to specific individuals again reinforcing the idea that we are concerned about people and that we understand the impacts of various issues. I would particularly like to see this done with

blue-collar, Catholic, ethnic voters, where we are soft, and where the softness seems to come from cultural problems and which I believe can be solved by assurances that Jimmy understands their problems and communicate, and has real concern about them as individuals and their particular problems.

2. Early media. Jerry has already undertaken that. On Thursday the early media starts. However I worry, given what the Republicans are going to spend on media, that Jerry's TV-buy budget for the entire campaign may be far less than adequate.

3. Surrogates. It is crucial that we develop a real surrogates program for this campaign. Jimmy Carter and Walter Mondale are having to carry the entire load of attack. With a united party there clearly must be spokesmen who are willing to take Ford on, whether it's on parks, or whether it's on some of Dole's charges, or whatever. The surrogates clearly have the advantage of saying some of the things that Carter and Mondale cannot say without causing difficulty or blemishing their own images. Yet to date we've had no help from surrogates, and that program has come along very slowly. I suspect only a strong commitment and push from inside our campaign will result in the development of a real surrogates program. For example I'm quite concerned that Senator Dole has managed to go several weeks without being attacked on a number of

18  
statements that he made on Watergate when he was national chairman, on the ITT affair, and on other Republican programs in general. While such attacks would be unbecoming the presidential and vice-presidential candidates, they certainly are fair game for our surrogates. It is clear that the administration is going to utilize cabinet officers, from Henry Kissinger on down, and other administration officials to attack us, and it is ludicrous for us not to utilize our broad range of people in the party to do the same. In fact our surrogates and public figures are probably a lot more effective, a lot more popular, and a lot more recognizable than are theirs. This can be particularly important in helping us attack Ford's job rating and Ford's job. Let us remember that if Ford's job rating declines, that solidifies the election for us, and expands our margin.

4. Party differences: It is clear that one of the advantages that we have is the image of the Democratic party vis-a-vis the Republican party. As was obvious from watching the convention, the Republicans are embarrassed about being Republicans and are going to do nothing to foster that image, and they really, given their situation, are unable to. However, we really could utilize the party, particularly in terms of media, in just attacking the Republicans and pointing out what they've done since they've been in power, their philosophy, the things they've failed in, and essentially broadening the attack not on Ford at all, but on the Republican party in a general way. The advantage

to this is that it would allow us, if Strauss were able to raise the money, or we were able to help him, to go attacking Ford without having to do it directly and without it having to come out of our media funds. It is clear the party can buy time, and could mount a very strong pro-Democratic anti-Republican campaign in general that would specifically benefit us and every other Democrat, and at the same time would probably be free from counter-attack in that it's unlikely that the Republicans would be unable to mount a defense or would want to mount a defense. This is an area where I think we can get a lot of negative media done without it being directly associated with our campaign and without it being directly done on Gerald Ford. The more I've thought about this proposal, the more I think it makes sense, and the more I think it expands our ability of our communications effort and allows us to do so without jeopardizing our own budget and at the same time causing a back-lash against direct attacks on Ford.

5. Short phrases. Given the coverage that the candidates received on the media, I think it's important on every stop that the candidates make, particularly Jimmy, that we look for the one line, short, tough, interesting, that is going to be reported on the air. If we can plan that in advance, or isolate that statement, then we can have some say in determining what appears on the evening news on television. What this really requires is setting forth some very strong and well thought-out and effective

statements that will grab media attention, and inserting them in places that we go for that purpose. It's not a very big point, but it's one that I think we could exercise a lot more effectively in controlling what appears on the news.

6. Evasiveness! Professor Abelson, in his memo on the long unstructured President Ford/President Carter interviews sent down five suggestions of ways to deal with the evasiveness question. I'm merely incorporating them here for our consideration: First, choose a half-dozen issues on which Governor Carter's positions are the most straight-forward, simple, specific, and clear. Probably three of those six issues should be pocket-book issues, hit these issues repeatedly and hard. Second, resist mightily the temptation to qualify positions, especially after the original position statement is concluded. The public is not picking up the honesty and carefulness of Governor Carter, in stating all the boundary conditions on policy, such as military intervention or crop embargos. Nobody in the respondent sample said "I would like Jimmy Carter a lot better if he'd stop being over-precise". Instead of over-precision the tag of evasiveness has been planted. The public mistakes complex precision for evasiveness. Change his perception, emphasize the thrust of a position (e.g. to extend forgiveness and heal the wounds of Vietnam) rather than its distinctions (e.g. pardon versus amnesty); Third, orient the public toward the debates as the true testing

grounds of the candidate. The debates are the single  
 best form to stop the evasiveness charge cold, by  
 being clear, forthright and specific. If, during the  
 debates, Ford tries nit-picking on supposed Carter  
 avoidance of the issues, counter-attack against Ford's  
 avoidance of the needs of the American people. "Ford's  
 evasion of the responsibility of the presidency is the  
 worst evasion of all." Fourth, in a "Walter Cronkite  
 informal interview"-type of context, Governor Carter should  
 explain as an engineering student, naval officer, and  
 a businessman, he often had to consider complex contin-  
 gencies in an uncertain world. A governor and a President  
 have to do the same thing, even more so, especially when  
 there has been so much waste and recklessness in the  
 past. When you try to be honest about how complex some  
 problems are, though, many people think you are being  
 evasive. This line of discussion could then go into  
 specific examples from the campaign. Fifth, take advantage  
 of clear negative responses from audiences, such as the  
 booping by the American Legion to point out that criticism  
 is the price for forth-rightness. Politicians who say  
only what audiences want to hear do not get booped. (PHC  
 note - I would not want to overemphasize this point, as  
 I think it has as many down sides as it does pluses.)  
 Debates. The debates I think are critical and I'm sure  
 we all have that feeling. I have had prepared over the  
 last month in Cambridge, by Professors Popkin and Abelson,  
 a study of the data of the 1960 debate - what it

tells us about what really happened as opposed to what we think happened. In addition, I've asked them to incorporate attitudes we are receiving now on the debates and the candidates, and how that might effect thoughts about the debates. They have prepared this memo, and I'm quite pleased with it and recommend it to everyone. I have some concerns, however, at the basic thought that we are the Kennedy in the debate, and Ford is the Nixon. To some extent I think it's possible to argue if Ford is able to prove that he is at all more or equally as competent, visionary, and sharp as Jimmy, people may view the debates as a draw, and say there really is no difference between the candidates, and we ought to stick with the person we're comfortable with. While I have that concern, I think it's more likely that people will view the debates, if they are tied, with the sense that Jimmy Carter had all the qualities they thought he had and thus feel more reassured about supporting him. Nonetheless, it is important in the debate that we not debate at all, but that we use it as a forum to show how bright and intelligent and broad Jimmy Carter is, as well as what a strong and visionary person he is, in contrast to Ford. We should also emphasize, as much as we can, the fact that Ford's practicing his debate, videotaping, getting stand-ins that he really cannot do it without

Kind of preparation. We are picking up an inordinate  
 number of responses from people about that and in  
 a negative way. If it becomes obvious that that's  
 what he's doing we ought to particularly encourage  
 our surrogates to point that out, and in doing so  
 help build up the expectation that he is expected to  
 do very well, rather than us.

## LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY

### Table of Contents

<u>Bill</u>	<u>Page</u>
Antitrust Enforcement	1
Automobile R & D	1
Clean Air Act Amendments	2
Congressional Budget Resolution	2
Corporate Bribery	3
Electric Car	3
HEW Appropriations	4
Health Manpower	4
Land and Water Conservation Fund	5
Lobbying	6
Medicare & Medicaid Reform (Talmadge Bill)	7
Outer Continental Shelf Leasing	8
Public Works Appropriations	8
Revenue Sharing	9
Synthetic Fuels	9
Tax Reform	10
Toxic Substances	12

ANTITRUST ENFORCEMENT BILL

Status:

Passed Senate on Sept. 8; passed House on Sept. 16; signed by the President Sept. 30. Justice Dept. originally endorsed even stronger bill, but Ford strongly denounced it in March, 1976. Dole voted against all attempts to clear bill (e.g., filibuster cloture), but voted for final passage. Strongly opposed by big business. Strongly endorsed by all 50 state attorneys general and consumer groups.

Major Provisions

1. Authorizes parens patriae suits against price fixers by state attorneys general on behalf of all injured citizens
2. Increases authority of Justice Dept. to obtain business information for civil suits
3. Expands program requiring pre-notification by firms intending to enter into potentially anticompetitive mergers and giving courts authority to enjoin them

AUTOMOBILE R & D BILL

Status:

Cleared Congress on Sept. 13. Vetoed by President. The House overrode the veto, but the Senate sustained it.

Major Provisions

1. Would have authorized ERDA to develop test vehicles with cleaner, more efficient engines
2. Would have authorized \$100 million over next two years

CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS

Status:

House and Senate passed different bills. Conferees agreed to compromise, but Conference Report was never approved, largely because of Administration opposition. Senate bill acceptable to environmental groups. House bill was not, but supported by Administration.

Major Provisions

1. Both bills provide for "nondegradation"--i.e., more stringent air pollution standards in areas of country where air is relatively clean. New restrictions would apply only to new emitting facilities, not existing ones.
2. Both bills strengthen existing enforcement provisions.
3. Senate bill extends from 1978 to 1980 the date on which the more stringent emission requirements for autos found in present law would go into effect. House bill would extend date to 1982, but would require some phase-in of standards for unburned hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide (but not nitrogen oxides) before that date.

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET RESOLUTION

Status:

Cleared by both Houses. Did not require Presidential approval.

Major Provisions:

1. Imposes on Congress spending ceiling of \$413.1 billion and revenue floor of \$362.5 billion for FY 1977
2. Ceilings and floors will be binding on both Houses for first time. Legislation that would raise ceiling or lower floor is out of order.

Impact:

Compares with Ford FY 1977 budget, as updated in July, as follows (figures in billions):

	<u>Administration</u>	<u>Congress</u>
Receipts	\$352.5	\$362.5
Outlays	400.0	413.3
Deficit	47.5	50.8

CORPORATE BRIBERY BILL

Status:

Passed Senate unanimously. Died in the House.

Administration Position:

Proposed a bill only requiring reporting of corporate bribes to foreign officials, which reports would be kept secret for one year. Opposed Senate bill.

Major Provisions

1. Makes it a crime to make or promise a payment to a foreign official for a corrupt purpose
2. Maximum penalty is 2 years and \$10,000 fine.

ELECTRIC CAR BILL

Status:

Enacted on Sept. 17, after Senate and House overrode Ford veto of Sept. 13. Vetoed on grounds it was too costly and development should be left to private industry

Major Provisions:

1. Authorizes ERDA to do research and development on electric-powered vehicles
2. Authorizes government purchase 7,500 electric vehicles for demonstration programs
3. Authorizes \$100 million for research and \$60 million loan guarantee authority over 5 year period

HEW APPROPRIATIONS BILL

Status:

Cleared by Congress on Sept. 17. Ford vetoed because size of appropriation was \$4 billion over his request. Congress overrode veto.

Major Proposals:

1. Appropriates \$57 billion for HEW
2. Prohibits use of Medicaid funds for abortion, except where mother's life is in danger. Unclear whether it also provides exception when mother has certain diseases or is victim of incest or rape.

Impact:

Prohibited most of the 250,000-300,000 abortions paid by Medicaid last year, at cost of \$45-55 million. However, lower federal court in New York has ruled that this anti-abortion limitation is unconstitutional. Decision is on appeal.

HEALTH MANPOWER BILL

Status:

Cleared by Congress and signed by President October 13. A similar bill that was more restrictive in terms of doctors' freedom of choice in selecting place to practice was pocket vetoed by Ford in 1974. Upon signing current bill, Ford took credit for the idea.

Major Provisions:

1. Authorizes \$2.1 billion for medical school scholarships, student loans and capitation grants.
2. Ties almost all scholarship grants to enlistment in National Health Service Corps, which places doctors in area of need.
3. Requires medical schools with teaching hospitals to set aside increasing proportions of residency training positions--up to one-half by 1980--to general and family practice and pediatrics.

LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION  
FUND ACT AMENDMENT

Status:

Cleared by Congress and sent to President on Sept. 16  
President signed.

Administration Position:

Ford has opposed this legislation in the past, and was expected to veto. Did not veto apparently because of his own parks initiative and because overwhelming margins of passage (282-3 in House; unanimous consent in Senate) indicated veto override anyway. Bill authorizes more money for parks acquisition than Ford's recent initiative.

Background

Current law, passed in 1965, creates Land and Water Conservation Fund and authorizes \$300 million per year. 40% to be used for acquisition of federal recreation areas, and 60% to states on formula basis. Fund cannot be used to develop existing parkland. Under Nixon-Ford, federal portion has been used only sparingly, and large backlog has developed, which Ford now intends to use in his new proposal.

Major Provisions:

1. Would increase funding level to \$600 million in FY 1978; \$750 million in FY 1979; \$900 million in FY 1980 thru 1989.
2. Administration required to use all of federal portion of appropriation.
3. Sec. of Interior must submit extensive review of urban recreational needs within one year of enactment.

LOBBYING BILL

Status:

Senate passed bill in June. House passed a different bill, which died when sent back to the Senate. Senate bill strongly opposed by many public interest groups, most of which would have to register under it.

Major Provisions

Senate Bill--

1. Requires all organizations and businesses to register as lobbyists if they (1) have more than 12 oral lobbying contracts with members of Congress (other than their own representatives or employees of the Executive Branch regarding pending legislation or grant or contract in excess of \$1 million in 3 mo. period; (2) spent more than \$250 in 3 mos. to hire lawyer to lobby; or (3) spent more than \$5,000 in solicitation campaign to influence legislation.
2. Local affiliates of national organizations are exempt if they are controlled by the parent and make fewer than 12 oral contacts thru paid employees.
3. Detailed registration statements and quarterly reports are required. Report requires among other things list of all contributors of more than \$2,500 to the organization.

House Bill--

1. Defines lobbyist as organization that employs at least one full-time person spending more than 20% of his time trying to influence government.
2. More simplified reporting procedures than Senate bill. Requires disclosure of contributors of more than \$2,500 if that represents 5% or more of receipts of organization.

MEDICARE AND MEDICAID REFORM (TALMADGE) BILL

Status:

Talmadge bill died in Senate. On Sept. 20 Senate attached rider to irrelevant House bill that would adopt three key provisions of Talmadge bill and add two others. Rider died in the House.

Major Provisions

Senate-Passed Bill--

1. Establishes central fraud & abuse unit under Inspector General, who reports only to Sec. of HEW.
2. Prohibits factors from discounting Medicare & Medicaid receivables under power of attorney.
3. Upgrades Medicaid and Medicare fraud from misdemeanor to felony.
4. Requires disclosure of ownership and financial control of Medicaid mills.
5. Requires Sec. of HEW to give priority in investigations to referrals by professional standards review organization.

Talmadge Bill--

1. Items 1, 2 and 3 above.
2. Combines Medicaid performance standards for states and provides penalties for violations and technical assistance to assure compliance.
3. Establishes Medicaid performance standards for states and provides penalties for violations and technical assistance to assure compliance.
4. Establishes uniform cost accounting systems for hospitals and mechanism for reimbursement for routine operating costs for hospitals, giving incentives to those hospitals with below average operating costs.
5. Establishes incentives for physicians to accept "reasonable" Medicare charges a full billing amount.
6. Makes more equitable the procedure for determining "reasonable" charges.
7. Places controls on payments to nursing homes.

OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LEASING BILL

Status:

Bill cleared Conference Committee once, but House voted to recommit it to Conference where it died the second time. Strongly supported by coastal states; opposed by oil companies and Administration.

Major Provisions:

1. Requires Secretary of Interior to prepare five-year leasing plan.
2. Requires leaseholders to submit development and production plans, which are to be reviewed by regional advisory boards established by governors of coastal states.
3. Revises bidding practices to allow government to call for bids on the extent to which government would share in profits, rather than present system of specific price for the lease, plus fixed percentage of profits. Would make smaller companies more competitive.
4. Authorizes Interior to do exploratory drilling to have better idea of how much oil and gas will be recovered.

PUBLIC WORKS APPROPRIATION BILL

Status:

Conference Committee agreed to final provisions. Final clearance by both houses on September 20. Ford signed. A bill authorizing these expenditures (Emergency Public Works Bill) was enacted earlier this year over Ford veto.

Major Provisions:

1. Appropriates \$2 billion to provide 100% funding to state and local governments for construction of public facilities. Projects must be started within 90 days, and 70% of funds must be spent in areas with above average unemployment.
2. Appropriates \$1.25 billion to provide countercyclical aid to state and local governments. Will enable states to maintain essential services without increasing taxes.
3. Appropriates \$480 million for grants to states to construct wastewater treatment plants.

Impact:

Total FY 1977 appropriations \$3.73 billion. Will create as many as 300,000 jobs.

REVENUE SHARING BILL

Status:

Approved by Congress Sept. 30 and signed by President. Bill provided less money and for shorter period of time than proposed by President.

Major Provisions:

1. Extends revenue sharing program through September 1980.
2. Authorizes \$27.2 billion over 4 years (\$6.65 billion first year, \$6.85 billion thereafter). Does not require further congressional appropriation.
3. Strengthens enforcement of provisions against discrimination on basis of race, color, national origin or sex and extend coverage to include religion, age or physical disability.
4. Makes it clear that funds can be used to support religion-supported social welfare programs that give preference to members of their denomination. Religious groups (especially Catholics) strongly support this concept, and you have endorsed it.

SYNTHETIC FUELS BILL

Status:

Cleared Senate. Died in House when House failed to adopt rule to bring it to floor.

Major Provisions:

1. Authorizes \$3.5 billion in loan guarantees over two years for commercial scale demonstration plants to produce synthetic fuels from coal (especially gasification), oil shale, solar, biomass and renewable resources.
2. Authorizes \$500 million in price supports for synthetic fuel plants.

TAX BILL

Status:

Cleared by both Houses on September 16. President signed.

Impact:

Net revenue increase of \$1.6 billion next year; \$2.4 billion by 1981, but these amounts to be offset by loss of about \$1 billion per year beginning in 1978 because of new estate tax exemptions.

Major Provisions:

Individuals --

1. Extends antirecession tax cuts of 1975 and 1976.
2. Increases deductions or credits for child care (and eliminates anti-grandmother provision), alimony, retirement and moving expenses.
3. Tightens deductions for use of home for business purposes and rental of vacation homes and exemption for persons working for U.S. firms abroad.
4. Eliminates sick pay deduction.

Investors:

1. Substantially strengthens the minimum tax provisions, increasing coverage from 30,000 to 300,000 taxpayers and increasing revenue from \$1 billion.
2. Tightens rules on tax shelters such as real estate construction-oil and gas drilling, sports franchises, and on use of maximum tax limitations by higher salaried persons.
3. Eliminates tax benefits for stock options.

Corporations:

1. Extends tax credit through 1980 and makes it more useful for railroads, airlines and shipbuilders.
2. Extends tax reduction on first \$50,000 of profit of small businesses.
3. Extends minimum tax provisions for corporations, increasing revenues \$60 million this year, \$200 million by 1981.

Estate and Gift:

1. Doubles exemption to \$120,000; increases to \$175,000 in five years; provides relief to farms and small businesses.
2. Changes tax basis for inheritances to value at time of purchase, rather than time of inheritance.

Miscellaneous:

1. Imposes tax penalties for companies complying with Arab boycott (this is only provision Ford Administration strongly opposed).
2. Increases public access to tax rulings, and strengthens limitations on disclosure of tax returns.
3. Provides deduction of up to \$25,000 per year to businesses for removing barriers to the handicapped.

TOXIC SUBSTANCES BILL

Status:

Approved by both House and Senate. President signed, calling it one of the most significant pieces of environmental legislation ever passed by Congress.

Previous Administration Position:

Although Ford will probably try to take credit for bill during debate, Administration was generally opposed to key pre-marketing notification and testing provisions. EPA Administrator Train strongly supported bill throughout.

Major Provisions:

1. Bans manufacture or importation after two years of PCB, a chemical used in electrical capacitors and transformers and known to cause tumors and other disorders.
2. Authorizes EPA to require new chemical substances to be subjected to testing if there is potential health risk.
3. Requires 90-day prenotification of intent to market new chemical, which EPA can extend for another 90 days.
4. Authorizes EPA to ban new chemicals presenting health risk and to seek injunction if more testing is required.

Impact:

Subjects the approximately 1,000 new chemicals marketed each year to possible testing. Previously, only pesticides, food and drug additives were subject to testing.

## BASIC RESPONSES TO FORD

### 1. Peace

Peace is more than the temporary absence of war. We are living, at best, in a period of transition in which we have only a short time to prepare for the dangerous period that lies ahead. The way we are drifting now, and selling arms and nuclear technology to all comers, within a decade over 40 nations could be able to play the game of nuclear blackmail. Some of these nations are: Egypt, Iran, India, Pakistan, South Korea, to name only a few. This Administration has no policy to stop it. We are in the midst of a genuine energy crisis, and this Administration's only policy is to buckle under to OPEC blackmail. Our relations with our partners in Japan and Western Europe have deteriorated and our standing in the developing countries -- those countries which used to look to us for leadership -- has never been lower. We can use this time, or we can drift in a kind of caretakership for another four years. I don't think we can afford to drift.

### 2. Increased Spending

No administration has been quicker to make arms policy a political pawn than this one -- whether it is selling missiles to Saudi Arabia or manipulating the defense budget in response to Ronald Reagan's primary campaign. Our economy is weak and stagnant -- that is the cornerstone of national security. The roles and missions for which our defense establishment must prepare have not been systematically reviewed since 1947. We are wasting precious resources on useless and duplicative support missions, while we have too little budgeted

for strengthening our actual combat strength. We are spending billions (?) preparing for contingencies like another land war in Asia, in which we will surely never become involved again, while resources are inadequate for serious dangers we face in other areas. Too much for support -- not enough for combat capability. This administration has no clear view of our interests in the world -- other than a 19th century balance-of-power view which places a higher value on relations with our potential adversaries than with our friends and allies. And the American people do not know where their country is headed in the world. More dollars to the Pentagon won't set that right, but a new President will.

## EXPERIENCE AND RECORD AS GOVERNOR

### QUESTIONS

1. How do you reconcile major campaign promise of government reorganization and reduced waste and inefficiency with fact that, as Governor of Georgia, your reorganization is alleged to have been only box shuffling, expenditures went up 50%, number of state employees went up 25% and bonded indebtedness went up 100%?

2. Is experience as a one-term Governor of Georgia and a one-term state senator adequate to prepare you for the Presidency?

### ANSWERS

Theme: As President Kennedy said, many routes to Presidency. My experience makes me more qualified than Ford. Know concerns of ordinary people better. Not part of Washington buddy system. Record as Governor widely praised.

#### A. Attack Points

1. Ford grossly and deliberately distorted my record as Governor in first debate.

2. Ford's experience consists only of representing a congressional district of less than 500,000 population for 25 years, serving year as unelected Vice President, and two years as unelected President. This provided opportunity to become part of Washington buddy system, but not to learn much about rest of the country. Little experience as leader, administrator.

#### B. Positive Points

1. Ford said expenditures went up 50% during my term. True, but was during period of Georgia's greatest economic growth. State's revenues increased at even faster rate because of increased tax base. Left office with \$116 billion surplus.

2. Only gasoline and cigarette taxes increased, to bring them in line with national average. Income taxes were reformed (mostly to standardize with federal). Standard deduction and dependency allowances were increased. No overall change in income tax revenues. Reduced and reformed property taxes. Tax record in Georgia good example of how government services can be increased and tax reform accomplished without tax increase.

3. Ford said number of state employees increased 25% during term. True, but compares with 45% increase under Maddox. Growth in employees decreased to 2% per year in last year and compared to 8-10% before reorganization.

4. Reorganization and elimination of waste does not necessarily mean a reduction in total number of employees. Does mean their more efficient use. Reorganization supported by state employees.

5. Ford said bonded indebtedness increased 20% during term. Actual increase was over 100%, but was because I reorganized fiscal structure to allow general obligation bonds for first time and eliminated those of separate agencies. Result was increase in indebtedness first two years but decrease last two, and increase in bond rating from AA to AAA.

6. Other major accomplishments: Reorganization into 22 agencies; complete reappraisal of educational system; quadrupling of retarded persons served by community drug abuse program; "Killers and Cripples" program; creation of Georgia Residential Financial Agency; judicial reform; offender rehabilitation improvements; creation of Heritage Trust; welfare reform.

7. Bring new leadership with new perspective. Experience from receiving end of federal grants and revenue sharing. More experienced than Ford at administering large organization, and not part of Washington establishment; more familiar with concerns of farmers and working people.

8. For same length of time Ford has been President and isolated in Oval Office, I have been crisscrossing America, meeting ordinary people in living rooms, factory lines. My experience has given better feel of pulse of America, what its people want and don't want from government.

Note: This is an area where some of the subject matter was covered in first debate and may therefore not be asked about directly. However, Ford distortions of Georgia record were not adequately rebutted in first debate, and certain other positive points above could effectively be worked into answers on other subjects.

## CLOSING STATEMENT

Tonight we conclude this series of Presidential debates; and in 10 days this long campaign will be over as well. But I hope, with your help, that Election Day will signify not an end but a beginning--

-- the beginning of a new day of hope and confidence in our country;

-- the beginning of new economic policies that will bring prices down and put people back to work;

-- the beginning of a day when America's best values and principles are reflected in our foreign policy and when our leaders can stand as beacons of hope for freedom-loving people throughout the world.

I want to make that kind of new beginning for America; but I cannot do it alone. I need your votes on November 2nd, but I also need your help. I need your advice. I need your support in the months and years that lie ahead.

I want you to hold me accountable for all I have said I would do, so that I never let you down.

I want you to tell me whenever you are ill-served by governemtn, so I can find out the reason and set it right.

I want you to help me as I set to work to end Republican budget deficits ... to reform the welfare mess ... to make the tax code fair ... to provide national health insurance ... to

create real jobs for the unemployed ... to help our failing cities ... to provide decent housing ... and a cleaner environment... and a sensible national energy policy ... and to restore our place in the world. I want you to support my efforts to make the federal government work.

None of these things can be achieved easily or in one year or, in some cases, in any one term of office. But we must begin.

We should not deceive ourselves. If we do not begin ... if we continue to drift with the present Republican policies, more American families will face longer and deeper hardship. There will be millions needlessly without work ... elderly citizens cruelly robbed by inflation ... young people unable to meet their aspirations. Worst of all, we will be needlessly throwing away this nation's great potential.

If you agree with me that it's time for leadership, for a change; that it's time this country regained its pride and its confidence and its strength -- with a strong economy and strong moral standards and a strong defense and, above all, strong, competent, compassionate leadership -- than I ask you to give me your vote on November 2nd.

The choice is clear. The issues are clear. The contrast is clear. And whether you vote to continue the Republican status quo under Mr. Ford and Mr. Dole, or vote for new leadership, either way I hope you will vote. Millions of American men have died in battlefields abroad to protect our right to vote. Let your voice be heard. That is what America is all about.

You have good reason to be disenchanted with the last 8 years. But let us begin anew--together. South and North, East and West. Those things which unite us far exceed those things that divide us. We love this land or ours too much to lose faith now. We have survived a difficult decade. Together we can put those years behind us, make a fresh start -- for your children and mine.

Ford can be expected to get questions dealing with the following broad issues:

1. Handling of the economy (pp.2-4)
2. Pardon (5-9)
3. Style of leadership (10-12)
4. Relations with Congress(13-18)
5. The emotional issues (busing, abortion, amnesty, marijauna)(19-27)
6. Congressional voting record vs. present positions and obligations (28-31)
7. Record on the social service issues (housing, elderly, health care, education, and welfare)(32-40)
8. Energy (41-44)
9. Environment(45-49)
10. Government reform (tax reform and reorganization) (49A-49I)
11. Appointments (50-53)
12. Record on discrimination (women, blacks, Spanish-speaking)(54-57)
13. Integrity and morality in government (58-61)
14. Crime (62-66)
15. Influence of corporate interests (67-70)
16. Agricultural record (71-74) (75-82 omitted)
17. Record vs. Republican platform (83-87)
18. Mood of nation (88-90)
19. Use of incumbency(91-94)
20. Value of experience (95-97)
21. Major accomplishments of Administration (98-104),

For each of the above issues, regardless of the particular phrasing or emphasis of the questions, Ford will attempt to make his basic statement in the issue. That his statement may not really answer the question can be expected and, given his record, is probable: if there is one skill he has acutely developed after 27 years in Washington (but particularly 2 years as President), it is answering the question he wanted and not the one asked.

Even in the follow-up question, Ford is not likely to allow himself to be pinned down or to admit the weaknesses of his response to the first question. His practice in press conferences and interviews (with follow-up questions) has been to repeat his previous answer with a slightly different emphasis and one or two different illustrations.

So, the key to preparing a response to Ford's answers is simply determining the content and style of his basic statements. And that is made extremely easy because of the frequency with which Ford has recently stated his views on the campaign issues and his themes of attack. Based on Ford's statements, his answers are almost certain to be as follows:

1. Handling of the Economy

(a) Basic Question: During your Administration, there was a severe recession, from which the country is only now beginning to recover. And even now there is still high unemployment, high inflation, reduced economic growth, and a proposed record deficit. Why do you think your handling of the economy merits another four years in office?

(b) Basic Ford Response:

- (1) Economy strong compared to August 1974 - When I assumed office, the economy had high inflation, high unemployment and low output: inflation was 12%, sales were off, plants were shut down, thousands were being laid off every week; and fear of the future was stopping our economy and threatening millions of families. In two years, the economic picture has changed greatly: inflation has been cut by more than half; payrolls are up, profits are up, production is up and purchases are up; more than 4 million people have found jobs, and more people are now working than ever in the nation's history
- (2) Steady and sure course - I have achieved this record by refusing to panic or to support the billion dollar make-work programs proposed by the Democratic Congress; instead I have applied a steady and sure hand, knowing that a recession is not cured overnight and that sound financial management is the only answer.
- (3) Next four years will be even better - Because of the steady and sure course I have been following the economy is continuing its rapid improvement; in the past year, housing starts have risen by 40%, the GNP has risen by 10% and per capita disposable income has risen by nearly 5%. Under my prudent, affordable management of the economy, these figures will improve even more during the next four years.

HANDLING THE ECONOMY

Suggested Carter Response

(1) We just heard Mr. Ford tell us everything is good with our economy and getting better. Well I don't agree.

(2) And I'd just like to take my time by asking a few questions which I hope Mr. Ford will answer for us sometime tonight. And if not tonight, I hope he or his Republican party will give us the answers sometimes, anytime, during this campaign.

(a) Are there 7½ million workers unemployed today?

Yes! Is this 2½ million more than were unemployed when Mr. Ford took office two years ago? Yes!

(b) Is the unemployment rate today 7.9%? Yes! Is this a higher unemployment rate than we've had at any time under any other President since the Great Depression, and has this unemployment been rising for three straight months? Yes!

(c) Is the 1968 dollar today worth 61¢? Yes! Is today's inflation rate of 6% greater than the rate we've had at any time between the Korean War and the inauguration of Richard Nixon? Yes! Is this 6% inflation rate three times higher than the average rate for all the Kennedy-Johnson years? Yes! (Ford might say there is currently a 4% rate of inflation, which he gets by using the GNP deflator. This is a rather technical measure of inflation that does not directly measure consumer prices--which have been rising at a 6% rate.)

- (d) Is the average worker's weekly paycheck worth less today than it was in 1968? Yes! (\$103.39 in 1968 and \$102.94 today in real terms, adjusted for inflation)
- (e) Aren't the deficits submitted by Mr. Ford the largest in this country's history? Yes! Aren't the average yearly deficits under Mr. Ford at least seven times larger than the average yearly deficits under Presidents Kennedy or Johnson? Yes!
- (f) Isn't it true that there are fewer private non-farm jobs today than when Mr. Ford took office? Yes!
- (g) Aren't housing starts today lower (1,387,000 units) than they were when Mr. Ford took office (1,156,000)?  
Yes!

2. Pardon ; Nixon Relationship; Watergate

(a) Basic Questions: As a Congressman you were a strong supporter of Richard Nixon, you were picked by him as his vice-president, soon after you succeeded him you pardoned him prior to any criminal proceedings, and your Administration has kept many Nixon appointees and largely followed the Nixon policies. Do you still think the pardon was justified and would you grant it again? Given your record, do you think the voters should consider your relationship with Nixon and his policies in deciding whether you deserve an elected term? Do you think you should be held accountable in this election for Watergate?

(b) Basic Ford Responses:

(1) Pardon - I granted the pardon so that the country could move ahead from the long nightmare of Watergate and concentrate on the more pressing problems of economy recovery and world peace. That was my prime motivation, as I explained when I granted the pardon and testified before the House Judiciary Committee. Had the pardon not been granted, the country may have spent the last two years concentrating on Nixon's fate, rather than the economy and world peace. Let me add for those concerned rightly about compassionate leadership, the suffering of Mr. Nixon and his wife had been so intense that I did not believe they should be forced to undergo further needless suffering.

(2) Relationship with Nixon - I supported Nixon while I was in Congress because I agreed with his policies and because, as the leader of my party, it was my duty - where I agreed with the President's policies - to attempt to gather support for them. However, since assuming the presidency, I have made a clean break with the past; my cabinet is full almost entirely with my appointees; my staff is filled completely with my own appointees; and my policies have been different in a number of areas. So I don't think, given this clean break, there is any justification for considering my Administration with my predecessor's.

(3) Watergate in Campaign - I don't think there is any reason for Watergate to be an issue. I was not involved with Watergate; I knew nothing about the facts of Watergate. No one has ever claimed otherwise. The same is true of my running mate. In addition, my Administration has made a clean break with the previous administration; none of those involved with Watergate are involved in my administration. I think there are so many more important issues to worry about: prosperity, peace tax reform, toughened criminal laws, improved housing and health care.

PARDON; RELATIONS WITH NIXON; WATERGATE

Suggested Carter Response

(1) Pardon

a. I have said I would not raise the pardon in this campaign and I have not; I have mentioned the issue only when asked.

b. Now that the issue is before us, I feel obligated to let the American people know my views on what public opinion polls show to be a major concern for the voters:

1. I would not have pardoned Mr. Nixon, at least until after the judicial process upon which this country is based, had been concluded. I recognize he had been disgraced in the eyes of the American people and was destined to live out his life in exile; but he had apparently committed crimes in the highest office of the land; he had placed our system to its limits; and he had intentionally lied to the American people. Mr. Ford's pardon extended to known and unknown crimes. It deprived the American people of knowing the full facts of Watergate. To compound this, Mr. Ford attempted to give Mr. Nixon all of his papers, including those needed by the Special Prosecutor; failed to go through the Justice Department in the normal

process for the pardon; and did not insist on an admission of guilt from Mr. Nixon.

2. Under those circumstances, even if a pardon had been appropriate, it should have been handled much differently:

- a. The American people should have been told by Mr. Nixon why he was accepting a pardon, rather than being allowed to admit no criminal wrongdoing; the full disclosure of wrongdoing that occurred with Mr. Agnew's resignation would have been helpful.
- b. The Special Prosecutor's Office should have been consulted about the need for a pardon and the effect on other trials.
- c. The reason why Mr. Nixon's subordinates were being forced to remain in jail and subject to criminal prosecution should have been explained or justified.

(2) Relationship with Nixon

- a. I recognize that Mr. Ford assumed office under difficult circumstances and that a clean break was necessary; but the record of the last two years unfortunately shows there has not been a clean break.

b. This is evident from Mr. Ford's continued reliance on Mr. Nixon's advisors and the continuation of Mr. Nixon's policies:

1. All of Mr. Ford's foreign policy advisors were Nixon's as well. Virtually all of his economic advisors, from Burns to Simon, were also Nixon's. His agricultural advisor, Mr. Butz, was Nixon's. His NATO Commander was Nixon's chief of staff. His OMB Director was Nixon's HUD Secretary. His Secretary of Defense was Nixon's NATO Ambassador. So there has been a clear continuity in personnel.
2. Mr. Ford has also continued Mr. Nixon's style of government. He has used the veto to stop bills to create jobs and provide better health care, education, and housing; he has impounded funds appropriated by Congress for health care, education, housing, a clean environment, and more jobs; he has continued to rely on Executive privilege to shield facts from the American public; he has allowed the White House staff to keep its enormous power; he has appointed individuals who are clearly unqualified or have clear conflicts-of-interest; and he has allowed Big Business to keep its control over major policies.

c. Mr. Ford has not been able to establish his own Administration apart from Mr. Nixon's. The only way that can happen in the next 4 years is through a Democratic Administration. We need to make a clean break with the Republican past, which only new leadership can do.

(3) Watergate In Campaign

- a. I have not tried to make Watergate an issue in this campaign.
- b. I think the events surrounding Watergate are a national tragedy; the voters will have to decide for themselves whether Watergate should be a factor in their vote.
- c. I agree that Mr. Ford was not involved in Watergate. Although he defended Mr. Nixon's activities to the end, and he supported the firing of Mr. Cox, I am sure he did not know all the facts.
- d. I would also prefer that we concentrate on the more important issues. Mr. Ford's position on those is why I think I should be elected.

3. Style of Leadership

(a) Basic Questions: Mr. Carter and other Democrats have accused you of providing weak, drifting leadership to the country; opinion polls show that a significant percentage of Americans have a similar impression of your presidency. Why do you think so many people have that impression and why do you think it and the accusations of the Democrats are unjustified?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) I am the first to admit I am not a flashy speaker, a smiler, or a charismatic leader; I am, however, a hard-working, affirmative leader, and I get the job done - that is my style of leadership.

(2) The record shows that my style of affirmative leadership has worked. When I became President, the economy was in turmoil, the Vietnam War was still raging, the nation had grave doubts about its national leaders and institutions. In two years, I have turned the economy around, the nation is at peace for the first time in over a decade, national confidence has been restored, and respect for the integrity of the presidency has been re-established. Those accomplishments could not have been achieved by a weak leader.

(3) The impression that my leadership has been weak has been fostered by those who oppose - though cannot explain why - my Constitutional use of the veto. My 56 vetoes, which have saved the American taxpayer \$13 billion, have been the result of strong leadership. A weak leader would have allowed the Democratic Congress to overwhelmingly pass big-spending bill after big-spending bill. But I have not; I have stood up to Congress and I think that is a fine example of strong leadership in the public's clear interest.

STYLE OF LEADERSHIP

Suggested Carter Response

(1) I disagree with my Republican opponent's view of what is strong leadership. He thinks leadership is proposing bills that are known to have no chance of serious Congressional consideration, let alone passage; I think leadership is determining the nation's needs, devising legislation to meet those needs, and working with Congress to see that the legislation is passed. That is what I would do. Mr. Ford thinks leadership is vetoing bills, even though the vetoes are repeatedly overridden; I think leadership is working to correct legislation before it is sent to the White House. That is what I would do.

(2) I also disagree with Mr. Ford that the results of his leadership are anything to write home about:

- 2½ million more people are unemployed than when he assumed office
- Unemployment rates have reached their highest level since the Great Depression
- The highest deficits in history--7½ times higher than the average for Kennedy-Johnson--have been submitted to Congress
- Enormous inflation has made a dollar worth only 61¢ of its 1968 value

- The country is more dependent on foreign oil than before the Arab boycott.
- Abuses in the CIA and FBI go unreprimanded
- \$3-5 billion a year frauds in Medicaid go unchecked
- Crime has continued to rise; it is up more than 45% since 1968.

If these are the results of Mr. Ford's strong leadership, I want none of it.

(3) I do not believe Mr. Ford can be a strong leader.

Strong leaders do not emerge from 25 years of Congressional clubbiness. Strong leaders do not emerge from a Republican party still committed to the policies of Herbert Hoover and Tom Dewey. And strong leaders do not emerge from a situation in which the appointees and the policies of the previous Administration are still in place.

(4) If I am elected, I would make a clean break from the past. I would not owe by job to one man or a thousand special interest groups. I would owe it only to the American people and would be able to serve their interests alone. That is the type of leadership we need.

4. Relations with Congress

(a) Basic Question You have vetoed 56 bills in 2 years, sought to impound nearly \$40 billion in appropriated funds, failed to get action of many of your major legislative proposals - in short, you have not had - as your recent statements admit - good relations with Congress. What has accounted for those poor relations, why do you think relations will improve if you serve 4 more years, and why to you think a Democratic president serving with a Democratic Congress would not produce a more coordinated, less contentious federal government?

(b) Basic Ford Response:

(1) Relations with Congress - my relations with Congress have not been as good as I would like because of the strong positions I have taken in a number of areas against an overwhelmingly Democratic, liberal free-spending Congress.

(a) I have had to veto 55 pieces of extravagant and unnecessary legislation; 45 times I made those vetoes stick, even though the Congress was overwhelmingly Democratic. Through my vetoes, I have saved \$13 billion of the taxpayer's money. But that savings has angered the Democratic Congress.

(b) I have provided affirmative leadership; it is the Congress which has been negative:

(1) I have proposed a permanent tax cut coupled with spending reductions to stimulate the economy and relieve hard-pressed middle income taxpayers. But the Democratic Congress, which talked tax reform, has failed to act.

(2) I have proposed reasonable, constitutional restrictions on court-ordered busing of school children. But the Democratic Congress, which talks about busing as a "last resort," has failed to act.

(3) I have proposed a major overhaul of criminal laws to crack down on crime and illegal drugs. But the Democratic Congress has failed to act.

(4) I have proposed an Energy Independence Authority to ensure this nation will never again hurt by an oil boycott. But the Democratic Congress has failed to act.

(c) If there has been any strain in the relations between the Congress and the White House, I think it is clear that my actions have been designed to protect the average American taxpayer, not the Congressional special interests.

- (2) Improved Relations Next Term - I assumed the presidency under unusual circumstances; I have not had the respect from Congress that a mandate from the people would give me. With that electoral mandate, I would have greater leverage in dealing with Congress and could get more of my programs enacted.
- (3) Democratic President/ Democratic Congress - A Democratic president combined with a Democratic Congress, both committed to such multi billion dollar programs as the Humphrey-Hawkins and national health insurance, would bankrupt the Treasury. They would spend money with total abandon; there would be no check on each other. With the Democratic Congress so committed to big spending programs, the only check the American people have is a president willing to exercise the veto. Carter would not be such a president.

RELATIONS WITH CONGRESS

Suggested Carter Response

a. Mr. Ford's response is essentially that there is a stalemate between his Administration and Congress and that it is all the fault of the big-spending Congress. I have not been a member of Congress and do not think I am in a position to defend its actions on every one of the thousands of bills considered during the last two years. But in my view, Pennsylvania Avenue is a two-way street: a President doesn't lead by vetoing; he leads by sending up reasonable proposals and working with Congress before it passes a bill. And I think there has been too little of that type of leadership. We cannot afford 4 more years of stalemate with the urgent problems which face us.

b. If there had been leadership, Mr. Ford would not have had to veto 56 bills and have 10 of them overridden -- a higher percentage than any President in over a century and 5 times as many as President Eisenhower (who also worked with a Democratic Congress).

And by the way, those 56 vetoes did not really save \$13 billion; many of the vetoes involved bills having nothing to do with money, such as the veto of the Freedom of Information Act Amendment. The actual figure is less than \$4 billion, though that savings was at the expense of hundreds of thousands of jobs.

- c. If there had been leadership, Congress would not have rejected nearly 3/4 of all of Mr. Ford's legislative proposals. The fact that no action was taken on the proposals cited by Mr. Ford is, in my view, a compliment to Congress, not a criticism. His limit on busing is viewed by everyone outside of his Administration as unconstitutional; his concern with the criminal laws would make us believe if only we had more laws, we would have less crime -- what we need is better enforcement of present laws; and his energy authority is a \$100 billion boondoggle that would let the oil companies continue to control our energy supply.
- d. I have been a chief executive before; I dealt with a legislature before; I know the importance of working with them not against them.

(2) Improved Relations Next Term

- a. The next Congress is likely to be as Democratic in make-up as the present one; there is no real reason to believe the new Congress will react to Mr. Ford any differently.
- b. Mr. Ford's problems with Congress stem from his Republican, Big Business policies, not from the way he got into office. Since he is not going to change those policies, there is no reason to believe his relations with Congress will improve.

(3) Democratic President/Democratic Congress

- a. The argument that a Democratic President cannot control a Democratic Congress is one that Republican Presidential candidates always make. It was made by Mr. Nixon in the last Presidential debates.
- b. The facts, however, don't support the claim. Under the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, for instance, inflation was only 2.2%, considerably less than the 7% of the present Republican Administration. Budgets did not get out of control then as they have now with Republicans in the White House. Congress did not go out of control, even though Kennedy and Johnson were as committed to Democratic principles as the Congress. The reason is a Democratic President is the leader of his party; he can work with a Democratic Congress, not against it.
- c. The charge that if I am elected, the Democratic Congress will go out of control is as without foundation as it was in 1960. The Democratic Platform specifically says in the beginning that programs like national health insurance are to be phased in over a period of years as revenues permit. So nothing will be enacted which cannot be afforded. And the record high deficits of President Ford will not continue; a balanced budget will be in place by the end of my first term -- our

party is committed to that and I'm as committed to that as anything else I seek to accomplish.

As Governor, I blocked irresponsible, special interest legislation. If elected as President, I would not hesitate to do so.

5. Stand on the Emotional Issues

(a) Basic busing question You have frequently stated your opposition to court-ordered busing of school children for desegregation purposes, and you have proposed as a solution a bill to limit such busing to a 5 year period. What is the reason for your opposition to busing, why do you think a 5 year limitation will cure the problem, and why have you not gone the further step by supporting a constitutional amendment to prohibit forced busing?

(b) Basic Ford Busing Response :

(1) Opposition to Busing - I have long been opposed to court-ordered busing. I do not believe that in most cases when busing is ordered other methods of desegregation have been fully considered by the court. I think judges have ordered busing in cases when that method of desegregation went far beyond constitutional requirements.

(2) 5 Year Limitation - My proposal to limit busing to a 5 year period would reduce the amount of busing and, just as importantly, would encourage judges to seek an alternative, less destructive means of desegregation. They will not be so eager to order busing if they knew it won't last very long. The Attorney General has informed me that this type of legislation is clearly constitutional.

(3) Constitutional Amendment I have not supported a constitutional amendment to ban busing because my own 5 year limitation proposal would do the job of restricting busing and it could do so immediately after Congress passes the bill. But so far the Democratic Congress has failed to act. A constitutional amendment would take years to implement and would not cure the problem as soon as my proposal.

(c) Basic abortion question:

There has been some uncertainty about your position on abortion: As a Congressman, you supported a return-to-the-states amendment and as president you announced last year support for the same type of amendment; yet recently you stated your position was the same as the Republican platform, which calls for support of a constitutional amendment totally banning abortion. What is your position on a constitutional amendment and why did you think abortion should be a major issue in a presidential campaign?

(d) Basic Ford abortion response:

I am opposed to abortion and, unlike my opponent, I am willing to support a constitutional amendment to do something about it. That has long been my position. I have not changed it from state to state. The constitutional amendment I would support will return the question to the states, so that each state can decide about how abortion should be handled. I hope that each state would vote to ban abortions; but each state should have the opportunity to make its own decision. Such an amendment is consistent with the Republican platform, because the return-to-the-states amendment would have the effect of banning abortion. Abortion is clearly a major concern of many Americans, and it should therefore be a major campaign issue.

(e) Basic Amnesty question:

You have criticized Carter's proposal to grant amnesty to draft dodgers and pardons to deserters. Yet at the beginning of your administration, you also stated that it was time to get the amnesty issue behind us and proposed a program which had the effect of granting amnesty to dodgers and deserters. How did your program differ from Carter's and do you plan to do anything beyond your program (which has ended)?

(f) Basic Ford Amnesty Response:

There is a great difference between my clemency program and Carter's amnesty proposal. I proposed my program because of my compassion for those whose military and draft records were scarred by opposition to the war. However, I did not think that those who refused to serve or who deserted should be allowed to re-enter society on the same basis as those who did serve honorably. My program called for "earned re-entry": Those who participated in my clemency program either had to perform alternative service for several years or spend time in prison. Under Carter's proposal, deserters and draft dodgers would be allowed back into society without any sanctions; that is unfair to those who served or whose sons were killed. I have no plan to go beyond my clemency program. I made it available for 1 year and those who refused to take advantage of it should not be given another chance.

(e) Basic Marijuana Question: In light of the fact that so many Americans are using marijuana, including at one time your son Jack, why do you oppose easing the penalties for marijuana use?

(f) Basic Ford marijuana answer:

I oppose the decriminalization of marijuana. I believe the dangers of marijuana have not been fully studied; until they have been, I think it would be dangerous to encourage its use, which decriminalization would do. Carter supports decriminalization, and I think that is an irresponsible position: it will encourage marijuana use and harm the health of those who use it.

## EMOTIONAL ISSUES

### Suggested Carter Response on Busing

- (1) Mr. Ford is not the only candidate who dislikes forced busing. I dislike it. And the families affected by it dislike it.
  
- (2) But those who use it as a political football do a disservice to the nation, and to the families affected. It was detrimental to at first suggest intervention in the Boston school case before the Supreme Court and then to refuse to do so.
  - a. School districts need to bring blacks and whites together, as was done in Atlanta, to work out agreed alternatives to busing.
  
  - b. This is in contrast to Mr. Ford's position. His party's platform calls for a constitutional amendment to end busing if legislation of the sort he has proposed is not adopted. I don't now think a constitutional amendment, which would not be ratified by 3/4 of the states, is a helpful approach. I also do not think Mr. Ford's proposed time limit on busing is helpful. First, because it seems clearly unconstitutional and, second, because the problem that led to the need to bus may not have ended in 3 or 5 years; desegregation orders have to be tailored to each locality and not controlled by federal standards.

c. Busing is a national problem; but I do not think it is solved by raising hopes that can never be met. Mr. Ford's solution will never be passed; a constitutional amendment will never be ratified.

Suggested Carter Response on Abortion

(1) I think my difference with Mr. Ford on abortion is well known: Although, like Mr. Ford, I am personally opposed to abortion, I do not favor a constitutional amendment to overturn the Supreme Court's decision. However, I do recognize the right of those who wish to amend the Constitution to do so. I cannot support such an amendment for several reasons:

- a. I do not believe that I should impose my own beliefs on moral and religious matters on anyone else; supporting a Constitutional amendment would be imposing my distaste for abortion on others.
- b. A Constitutional amendment would be an attempt to turn the clock back on an activity that has become too widespread to stop by a change in the law; the experience with the Prohibition amendment shows that all too well.
- c. Energy spent trying to pass and ratify a Constitutional amendment could be better spent on family planning, improved adoption procedures, and other methods to avoid the need for abortions; an amendment would focus our attention down the wrong road.

d. Working toward a Constitutional amendment would do nothing to solve the abortion problem: Constitutional amendments can take 7 years to ratify if they can be first passed by 2/3 of Congress; it is clear that there is far too little support in Congress for an amendment to even get off the ground, let alone be ratified by 38 states.

(2) I think Mr. Ford recognizes the merits of the reasons I have just stated. I think that is why for two years as President he has done nothing to start the Constitutional amendment process going. For the Administration to now appear as a proponent of a Constitutional amendment is positively dismaying. I do not think it does much for the widely-held cynicism about the motivations of political leaders.

Suggested Carter Response on Amnesty

- (1) I don't think Mr. Ford's clemency program, though well motivated, did the job of healing, to the extent now possible, the wounds of the Vietnam War. Only 20% of those eligible for the program participated; the other 80% that Mr. Ford originally expressed his concern about still have Selective Service or military problems. While that 80% may have been wrong in what they did, a stone-wall policy several years after the war has ended helps no one but continues to harm thousands.
  
- (2) My solution, which is consistent with the American tradition of forgiveness after its wars, would be to grant a pardon but not amnesty to those with Selective Service problems, but to have only a case by case review of those who deserted the military, with the possibility of a pardon for them.

Suggested Carter Response on Marijuana

- (1) I am personally opposed to its use and would not want to do anything to encourage its use.
- (2) However, I part company with Mr. Ford over what role the government should play in controlling marijuana use. He wants to continue criminal sanctions for use and to subject all users to possible imprisonment. I don't think that position is realistic any longer. Tens of millions of Americans have used marijuana during the past decade; millions are still using it. To put them in jail, as Mr. Ford seems to want by supporting criminal penalties, serves no useful social purpose; it breeds further disrespect for our laws; it costs our state and local governments millions in police and court costs; and it detracts from our effort to stop hard drug usage.
- (3) I would favor an approach of civil penalties as a deterrent, that would not encourage marijuana use but would also allow the police and the courts to concentrate on drug pushers and importers: I think the decriminalization of marijuana possession involving no more than one ounce achieves that end. That type of decriminalization has been adopted by six states and worked successfully there.
- (4) Decriminalization is, however, a matter for each state to decide. The federal government plays no role in a state's decision about this.

6. Congressional voting record vs. present positions and obligations.

(a) Basic Question

As a Congressman you voted against so many programs which, as President, you are now in charge of administering. These include your votes against the Medicare and Food Stamp programs and your recomittal votes on several major civil rights bills. Do you think any of those votes were wrong, and if not how can you assure those affected by the acts that you are concerned with their interests?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) My constitutional obligation is to uphold the laws of the United States; I swore to that oath two years ago and have faithfully obeyed it to the best of my abilities. The fact that I may not have favored a law while a Congressman has no bearing on whether a law is enforced to its fullest. All laws are enforced regardless of what my voting record in Congress might have been.

(2) Very often a quick recital of a voting record can be misleading; and I think the votes cited are a perfect example of that:

(a) I had long been a supporter of a health care program for the elderly and in several Congresses had introduced bills to bring about such a program. The particular program that passed, Medicare, was not in my view the soundest health care program that had been proposed because its features ensured that health costs would skyrocket - and it is clear that they have. I have tried recently to lower health costs for the elderly by proposing a "catastrophic" health insurance program for those on Medicare. But the Democratic Congress has failed to act.

(b) My vote on the Food Stamp program was due to my belief that the loose eligibility rules made it certain that people not deserving of Food Stamps would be getting them, at the annual cost of billions of dollars to the taxpayers. Again, I think the record has shown my judgment to be right, and again I have attempted to correct the eligibility problem. I have done that by proposing to increase benefits for those families and individuals today needing them and to cut-off benefits for those above the poverty line. Unfortunatley, Congress has failed to act.

(c) My record on civil rights was one of complete support for the bills passed. I voted for the '57, '64, '66 Civil Rights Acts. I voted for the Voting Rights Act in '65 and for its extension in '70. I may have voted for amendments to those bills which failed or against amendments which passed, but I still voted for everyone of those Acts. And I think my civil rights record since becoming President indicates that my Congressional votes reflected my concern for the rights of all Americans. I proposed a broadened extension of the Voting Rights Act; I have increased funding for the Civil Rights Commission; I have expanded the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department; and I have appointed numerous blacks to important federal positions, including the second black in American history to a cabinet position - Bill Coleman at Transportation.

CONGRESSIONAL VOTING RECORD

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) I do not find Mr. Ford's effort to justify his voting record at all persuasive. The fact is that for 25 years he followed the traditional Republican position of opposing every major piece of legislation concerning human needs:
  - (a) He fought and voted against Medicare, which has been the greatest single benefit to our elderly since Franklin Roosevelt's proposal for a Social Security system.
  - (b) He fought and voted against Food Stamps, which have benefited the poor as well as the farmers.
  - (c) He fought and voted against raising the minimum wage 7 times over the span of his Congressional career.
  - (d) And the list goes on: he voted against mine safety, against black lung protection, against rat eradication, and against virtually all Federal housing programs.
  
- (2) This record of negativism and blind opposition has continued in the White House:
  - (a) Mr. Ford has continued his resistance to Medicare by trying, as part of his catastrophic health insurance proposal, to greatly raise costs of hospitalization and medical care.

(b) Mr. Ford has continued his resistance to Food Stamps by proposing to greatly increase costs of the program in order to eliminate those eligible, which include 3.5 million elderly citizens.

(c) Mr. Ford has continued his opposition to improved housing by vetoing a bill which would have reduced the interest rate on mortgages for new homes and would have provided young families with assistance in purchasing new homes.

(3) I think it is clear from this record that Mr. Ford was not levelling with the American public when he took office and said that his 25 year voting record reflected his constituency. That Congressional voting record represented Mr. Ford more than anything else. Its opposition to any social and economic improvements is not one that would make me proud; and it is not one that I would want to continue for another 4 years. But that is what Mr. Ford wants; and that negativism alone is reason why he should not be elected to his own term.

7. Record in Social Service Issues

(a) Basic Question

Not long ago you stated that there were issues you intended to campaign on, including the following domestic issues: housing, education, health care, and the elderly. Your record on those issues seems to many to be one of vetoes, impoundments, and budget-cutting. What do you think you have accomplished in those areas that merits your election to a full term?

(b) Basic Ford Response

I think the record is clear that in all of these areas I have sought improvements, better managed programs, programs that provide more for the taxpayers' dollar, but have opposed the Democratic Congress attempts to increase spending and to create unnecessary new federal programs:

(1) Housing

I have worked hard to improve the quality of housing available to low and moderate income families; I have reduced the waste and great expense of the past on construction and maintenance of large federal housing projects and replaced that with a program of providing rent supplements for lower income families.

I have used the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974 to allow lower-income families to pick their own housing and to then provide them with rent subsidies: over 400,000 families are now being assisted.

My home purchase policy has been to make mortgage credit more readily available to the average family; I signed the Emergency Home Purchase Act of 1974, which extended federal mortgage insurance to conventional mortgages; I signed the Emergency Housing Act of 1975, which provided emergency mortgage foreclosure relief; and I signed the Tax Reduction Act of 1975, which provided a \$2,000 tax rebate for purchase of new homes in 1975.

(2) Education

I have sought to return the responsibility and initiative for educational decision-making to the local level and to eliminate the the federal

intrusion; to do that I proposed the Financial Assistance for Elementary and Secondary Education Act, which would provide direct federal grants to facilities instead of forcing them to get needed money through HEW. But Congress has failed to act.

I have asked Congress to increase funding for the National Institute of education by 28%, in order to further educational research

I have supported the concept that financial restraints should not be a barrier to higher education and have sought to ensure sufficient aid is available for college students by seeking the full funding of the Basic Education Opportunity Grants program. Needy students are now ensured of up to \$1400 a year to meet these costs.

I have attempted to ease the tension in many cities and school districts by placing restrictions on forced busing. I proposed a limit of 5 years for such busing, but Congress has failed to act.

### (3) Health Care

From the start of my Administration, I have been committed to the goal of insuring that every American has access to quality health care.

I have proposed a catastrophic health insurance program to protect those on Medicare against the devastating impact of a serious illness. But Congress has failed to act.

I have proposed reforms in the Medicare program to hold down the inflationary surge in health costs. But Congress has taken no action.

I have proposed that 16 federal health programs be consolidated into a single \$10 billion dollar block grant to the states; the total aid to states under this program would increase and each state would have far more independence in deciding what needs ought to be met. Again, Congress has taken no action.

I initiated a program of unprecedented scope to immunize all Americans against a possible outbreak of swine flu. Although the program hit some snags initially, I kept the impetus behind the program going and it is now certain that every American can be immunized - at no cost - against swine flu.

(4) Elderly

Throughout my Administration, I have sought to ensure the income and health security of all older Americans.

In my '76 State of the Union address, I proposed that Social Security benefits be expanded by the full cost-of-living increase. That became effective this year as a result of my initiative.

I have proposed reforms to protect the integrity of the Social Security TRust Fund, but Congress has failed to take any action yet to ensure that funds will always be available to meet promised benefits.

I have proposed a catastrophic health insurance program for those on Medicare, but Congress has ignored my program and done nothing about the soaring costs of health care for the elderly.

I have signed amendments to the Older Americans Act, which will enable comprehensive services and meals to be delivered to the elderly at the community level.

(5) Welfare

In my last State of the Union Address, I called upon Congress for cooperation in cleaning up the nation's welfare mess. But so far, Congress has been content to do nothing:

Congress has failed to act on a variety of my proposals to improve the administration and effectiveness of welfare programs.

Congress has failed to act on my proposed reforms of the food stamp program.

The Democratic Congress talks about welfare reform; its actions indicate that it is only talk.

-33-

SUGGESTED CARTER RESPONSE ON RECORD ON SOCIAL SERVICE ISSUES  
(HOUSING, ELDERLY, HEALTH CARE, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE)

(1) Housing. By any objective evaluation, one of the biggest disasters of the Republican administration has been in housing. Scandals in the Department of Housing and Urban Development have rocked the country. We are building this year and last under Mr. Ford only half the number of houses necessary to meet the goals of the 1968 housing act. Housing is in a state of complete depression and some 20% of the construction workers in this country are out of work.

Since 1968 the median price of a single family dwelling has doubled, mortgage rates have skyrocketed, and the average monthly payment on a median-priced house has gone up 200%. New homes are now out of the economic range of almost three-quarters of the American people. The number of housing starts declined last year to the lowest level since the 1940s, and only within the last month housing starts were down 9.2%.

High Housing and Urban Development officials under the Republican administration have had no housing experience. 500 HUD officials have already been indicted and over 200 convicted of corruption and bribery in administering this program.

To compound matters, at a time when the housing industry was in a state of depression, President Ford vetoed legislation which would have reduced by one full percentage point the effective mortgage payments that a family would have to pay for new housing.

I am strongly in favor of a program to reduce interest rates on housing, as well as programs to rehabilitate existing housing and to strengthen our Section 202 housing programs for the elderly. I will introduce legislation to provide insurance for graduated payment of mortgages so that young families can purchase homes with relatively low monthly payments initially and defer additional costs until their income increases. As indicated I will work for legislation which provides mortgage interest subsidies on loan rates over 6%, along the lines of the legislation vetoed by Mr. Ford last year. This program, which is geared to middle income families, would be used principally in areas of housing shortages and high unemployment.

(2) Education. We have seen a continual decline in performance scores by our youth over the last few years. Unfortunately, the response of the Republican administration to these results has been a decline in the federal share of education costs, thereby thrusting a greater burden on the local property taxpayer. In addition, the Republican response has been to veto education authorizations and appropriations bills such as the Veterans Educational Benefits Act and to impound lawfully authorized funds for various educational programs.

We have also seen a Republican administration that has made no efforts to provide substantial federal assistance to parochial schools, which many Americans take a justifiable pride in and which shoulder a great load that the public school system could not otherwise bear.

No effort has been made during the last eight years to assist schools in preparing students for finding a career. Every year at least 1 million young people drop out of high school before graduating, often without sufficient job skills.

Much of the problem in the educational sphere is attributable to the poor management and duplication of functions within the federal education bureaucracy. For example, the National School Lunch program as administered by this administration has cost the American taxpayer one-quarter million dollars in waste in New York City alone. And for vocational education there are three different federal bureaus instead of one which would coordinate the programs more efficiently and probably at less cost.

(3) Health Care. As shown by Mr. Ford's opposition to Medicare as a Congressman, this Republican administration has shown little interest in improving the quality of health care in this country. 25% of all funds legally appropriated by Congress and impounded by this administration have been in the health care area.

No real efforts have been made to institute tight cost controls on programs such as Medicaid and Medicare.

The Republican administration has cut back on immunization programs for children. This administration itself has proposed a 50% decrease in immunizations of more children. Excess surgery costs our health care system over \$3 billion per year. Nothing again has been done to get a handle on this. Medicaid expenditures

have grown to 10 times their original level of 10 years ago, while waste in the program is losing 3 to 5 billion dollars per year.

Our country's health expenditures have jumped 250% during the eight Republican years. Now the average person spends some \$600 for health care that gives him inadequate protection. The average working person works one month each year just to pay for health care.

Only 7% of our federal health dollars is being spent on preventive services, while 1.2 million Americans are dying each year of cardio-vascular malfunctions, many of whom could be saved by rudimentary research in life-sustaining processes.

We need an administration that will move boldly on controlling fraud in the Medicaid system and which will develop strong cost control mechanisms and which will institute prospective rate-making for hospital charges under our federal programs and which will reduce our current emphasis on hospitalization which eats up 40¢ out of every health dollar, and stresses more effective preventive care.

Moreover, we will consolidate the management of health care programs, now spread out over 11 major federal agencies, so that our federal government is not working at cross purposes in the health care area.

(4) Elderly. The Republican record on the elderly is shameful. My Republican opponent as Congressman voted against Medicare and as President he proposed an arbitrary limit on the guaranteed,

cost of living increases for Social Security recipients. He now proposes an increase effective January 1, 1977 in the Social Security tax.

The Republican administration has refused to enforce the Age Discrimination in Employment Act and has failed to support both the Community Services Employment for Older Americans Act and a bill for housing for the elderly. The Administration has also failed to exempt the elderly from restrictive food stamp eligibility rules.

Yet today there are 3.3 million <sup>older</sup> Americans living in poverty.

It is time that some centralized direction be given over programs for the elderly. I will establish a Counsellor on Aging in the Office of the President, will seek to revitalize the Section 202 housing program for the elderly, and will propose subsidies for low cost public transportation for the elderly.

I will also act to stabilize the Social Security program, by reforming and stabilizing the replacement ratio so that future workers will be able to receive the same proportion of their wages as retired workers receive today, and will seek to raise the wage base rather than the tax rate to strengthen the Social Security system and bring more equity to it.

(5) Welfare Reform. Although Mr. Ford as Congressman voted for the guaranteed income plan proposed by Mr. Nixon, he has made no effort to clean up the incredible welfare mess. We

have scandals and frauds rampant in our system. We have 1.3 million people on welfare who are able to work yet continue to receive welfare payments. We have a system which is demeaning to recipients and costly to taxpayers. We have a system which encourages family breakdowns through the father in the house rule.

It is time to make a major effort to reform our welfare system. To take people off of welfare and put them back to work, to end the state-by-state variations in the welfare payments for those who cannot work, and to provide incentives for the working poor so that it is never more popular to be on welfare than to work and so that they are encouraged to continue in their jobs.

We should not tolerate the welfare system and the welfare mess which we have. Yet that is precisely what the Republicans have done for the last eight years.

8. Energy

(a) Basic Question

Your basic approach to the energy problem has been to develop policies which will assure by 1985 America's energy independence. One of the major policies you have developed toward the goal is the decontrol of all new natural gas and all domestic oil. Since the effect of those policies would be to increase greatly the consumer price for gas and oil, do you think the average family can afford your policies and do you think energy independence is a realistic and necessary goal?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) To begin with, costs would not rise greatly under my energy independence program. At the most, an additional penny or two would be paid for gasoline at the start. However, as increased emphasis and funding is provided toward more efficient use of energy resources at home and as alternative energy sources are developed, gasoline and oil prices would decline. But even more importantly, Americans will never again be held hostages for an Arab oil embargo; the long lines, outrageous prices, and often the complete unavailability of gasoline will never again be a fear for Americans.

(2) Real progress toward energy independence has been made during my two years in office; while we are still dependent on foreign oil, without the steps I have taken that dependence would be even greater. Among those steps have been six major energy proposals passed by Congress, including bills to allow production of oil and gas from government-owned petroleum reserves, to establish strategic petroleum reserves to help if another embargo is imposed, and to require auto and appliance manufacturers to inform consumers of the energy efficiency of their products.

(3) However, much more needs to be done, but the Democratic Congress whose energy policies are embodied in the Democratic Platform embraced by my opponent, has refused to take action. I have six other major proposals caught in the Congressional logjam - proposals that would increase the nation's ability to produce efficient and safe nuclear energy, to use our nation's abundant coal supplies, to conserve energy by providing homeowners with tax credits for energy-saving home improvements, and to assist in the private financing of new energy facilities. What has the Democratic Congress done about these proposals? Nothing. It seems more concerned about artificial price levels than it does about the availability of energy. If the Congress fails to act soon, there will be no energy resources left at any price level.

ENERGY

Suggested Carter Response

(1) President Ford alleges that the price of gasoline rises only a penny or two per gallon under his oil and gas decontrol program. What he neglects to tell us is that the price of all our energy, and therefore all of our consumer products, goods, and services would increase dramatically. The price of oil and gas will rise to whatever level OPEC thinks best, tying the entire U.S. economy to the whims of foreign nations. It is estimated by the Joint Economic Committee that a decontrol program for oil and gas would have cost \$32 billion, or almost \$600 per family of four in 1975. This increase reflects only the increase in direct energy costs--gasoline, heating oil, electricity, and the extra costs associated to produce consumer products. If the ripple effect or multiplier effect were taken into account, this increase could be as high as \$900 per family.

(2) The so-called energy program which the President sent to Congress is unworkable. This country can ill afford his \$100 billion welfare program to bail out large energy corporations. The conservation programs which he proposed do little more than urge us to turn out the lights. He opposed mandatory fuel efficiency standards for automobiles, relying instead on a "voluntary" agreement which he and his

Cabinet members negotiated in the board rooms of the large auto makers. He opposed efficiency standards for appliances and consumer products, again preferring a voluntary approach. The President has failed to follow through on major conservation such as revision of the electric rate structure, incentives for retrofit of houses and office buildings to provide better use of energy, and has failed to take any effective steps to require utilities which now burn oil or gas to switch to coal. The Federal Housing Administration has no guidelines for use of solar energy in homes and the President has proposed no programs to provide incentives to make use of presently available solar technology.

(3) President Ford has emphasized development of expensive, capital intensive nuclear technology at the expense of other resources. We have poured billions into the liquid metal fast breeder reactor which may turn out to be this country's most expensive white elephant. His administration has not pressed for a solution to the problem of handling radioactive wastes, nor has he acted to stem the tide of proliferation of nuclear power and weapons throughout the world.

(4) As President, I will get this country back on track toward development of a workable energy policy which the American people can afford. Conservation which goes beyond

just urging people to turn out the lights must be a mainstay of our energy policy. We must make an all out effort to shift to coal as a primary source of electricity, pressing for perfecting the technology to mine and burn coal safely and cleanly. I will deemphasize our reliance on nuclear power, freeing the billions now devoted to this source for investments in solar energy, conservation, development of mass transit, and a clean coal policy. I will act to reduce our dependence on foreign oil through development of our strategic reserves and use of all the economic tools at our disposal to keep OPEC responsible.

9. Environment

(a) Basic Question

Although you have frequently spoken about the need for cleaning up the nation's environment, you have also supported legislation to substantially weaken existing air and water pollution standards, and have been widely criticized by environmental groups for that support. How can you square your expressed commitment to the environment with your attempted legislative actions?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) The strength of my commitment to a clean environment is right on the public record:

(a) As a Congressman, I strongly supported and helped to enact the two major pieces of environmental legislation - the Clean Air Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and I was involved with the creation of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) As President, I have taken a number of steps to ensure a clean environment:

- supported the enactment of a toxic substance bill

- signed the Safe Drinking Water Act to enhance the safety of public drinking water supplies through the establishment and enforcement of national drinking water standards.

- sought a 60% increase in funding for wastewater treatment plant grants.

- proposed the doubling of the national park and wildlife refuge systems, along with increased park personnel.

(2) My commitment to a clean environment is not, however, one which is blind to the needs of a dynamic, growing economy. There must be a reasonable balance between the need for a clean environment and the need for a strong economy. Without that balance, jobs will be lost, and the economy will stop its recovery.

(3) My concern to keep the economy going - at the same time that a clean environment is pursued - is the reason why I support amendments to the Clean Air Act which will allow plants and factories to keep going while they seek to meet the Act's standards. Without those amendments, tens of thousands of workers will lose their jobs in the near future as their plants are forced to shut. I do not think the American people want no-compromise environmental standards; that is why I have sought a compromise and sought to keep plants open.

(4) I find it unfortunate that so many Democrats in Congress and Mr. Carter oppose any compromise on environmental standards, even though a no-compromise position means lost jobs. They are continuously talking about the need for jobs; but they seem more interested in spending billions for public works jobs and totally uninterested in working to save the jobs of the hard working men and women who already have them.

(c) Additional Environmental Question

You have recently proposed a ten year, \$1.5 billion program to double the size of the nation's park and wildlife areas and to rehabilitate existing park and wildlife areas. In light of the fact that this proposal reversed your Administration's two year opposition to increased funding for national parks and wildlife areas, and it was shortly after you named recreation as a major campaign issue, how do you respond to the charge that your actions were motivated solely by political considerations?

(d) Additional Ford Environment Answer

(1) When I came into office the economy was heading into a recession. During the recession that followed, economic and environmental goals had to be balanced. As a result, the type of parks and wildlife proposal I just made could not be afforded.

(2) However, for the past two year I did show my deep concern for those areas - I proposed to add 60 million acres to the wildlife system, I signed a bill to add 400 park rangers in 1976, and I requested full funding for the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

(3) Now that the economy is headed to prosperity, we can afford the improved park and wildlife system I proposed.

ENVIRONMENT

Suggested Carter Response

(1) I reject President Ford's contention that there must be a conflict between protection of our environment and a healthy rate of economic growth. Over one million new jobs have been created by existing programs for the protection of air and water quality, including 200,000 to 300,000 in the hard hit construction industry. Biologists, chemists, and toxicologists who were out of work five years ago are now working to evaluate the effects of pesticides, water pollutants and toxic chemicals. A \$1.7 billion pollution control equipment industry -- which did not exist 5 years ago -- has emerged and is growing fast.

(2) President Ford has failed to provide the leadership and the vision needed to realize both our economic and our environmental goals. His two vetoes of federal strip mining legislation have prolonged both the destruction of the environment by abusive surface mining and the climate of uncertainty surrounding coal production. With responsible strip mining legislation and enforcement of deep mine health and safety laws we can begin to put coal miners back to work.

(3) The President by his opposition to a strong toxic substances control bill has stymied efforts to enact requirements that the chemicals we use in industrial processes and consumer

products be evaluated prior to their introduction onto the market. The failure to test these chemicals has cost workers their health and has put fishermen, dairy farmers and others who depend on a clean, healthy environment out of work. Although air pollution takes an estimated 15,000 lives each year, President Ford recommends delaying implementation of auto emission requirements for an additional five years, even though one foreign manufacturer has been able to meet these standards this year with a 10% improvement in fuel efficiency over last year's model.

(4) Callous Republican disregard for our national parks and wildlife areas has resulted in a severe deterioration of these precious national resources. The/ <sup>election-year</sup> grandstand proposal at Yellowstone is merely an attempt to cover up eight years of mismanagement and neglect.

(5) As President, I will stick to the goals we have set for environmental protection and our industries will know they cannot come running in to the President for a change in direction each time they find environmental compliance slightly inconvenient.

I will sign responsible strip mining legislation and will ensure that our parks and wildlife areas are properly maintained, and that new parks are added near the cities, where most of our citizens can enjoy them, not just the Alaskan wilderness. Safe drinking water, a pure food supply and a healthy

urban environment will provide the foundation for a successful national health program. We will develop the outer continental shelf in a way which permits the coastal states to protect their shorelines, tourist industries and coastal communities.

An aggressive program for energy conservation will reduce the demand and permit us to manage our energy resources responsibly, not trading the health of our people and the landscapes of the countryside for wasteful and unnecessary consumption.

10. Government Reform (Tax Reform, Reorganization)

(a) Basic Question on Tax Reform

Mr. Carter has said that our tax laws are a national disgrace and that one of his first priorities if elected would be the complete reform of those tax laws. You have not indicated that reform of the tax laws is one of your highest priorities. Is that because you are either satisfied with the tax laws or believe change is impossible; and if not what do you propose to do about reforming the tax laws?

(b) Basic Ford Response on Tax Reform

(1) I am just as concerned about tax reforms as Mr. Carter, but I have had enough experience with the chieftains of the Democratic Congress to know that they are not concerned about tax reform. I have proposed bill after bill to the Congress to reduce the tax burden on our low and middle income individuals and families; and the Democratic Congress has failed to take any action - either on my proposal or any other similar proposal:

(a) I proposed in this year's budget a \$28 billion permanent tax reduction - \$10 billion more than the current temporary tax reduction. That tax reduction would save the average family of four earning \$15,000 a year more than \$225 a year in federal taxes. But what has the Democratic Congress done? It has only passed an extension of the temporary tax cut we already have. Why has it done that? Because I also proposed spending cuts for some of the set Democratic programs.

(b) I proposed to raise every taxpayer's personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000. Again, the Democratic Congress has failed to do anything about that proposal.

(c) I also proposed to ease the unnecessary burden of the estate tax laws on families owning small farms and businesses, and to increase the estate tax exemption by more than 100% in order to permit the free transfer of estates between spouses. And again, the Democratic Congress has failed to act.

(d) And I proposed simplifying tax returns so that any taxpayer could fill out a return without professional help. Again, Congress has done nothing.

(2) So it is clear that it is the Democratic Congress and not my Administration which has opposed tax reform. Even when the Congress was recently considering its own tax reform bill, time after time amendments to

reduce the tax burden on the low and middle income groups were defeated by the power cliques of the Democratic Congress.

(3) If the party of Mr. Carter wanted real tax reform it could have had it by now; I have not stood in its way. But the Democrats don't really want tax reform; they only want to talk about it.

(4) Because Mr. Carter would have to deal with the same Democratic chairmen who now control tax bills, I don't believe he could get tax reform either. But it is difficult to say what the Democratic Congress would do about Mr. Carter's proposals for he hasn't made any. After two years of campaigning for the Presidency, he has only been able to talk about reform; he hasn't told us exactly what he has in mind. The only specific proposal I have heard so far is that he might eliminate the interest deduction on home mortgage payments. Other than that, I don't know where he stands. Though I do know that he raised excise taxes while Governor of Georgia, which disproportionately affected lower income groups, and that he tried to increase by 50% the personal exemption.

My cards are on the table for the American public to see and judge. The public is waiting for Mr. Carter's.

(c) Basic Question on Reorganization:

Mr. Carter has made reorganization of the federal government one of his major campaign themes. You have not made reorganization one of your major themes. Is that because you are essentially satisfied with the structure of the federal government, or are you also proposing major re-organizational changes if elected and if so what are they?

(d) Basic Ford Response on Reorganization:

(1) While Mr. Carter has been travelling around the country talking about reorganization, though not really saying what he means by it, I have been trying to do something about streamlining the federal government:

(a) I proposed a National Commission on Regulatory Reform to determine which regulatory agencies are necessary and which are not. But Congress has failed to create that Commission.

(b) I proposed an Agenda for Government Reform to review the entire federal bureaucracy in order to determine where there is too much red tape, too much federal meddling, and too much bureaucracy. The Democratic Congress has failed to pass the agenda.

(c) I proposed several laws to restore competition and remove federal regulation in several major industries, including the railroad and airlines industries. These deregulation proposals, have been ignored by the Democratic Congress.

(d) I proposed the consolidation of federal grant programs in education, health and the social services; the consolidation would eliminate needless duplication and paperwork in Washington and would increase the funds available for those programs. But the Democratic Congress has turned a deaf ear.

(e) I proposed the consolidation of all agencies and bureaus concerned with federal energy policy into a single Office of Energy (Ford may do this right before the debate).

- (2) My proposals for streamlining the federal bureaucracy are clear. I think if I am elected this year, Congress will have to recognize the mandate for my programs and begin in the next Congress to take real action and to help me get Washington off the peoples' backs.
- (3) Mr. Carter's proposals for reorganization are less clear, however. After two years of campaigning on a slogan of reorganization, he hasn't told us what he has in mind, if anything. He said there were 1800 federal agencies he would reduce to 200. Well, there aren't 1800 agencies and Mr. Carter knows it. And he hasn't yet said which ones he plans to remain as his 200. He hasn't even told us 5 agencies out of his 1800 which he plans to eliminate, let alone the other 1600. The only thing we know about Mr. Carter and reorganization is his record in Georgia. There, his reorganization mostly involved the consolidation of agencies; nothing was eliminated and no hard facts exist to prove that any savings were made as a result of the reorganization. To the contrary, one of the agencies he created, the Human Resources Division has been a bureaucratic nightmare by the admission of Mr. Carter's successor, and it may soon be dismantled.
- (4) So when we're talking about reorganization, my proposals are clear; Mr. Carter's are not.

TAX REFORM

Suggested Carter Response

(1) I do not think the American people will believe for an instant that the party of Hoover, Dewey, Nixon and Big Business is the party trying to change the tax laws to help low and middle income taxpayers. That is simply not believable, and Mr. Ford's record shows why:

- (a) Almost immediately after Mr. Ford came into office he proposed a tax increase as part of his WIN program.
- (b) When he reversed course and followed the Democrats' call for a tax reduction, he proposed a reduction devised to impact hardest on the low and middle income taxpayers.
- (c) When the Congress passed an extension of the tax cut, Mr. Ford's initial response was a veto.
- (d) When Mr. Ford sought this year to make the tax reduction permanent, he also sought to drastically increase Social Security taxes -- though not until after the election.
- (e) When Mr. Ford has sent his Secretary of the Treasury to Capitol Hill to talk about tax reform, the only words that come out of his mouth are

"lower corporate taxes." Time after time, this Administration has proposed one means or another of lessening the "burden" on Big Business and the wealthy: lower corporate tax rates, increased tax deferral on foreign income, higher oil depletion allowances, and loophole after loophole understandable only by corporate tax lawyers.

- (2) I have pledged since the beginning of my campaign to completely reform the tax code -- to make it more progressive, to eliminate loopholes, to remove unfair burdens from the low and middle income taxpayers, and to simplify tax returns so any taxpayer can fill them out.
- (3) I have made the pledge to the American people because, unlike Mr. Ford, I am not content to allow 240 taxpayers with incomes over \$200,000 to pay no income taxes. I am not content to allow the wealthy to invest in tax shelters for the sole purpose of tax avoidance. I am not content to allow some of the nation's major corporations to pay an income tax that is a fraction of the rate being paid by the \$15,000 a year wage earner. These practices will not continue if I am elected President.

REORGANIZATION

Suggested Carter Response

(1) Responsive government and economy in government are themes that the American people often hear from Washington during an election year. But the problem with our government today is that elected officials don't deliver on their promises, and the public knows it. It is always easier to talk about reform than it is to develop a clear policy and get it implemented. We need a national leadership that knows what it is like to contend with the bureaucracy from the receiving end as I had to as Governor of Georgia. We need a national leadership that is free from political obligations to special interests and has more than a rhetorical or election year commitment to making government work:

--Under Republican rule from 1969 to 1975 192 federal agencies, commissions, bureaus and departments were created.

--Federal agencies spent \$15 billion on paperwork in 1973.

--The costs of administering the welfare system have doubled in the past 4 years and now total \$1.4 billion per year.

--The amount of waste at the federal level is inexcusable. Up to one-half of the Federal Medicaid funds is being wasted--some \$3-5 billion per year. The Postal Service is charging ever rising prices for worsening mail service, and yet 17 of the Postal Service's chief executives receive salaries higher than any member of Congress.

- (2) To reduce this waste and inefficiency I will institute zero-based budgeting and a permanent audit and evaluation of all programs. I intend to push for sunset legislation under which programs will automatically end unless they can justify their existence. I will seek a reorganization of government along functional lines so that people can once again understand and be able to work with rather than fight their government. I will abolish agencies which no longer serve a purpose. I was able to do this for the state of Georgia, and as a person who did not help create the bureaucratic mess which is now strangling us I will do so at the federal level.
- (3) But there is more to making government work. We must open up our government to public scrutiny and insure public access to the executive offices. In Mr. Nixon's first year in the White House 3.5 million was spent for the White House staff. Mr. Ford now proposes to spend \$16.5 million not to mention \$4 million for the Executive Office of the President. I will cut the White House staff by 25 percent and abolish unnecessary agencies in the EOP

such as the Office of International Economic Policy and the Office of Telecommunications.

- (4) I will restore independence to Cabinet officers and insure that no conflicts of interests can affect the judgment of my appointees.
- (5) Government in the open and in the sunshine is the best remedy for abuse and maladministration of our governmental process.
- (6) I will abolish the great majority of the 1267 advisory committees which cost the American taxpayers \$52 million.
- (7) I will consolidate into one agency the desparate energy functions of research and development and conservation, now spread out between the Federal Energy Administration (FEA), the Energy Research and Development Administration (ERDA), the Department of Commerce, and the Department of the Interior. Health, safety and environmental matters which impunge on energy would be kept separate.
- (8) I would consolidate into one area the entities now working in career and vocational education.
- (9) The Federal Energy Administration can be used as a fine example of runaway government, one to which the present administration gave birth.

(A perfect example of our runaway, out-of-control bureaucracy in operation is the Federal Energy Administration. This agency was originally created (as the Federal Energy Office) in December 1973, as a temporary solution to the Arab oil embargo. The embargo ended in the spring of 1974, but the FEA lives on.

It has grown into an enormous and evidently permanent bureaucracy, filling its shopping cart with any and every type of new program it could imagine--even when other agencies already have similar responsibilities. For example, the FEA in the past has set up a natural gas task force and an Office of Nuclear Affairs, even though these problems are already the business of other agencies (FPC, ERDA, NRC). The Wall Street Journal reported that FEA hired 112 public relations specialists to promote its survival. The Journal also reported that the agency had cultivated the aid of powerful special interest pressure groups to work on Congress. Treasury Secretary Simon stated that the FEA is an "outrage" which should be "abolished....tomorrow." But Mr. Ford asked Congress to extend FEA's life for three years. (In August Congress extended FEA for 18 months.) We need a major national energy department, like we need a national energy policy. But these changes should happen by direction from the top, not as an accidental result of bureaucratic empire-building ambitions.)

11. Appointments

(a) Basic question:

Mr. Carter and other Democrats have criticized the quality of your appointments to major federal positions, on the grounds that your appointees have been out-of-work Republican politicians, have no visible qualifications, or have clear conflicts of interest. How do you respond to such criticism?

(b) Basic Ford response:

I think the recent criticism of my appointments is just election-year rhetoric, designed to encourage Congress to hold up my appointments until after the election (and thereby slow down the working of the federal government). The record shows, though, that my appointments have been of men and women of demonstrated talent and integrity. My Cabinet, for instance, contains outstanding representatives from the academic, legal, business, and political communities. I appointed the second black and the second woman ever to serve in a cabinet. Elliot Richardson is a former elected official in my Cabinet; I don't think anyone would say that he is disqualified from serving because he sought election in Massachusetts.

Let me add that my one appointment to the Supreme Court was widely praised and was unanimously confirmed by the U.S. Senate. In addition, I have appointed over 1/4 of all the women ambassadors in the country's history; fourteen percent of all my personal appointments were women; 78% of all my appointees hold advanced degrees; and my senior appointees represent every geographical area.

There has been no corruption in my Administration.

APPOINTMENTS

Suggested Carter Response

(1) I am afraid that the outstanding persons in this Administration are an exception, the tokens. Let's look at the record:

(a) Mr. Ford has continued his predecessor's practice of shuffling the same faces from one position to another, almost as if musical chairs was being played with major federal positions. Mr. Nixon's OEO chief (Rumsfeld) became his NATO Ambassador; then he became Mr. Ford's chief of staff and now he is Secretary of Defense. Mr. Nixon's Secretary of HEW (Richardson) and Defense became Mr. Ford's Ambassador to England and now he is Secretary of Commerce. Mr. Nixon's Secretary of Interior (Morton) became Mr. Ford's Secretary of Commerce and then his White House Counsellor and campaign chairman. Mr. Nixon's HUD Secretary (Lynn) became Mr. Ford's OMB Director. I think it is unfortunate that Mr. Ford feels there are so few talented people in the country that he must move around the same ones whenever a vacancy occurs.

(b) Mr. Ford has continued to reward defeated Republican candidates with major federal positions. Fifteen former Republican Congressmen have been appointed by this Republican Administration to major positions.

(c) Mr. Ford has overlooked conflicts of interest in filling major jobs: He named as the nation's energy chief a man getting over \$80,000 a year from an oil company; he named opponents of the Legal Services Corporation to its Board of Directors; and he named a Secretary of Interior with no record of concern for the environment. And he has continued to name regulatory committee members from the industries being regulated: In the past five years, more than half the appointees to the nine key agencies have been from the regulated industry.

(2) I think we can do better; I think the country deserves better:

(a) I will make an intensive talent search for the nation's finest men and women, of every race, religion, and ethnic group. I will seek appointees from every state and region and from every ethnic, racial and economic segment in the country; I will not limit myself to those with prior government experience; and I will not end the search when my Administration begins -- it will be ongoing.

(b) I will require all my appointees to publicly disclose their finances. That will be my First Executive Order.

(c) My record in Georgia indicates that when I made the same promises there, I kept them. So I have a record about which you can judge my commitment to excellent appointees.

12. Discrimination

(a) Basic Question

Although you often talked about the goal of eliminating discrimination in our society, many of the actions of your Administration seem to conflict with that goal. What actions has your Administration taken to prevent discrimination against such groups as blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans and women?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) Blacks, Spanish-speaking Americans

(a) As a Congressman, I voted for every major piece of civil rights legislation that became law - '57 C.R. Act; '64 C.R. Act; '65 Voting Rights Act; '66 Open Housing Law and '70 extension of Voting Rights Act.

(b) As President, I have reaffirmed my commitment to the concept of equal opportunity:

I recommended and signed as extension of the Voting Rights Act; and the extension at my direction broadened the protections of the Act to include Spanish-surnamed Americans.

My proposed FY'77 budget calls for a \$1 billion increase for civil rights activities over last year and a 24% increase over FY'75 budget for civil rights enforcement, including a 20% increase for EEOC.

I have also requested an increase in funding for SBA loans for minority enterprises that is 100% above the funding of two years ago.

And I have appointed a number of blacks to my personal staff and an outstanding black leader, Bill Coleman, as my Secretary of Transportation (making him only the second black to serve in a cabinet)

(2) Women

(a) I have long been a strong supporter of greater opportunities for American women. As House Minority Leader, I was instrumental in lining up some of the last signatures needed to obtain a "discharge petition" to force the Equal Rights Amendment, where it had languished for 47 years.

(b) As President I have directed the Attorney General to review all federal laws to determine the need for revising sex-based provisions not justified in law or policy; recommended the elimination of the estate and gift tax on all transfers between spouses; supported the establishment and appointment of the National Commission on Observance of International Women's Year; directed the heads of all federal departments and agencies to guarantee that all persons have an opportunity to compete on an equal basis for employment and advancement in the federal government; and signed the Equal Credit Opportunity Act of '74, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex and marital status in the granting of consumer credit.

(c) I have also appointed more women to high level federal positions than any previous administration: 14% of all high level appointments have been women, including the Ambassador to England, the Chairman of NLRB, the Chief of Protocol, and the Secretary of HUD (who was only the second woman to serve in a cabinet.)

DISCRIMINATION

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) One of my major concerns in this campaign is to unite all segments of our society and to end artificial, unnecessary divisions. Based on his record, Mr. Ford does not truly seem to share that concern:
- (a) As a Congressman, he voted time after time to re-commit civil rights bills. A vote to recommit is well known to be a vote to kill a bill. That is the vote that counts. And those votes were the reason all of the leading civil rights groups opposed Mr. Ford's confirmation as Vice President.
- (b) As President, Mr. Ford:
- allowed an unconscionable amount of time to go by before issuing regulations banning discrimination against women, under Title IX;
  - Has failed to do anything about the fact that only 3% of those in high level government positions are women; or that only 2% of the nearly 10,000 employees in the top three Civil Service grades are women;
  - been criticized by his own Civil Rights Commission for impeding the orderly desegregation of schools;
  - has failed to do anything to prevent the continuing discrimination which exists against many Eastern and Southern European ethnic groups;
  - has completely failed to consider the language problems of the millions of Spanish-speaking citizens.

(2) As President, I can assure you I would take the steps necessary to correct these problems. I will reform the civil rights laws. I will appoint, women, blacks, and members of other minority groups to positions throughout the federal government, as I did throughout Georgia while Governor. I will make the first serious effort in 8 years to unite the country, rather than divide it.

13. Integrity and Morality in Government

(a) Basic Question

The belief that Washington politicians lack integrity and morality has been growing ever since, and no doubt as a result of, the Watergate affair. Mr. Carter has made the anti-Washington, anti-politician theme a major one of his campaign. As the handpicked successor of Richard Nixon and as someone who has been a Washington-based politician for 27 years (25 in Congress), why should voters concerned about integrity and morality keep you in office 4 more years?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) Although I did serve in Congress for 25 years, my record for integrity and morality was unchallenged throughout that period. During my confirmation hearings for Vice-president, I was scrutinized by the Senate and the House more thoroughly than any nominee had ever been - my personal, financial, and political records were reviewed completely and found in perfect order. And as a result I was overwhelmingly endorsed by both the Democratic-controlled Senate and House. Senator Mondale was one of those who voted for me.

(2) Immediately upon assuming the Presidency, I made a clean break with the previous Administration: I picked new advisors, I operated the government differently, and I made my own policies. So there is no basis for linking me with the previous Administration or its Watergate activities. I was not involved with those, nor were my advisors.

(3) I have made my Administration an open and a candid one.

Openness - My Presidency has become the most open in modern times: I have held 35 national press conferences, met in White House conferences with more than 10,000 Americans, travelled over 200,000 miles to talk and meet with Americans, and even appeared and testified before a Congressional committee - the first president in history to do so.

Integrity - I have restored integrity to the White House; and I believe that has been one of the two or three major accomplishments of my Administration to date. I have done this by appointing men and women of the highest integrity to major posts, by promulgating a strict code of conduct for my White House

staff, gave strict instructions to all cabinet members concerning the conduct of their departments, supported the Attorney General in his actions investigating the FBI, appointed the Richardson Commission to investigate and recommend action on the problem of international corporate bribery, and proposed the establishment of a permanent, independent special prosecutor.

(4) In light of this record, I do not think I can fairly be linked with the previous administration or with Watergate.

INTEGRITY AND MORALITY IN GOVERNMENT

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) From the start of my campaign two years ago, one of my major concerns and promises has been the restoration of honesty and morality to the Federal government. When I began my campaign, what had been happening in Washington made the need for honesty and morality in government obvious to everyone.
- (2) Now, two years later, Mr. Ford has told us that integrity, openness, and trust have been restored to the Federal government by him. I am just unable to agree with that.
- (3) I have no doubt that Mr. Ford is personally honest, open, and moral; I have never said otherwise in two years of campaigning. But the Federal government extends beyond the Oval Office, and Mr. Ford has unfortunately not shown the leadership needed to ensure that everyone else in the Federal government follows his personal standards:
  - (a) Appointees to regulatory agencies still come from the industries they are supposed to regulate -- a clear conflict of interest -- and return to their old employers after a short time with the government. Mr. Ford has done nothing to stop that; I can assure you I would.

(b) Major federal appointees still assume and hold office without making any financial disclosure.

Mr. Ford could have issued an Executive Order requiring disclosure. He has not. I will.

(c) The Executive Branch of the federal government is still able to hold major meetings involving public policy in secret. Mr. Ford could have ended that but has not. There should be no doubt that I will.

(d) Scandals in the FBI and the Medicaid program have recently come to our attention. Strong leadership is necessary to correct these abuses, and I can assure you that I will exert that leadership.

(e) The Freedom of Information Act Amendments, which were designed to make that Act workable, were vetoed by Mr. Ford. I would have signed them.

(4) So while I think Mr. Ford's record for personal honesty and integrity far exceeds that of his predecessor, I don't think Mr. Ford has done anything to ensure that the rest of the government is also conducted in a way that respects the American people and which they can respect. That requires strong leadership. My record in Georgia shows that I am capable and willing to exert that type of leadership.

14. Crime

(a) Basic Question on Crime

Although your predecessor, Richard Nixon, campaigned on a law and order theme, promising to crack down on crime, and billions of federal dollars have been spent in the last eight years toward that end, crime has increased over 50% during the past 8 years. Do you think the federal government can solve the crime problem, and, if so, what steps are you taking to reduce crime?

(b) Basic Ford Response on Crime

(1) The experience of the last 8 years has shown that more than money is required in the effort to reduce crime; I have proposed other steps that would substantially reduce crime, but the Democratic Congress - which repeatedly deplors the high cost of crime - has failed to take action on any of them, or even to do anything.

(2) But let me emphasize that I have been directing the fight against the growth of crime only since August of 1974. At that time crime was increasing at the rate of 18% a year. By the end of 1975, the rate had dropped to 9% and the latest figures for 1976 show only a 4% increase. So, since I took office, the growth in the crime rate has been cut by more than half.

(3) The growth in crime would even further be cut if the Congress would take action on my proposals to (a) enact a new, tough criminal code having stricter penalties for serious crimes, (b) enact a mandatory minimum sentence law to ensure that a conviction for serious offenses would result in a jail sentence, (c) establish a "career criminal" program to assure quick identification of repeat offenders, (d) and pass the extension of the LEAA authorization act, which is the form I proposed would provide increased funding to improve state and local court systems and to concentrate police activity on high-crime areas.

(c) Additional Crime Question:

During your Administration, it has been revealed that the FBI has conducted illegal break-ins, suffered from conflicts-of-interest in its purchasing practices, misused public funds, and had allowed Dir. Kelley to receive gifts and services from FBI employees. What have you done about these abuses and what is being done to prevent a recurrence?

(d) Additional Ford Response:

(1) The FBI has rightly been one of the nation's most respected institutions; it has been responsible for the scientific pursuit of crime and for the respect of federal law enforcement.

(2) The recent incidents, which involved very few people, unfortunately tarnished the FBI to some extent. But the effectiveness of the FBI and its fight against crime have not been impaired.

(3) To determine exactly what the facts were in the incidents, and whether sanctions were appropriate, I had the Attorney General conduct a thorough investigation. In certain cases, individuals have already been dismissed or disciplined; in others, the investigation is still going on and I expect to take some action when it is completed.

(4) With respect to Director Kelley, I also had the Attorney General conduct an investigation. He recommended that Kelley be kept and I accepted the recommendation. Unlike my opponent, I did not think someone who has devoted his life to crime enforcement, who has effectively run the FBI for several years, and who is a man of unquestioned value to the nation, should be dismissed because he accepted \$300 worth of window valances while his wife was terminally ill.

CRIME; FBI

Suggested Carter Response

(1) Crime

a. I find it hard to avoid comparing Mr. Ford's answers with the law and order platform the Republicans ran on 8 years ago:

1. Mr. Nixon promised to reduce crime, get tough with students protesting the Vietnam War, and restore sound law enforcement to the Justice Department.

2. Instead, we now hear how the crime rate, which rose by more than 45% during the last 8 years, is rising more slowly than it did last year; we now hear of the need for compassion for high government officials who broke the law; we do not hear how two Attorneys General, one Vice-President, one President and a White House staff left in disgrace; we do not hear how \$4.5 billion of LEAA money has produced no reduction in crime; we do not hear how scandal after scandal has racked the FBI with no reprimands from the White House; and we do not hear that one-half of all Americans are still afraid to walk in their neighborhoods in the daytime.

b. I recognize that a President's role in reducing crime is comparatively small and that nothing is helped by

promising more than can be delivered. But much more can be done than has been done:

-- Crime can be reduced.

-- Credibility in federal law enforcement can be restored.

-- The bottleneck in the court system can be removed.

-- The criminal laws can be changed to meet modern needs.

-- LEAA can be made into more than a billion dollar a year boondoggle.

c. All of this can happen, though, only with a Democratic President committed to enforcement, citizen protection and justice. I do not think it can happen with a Republican President committed to a policy which has failed so completely these past 8 years.

(2) FBI

a. From the information available to me, the Levi report on Kelley not having been made public, I think it is clear that Kelley took gifts and services from FBI employees. No side issues can change those facts. And in light of those facts, I believe Kelley should be treated like any federal employee involved in such a misuse of position -- a public hearing should be held and discipline that is appropriate should be imposed.

b. To me, what is really troublesome about the Kelley incident is that it seems representative of so much that has gone on in the FBI recently: agents involved in illegal break-ins have gone unpunished; top level officials involved in purchasing kickbacks have gone unpunished; domestic spying has apparently continued unchecked.

I do not understand why nothing has been done about these incidents. I can assure you that if I am elected I will initiate a tough, thorough investigation of the FBI from outside the Justice Department. My goal would be to re-establish the respect for the FBI that existed 8 years ago.

15. Influence of Corporate Interests

(a) Basic Question.

Your Administration, like your predecessor's, has been accused by many Democrats, consumer groups and public interest groups of allowing the big corporate interests to unduly influence major policy decisions. Is there any merit to those accusations? Can you name several major policies of your Administration which are opposed by the corporate interests?

(b) Basic Ford Answer

(1) Business groups have no more influence on my Administration's policy than do any other interest groups or parts of our society. My Administration listens to and welcomes the views of all segments of our society. But all decisions are made only with the public's interest in mind.

I have restored integrity to the White House by conducting an open and candid Administration. No deals are made with or for business groups. I would not allow them; I would not tolerate them.

(2) Democrats have accused me of following the wishes of business because many of policies are approved by businessmen; but those are policies which I believe more than a majority of all Americans approve: reducing inflation, reducing taxes, fighting crime, opposing extravagant social programs, ensuring a strong defense, returning power and decisions to state and local communities, and eliminating federal red tape. The Democrats can offer no evidence that I have followed those policies because deals were made with businessmen. If there were any evidence, they would have presented it; but they have not.

(3) Part of the proof that my Administration does not follow the wishes of business is that many of my policies have been strongly opposed by the very business interests that the Democrats say influence my policy:

De-Regulation - I have proposed rate de-regulation of the airline, railroad and trucking industries in order to increase competition and lower transportation prices. Those industries and others strongly oppose my deregulation programs.

Securities - I proposed and signed a bill to open competition in the securities industry and therefore decrease brokerage fees. The securities industry strongly opposed that bill.

Fair Trade - I supported and signed the repeal of the Federal Fair Trade laws which for many years allowed manufacturers to dictate artificially high retail prices.

Financial Institutions - I have supported the Financial Institutions Act, the first major reform legislation for the banking industry since the 1930's. The result for the consumer would be to lower interest rates and other costs for the consumer. The banking industry strongly opposes this bill.

Antitrust - I have supported several proposed changes in the antitrust laws to ease their enforcement and increase their penalties. My Justice Department has vigorously prosecuted the antitrust case against IBM and has filed the largest antitrust suit in history against At & T, seeking its divestiture.

INFLUENCE OF CORPORATE INTERESTS

Suggested Carter Response

(1) I agree that Mr. Ford has given Big Business good reason not to support him: high inflation, sustained recession, a lag in GNP growth, and record deficit spending.

(2) Nonetheless, I think it is clear that countless actions were taken by Mr. Ford and his Administration because of direct influence of Big Business:

- Urging immediate oil and gas decontrol;
- Opposing Consumer Protection Agency;
- Vetoing strip mining bill;
- Opposing major anti-trust bill to allow State Attorneys General to represent citizens in their states in major anti-trust litigation;
- Seeking a weakened Clean Air Act;
- Supporting lower corporate tax rates and additional corporate tax loopholes;
- Failing to enforce financial conflict-of-interest regulations.

(3) I am a businessman and the only candidate in this election who has ever had to regularly meet a payroll. I understand the problems of businessmen. During my campaign, I have had meetings with businessmen and

tried to give them my views on their problems. . But  
I have always indicated that in my Administration,  
the public interest would never come second to the  
interests of big business.

16. Agricultural Record

(a) Basic Question

In 2 years, your Administration has imposed three grain embargoes. You stated in your acceptance speech what conditions led to the embargoes being imposed and how can you be certain that those conditions will not recur?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) First, let me say that the past two years have been among the best agricultural years in our history:

Net farm income has increased from \$24 billion in 1972 and 1973 to an average of \$26 billion during 1975 and 1976. During the Kennedy-Johnson Administration, net farm income averaged only \$13.8 billion.

Farm exports in 1976 reached \$26 billion, an all-time record, in '72 they were only \$8 billion.

Net farm assets increased from \$313 billion in 1973 to \$427 billion in 1975.

Decline in the number of operating farms has been reversed; my proposal to reduce the estate tax to allow families to keep their farms will continue that trend.

(2) These records have occurred directly because of the policies I have pursued:

Farmers have been given the opportunity for full production in a free market and they have responded. That is in contrast to what Democratic administrations have always done: controlled what farmers can do, limited their production, and held farm exports below their potential. Under my full production policy, farmers have been able to put over 57 million "set aside" acres back to work.

My fight to stop inflation, which I have lowered from 12% to 5%, has stabilized the long upward surge in farm production expenses. This has resulted, of course, in the much slower growth in consumer food prices, which are now rising at only 2-3% compared to a 14 1/2% rise in the 1973 period.

I have adopted a policy of allowing unlimited exports; and have opposed - and would veto - any bill establishing a government-owned grain reserve. Mr. Carter has not ruled out such a grain reserve.

- (3) Because of the healthy farm picture and the improving economy, I can confidently say there will be no more grain embargoes. Mr. Carter apparently cannot say that, for when he started to he quickly changed his mind. The embargoes that were ordered resulted from an unusual combination of high inflation and unanticipated, record demand for our grain abroad. Because of the economy and our record production, which ensures no shortages at home, I can knowledgeably state there will be no more embargoes.

AGRICULTURE

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) I think it is clear that Mr. Ford's figures are the result more of Republican double-digit inflation than anything consciously done to help farmers; "real farm income" (which accounts for inflation) has been disastrous: 1975 -- \$16.8 billion; 1976 (projected) -- \$17.7 billion; 1974 -- \$22.6 billion; 1973 -- \$27.7 billion; farmer purchasing power in 1976 will be no greater than 1972.
  
- (2) Mr. Ford's only conscious actions have been against the interests of farmers and others responsible for producing the nation's food:
  - Grain embargoes were ordered 3 times -- though Ford cannot explain why; last year's wheat embargo cost \$1 billion.
  
  - Grain inspection frauds went unprosecuted.
  
  - Bills to increase price supports for cotton, grain, milk and tobacco were all vetoed by Ford.
  
- (3) I sincerely believe that the interest of farmers would be better protected -- and cared about more than once every four years -- under an Administration:
  - headed by someone who has worked the fields and whose income comes from the ground.

- committed to no embargoes under the situations used by Ford as a pretext for them (and only in the case of dire emergency food shortage in this country).
- determined to make agribusiness exporters report what they are up to.
- committed to full production, to price supports needed to cover farmers production costs, to unlimited exports, and to the preservation of the family farm.
- committed to having a Secretary of Agriculture who understands and wants to help farmers, not exporters, grain dealers, and other agribusinessmen.

PAGES 75 - 82 OMITTED

17. Record v. Republican Platform

(a) Basic Question

You have stated that Mr. Carter, as the Democratic nominee cannot be separated from the Democratic platform. As the Republican nominee, are you not equally inseparable from the Republican platform, and if so how can you square your positions on abortion, busing and school prayer with those in the platform?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) Carter cannot be separated from the Democratic platform because he wrote it and, after his nomination, he said he was comfortable with it and could easily run on it. Now he may have changed his mind about that during the last few weeks, but I do not know about it; Mr. Carter will have to tell us if he still favors the Democratic platform. Let me point out that the Democratic platform calls for so many new and expensive social programs, like Humphrey-Hawkins, national health insurance and federalized welfare, that the taxpayers will be handed a \$100 billion bill if the Democratic ticket is elected. I don't think we can afford the Democratic platform; each family in this country would be assessed \$1800 to pay for the platform.

(2) The Democratic platform is in stark contrast to the Republican platform, which calls for a continuation of the steady and sure management that I have been following: no new multi-billion dollar programs will be required if I am elected; the taxpayers will not be assessed \$100 billion. All that is called for is the continuation of the affordable, reasonable and moderate approach to the nation's problems that I have used the last two years. I think that is the approach the country wants; and I am proud to run on a platform which advocates it.

(3) The position I have taken and the Republican platform are entirely consistent:

(a) Abortion -

- The Republican platform calls for a support of those seeking enactment of a constitutional amendment to restore the right to life of unborn children.

- Since the Supreme Court issued its abortion decision several years ago, while I was in Congress, I have taken the position that the Court's decision was wrong, that abortion is wrong, and that the only feasible solution is a constitutional amendment overturning the Court's decision and allowing each state to make its own decision about abortion.
- Such a constitutional amendment would result in the great majority of states - if not all - deciding to ban abortions completely (aside from certain medical emergencies.) That would result in the restoration of the right to life of unborn children. But I think it is important that each state have the chance to make that choice.

(b) Busing

- My opposition to forced busing is well known; again, I have opposed it since the Supreme Court's decision approving forced busing.
- As President, I have been disappointed about the Democratic Congress' repeated failure to take any action to limit or end forced busing. I believe, though, that the sentiment of the country is clearly against forced busing and Congress will soon get the message.
- If Congress fails to soon act on legislation to restrict forced busing, such as the bill I proposed several months ago to limit busing to 3 years in any school district, then I think consideration to other alternatives, possibly including a constitutional amendment, may be necessary. That is all the Republican platform calls for; and that is what I believe.

(c) School Prayer

- I was also disturbed as a member of Congress that the Supreme Court banned non-sectarian prayers in public schools. Soon after that decision I proposed a constitutional amendment to allow such prayers to be made. I thought such non-religious prayers would go a long way toward restoring a

sense of morality and purpose to our public schools.

- That is still my position. The Republican platform seeks a constitutional amendment to allow non-sectarian prayers, and I support it.

REPUBLICAN PLATFORM

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) I have read the Republican Platform carefully and I cannot agree that its planks are consistent with Mr. Ford's record; in many respects, it appears to be a repudiation of his record. I think Vice-President Rockefeller recognized that when he said, soon after the Republican convention, that Mr. Ford would not really be running on the Republican platform.
  
- (2) A look at the Republican Platform shows why Mr. Rockefeller felt such a statement had to be made:
  - (a) The platform calls for three constitutional amendments, one to re-institute school prayers, one to ban busing, and one to prohibit all abortions-- Mr. Ford, as President, has never indicated support for any of these amendments.
  - (b) The platform calls for an end to federal deficits; Mr. Ford has had the biggest deficits in our nation's history.
  - (c) The platform praises Alexander Solzhenitsyn; Mr. Ford initially refused to meet with Mr. Solzhenitsyn.
  - (d) The platform criticizes "secret agreements in foreign policy;" but Mr. Ford has continued to allow Mr. Kissinger to make such agreements.

- (3) I think these differences make it clear that Mr. Ford's own party has rejected his policies. Repeating his statement that the platform does represent the Ford policies will not make it so.
- (4) That Mr. Ford has so misread the Republican Platform makes it easy to understand how he could so misread the Democratic Platform. That platform does not call for \$100 billion in new spending. What it does call for are new programs--such as national health insurance--to be phased in as revenues permit. That is consonant with my own philosophy. I do not intend to initiate the first new spending program unless the revenues permit and unless government spending can be kept to the same percentage of our national wealth as it takes up under Mr. Ford.

18. Mood of Nation

(a) Basic Question

Public opinion polls and a number of recent elections have shown that there is a widespread mood throughout the nation against incumbent officer holders and for newcomers, or at least the party out of power. Part of that mood seems to be reflected in a desire for new and different national leadership. After 8 years of Republican rule, why is it not the right time to turn over the White House to the Democratic Party in order to see if it can do more to solve the nation's problems?

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) To begin with, the end of my term in 1977 will not be the end of 8 years of the Ford Administration, but only of two. My Administration - in its personnel, style and policies - has made a clean break from my predecessor's, and I don't think can be fairly linked with it. At the end of my two years, I will not have had the opportunity that a two-term president normally has to propose programs, enact them, implement them and then improve upon them. In my short term, I have started a number of policies which have not yet been enacted or fully implemented. If I left office, those policies - such as my fight against inflation, for improved economic output, and for a strong defense would be interrupted, and based on Mr. Carter's platform, reversed. The continuity that is so necessary in implementing federal policy would be lost while Mr. Carter learns where his Cabinet departments are located and what they do.

(2) Aside from the lost continuity, there is another key reason why the Democrats should not be elected this year. The Democrats now overwhelmingly control Congress; they will certainly control it by nearly the same margins next year. If Mr. Carter is elected, there will be no check or balance between the presidency and the Congress, for Mr. Carter has already embraced the policies of the Democratic Congress. He is for Humphrey-Hawkins, federalized welfare, national health insurance. And he would probably support whatever additional big-spending program the Democratic Congress could dream up. There would be no one in the White House to say no, to say that cost too much, to use the veto. If I am elected, you can be sure I will do that, and the country and our system of government needs it to be done.

. MOOD OF NATION

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) Continuing past policies is disastrous when these past policies were developed by Mr. Nixon and come from the same Republican thinking used by Hoover, Dewey and Nixon. Are these the policies we want continued for four more years? 7.9% unemployment, 6% inflation, no real GNP growth, no national energy policy other than high prices, no national health insurance program, no welfare reform, no reorganization of the bureaucracy, no tax reform for the poor and the middle class; but plenty of embargoes, vetoes, impoundments, and executive privilege. My answer is a clear no.
  
- (2) The argument that a Democratic President cannot control a Democratic Congress was made in the last Presidential debates by Mr. Nixon against John Kennedy. It was wrong then and I think it is wrong now. President Kennedy worked with the Congress; inflation was kept around 2%; the deficit was microscopic compared to the current deficit; and unemployment was extremely low. If I am elected, I don't see why there would be any difference. I would be working with your elected representatives, not against them. I would phase in all new programs only as revenues permit. And I would be committed to balancing the budget by the end of my

first term. If another Republican Administration is elected, I am afraid we will have four more years of conflict with Congress, a depressed economy, and tired leadership with old faces.

19. Use of Incumbency

(a) Basic question

You have been accused, by Governor Reagan in the primaries and now by many Democrats, of unfairly using your incumbency for political purposes, such as by making appointments or awarding grants designed to help your political prospects. Can you categorically state that no government decisions were made or government resources were used for your political purposes?

(b) Basic Ford response on incumbency

(1) I can categorically state that my political prospects have not been the basis for government decisions or use of government resources.

(2) Charges are often made in political campaigns that an incumbent is using his office unfairly. In some cases such charges may be merited. But in my case the record clearly indicates that they are not:

- I assumed the Presidency during a period of great turmoil and distrust; and I have restored integrity to the White House. I do not think even Mr. Carter would dispute that.
- I can assure the American people that I would not tarnish that restoration of integrity to gain political support. Remember, I did not seek the Presidency; it is not a prize I spent part of my life running for. As much as I enjoy my job, I am not so interested in keeping it that I would ignore the public interest and make government decisions out of a sole desire to advance my election prospects.
- When my entire 25-year career was carefully scrutinized by Congress upon my nomination to the vice-presidency, both the Senate and the House carefully looked at all my personal, financial and political actions and found nothing to indicate that I had ever used my office in any unethical or illegal ways. And both Houses overwhelmingly endorsed by nomination.

(3) Inevitably, any decision by an incumbent will be attacked by his political opponents as unfair.

That is to be expected. But I want to emphasize that government decisions must continue to be made; the government cannot come to a halt for 6 months or a year. My responsibility to the American people is to keep the government going, the economy strong, and our national defense on the alert. I can assure the American people that no decision I make in doing that will be determined solely by what helps me politically. My concept of public duty would not allow that for a minute.

USE OF INCUMBENCY

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) I am, of course, in a different position than Mr. Ford. When I started my campaign two years ago, I had already completed my term as Governor. I therefore had no government resources or staff at my disposal; my entire campaign had to be--and was--financed by private support. My running mate is currently an office holder, but from the date of his selection, Senator Mondale has completely separated his Senate staff and resources from those of our campaign.
- (2) In light of the sad events which led to Mr. Ford's assuming the Presidency, I think it is vital that the separation of government and politics occur--but just as important that the appearance of a separation occur.
- (3) Unfortunately, I think there has been an appearance of political actions in the name of governmental actions:
  - appointments of individuals in certain primary states were announced right before those primaries;
  - Federal grants were awarded to primary states right before those primaries;
  - White House staff members have been openly working on political matters;
  - Uncommitted delegates were invited to White House State dinners and affairs of State;

-- Mr. Ford just recently reversed his 2 year policy of no new programs and announced an expansion of the national parks system, shortly after saying that recreation would be an issue in this campaign.

- (4) I have no doubt that Mr. Ford is sincere in his desire to return integrity to the government. But I do doubt that the appearance of some of the things recently done by his Administration is a step in that direction

20. Value of Experience

(a) Basic question on experience

In your campaign thus far you have made a point of your experience in the White House and with the federal government and a lack of similar experience by your opponent. And you have stated that the difference in federal government experience is a major reason why the voters should choose you. But was not the same lack of experience argument used against Lincoln, Franklin Roosevelt and John Kennedy, and did they not show that federal government and White House experience is less important in running the country than any other factors?

(b) Basic Ford response

(1) First, I do not think the value of federal governmental experience can be underestimated. I have been in Washington for many years, and President for two years; I know first hand how the federal government works and how to get it moving. I did not learn that at briefings or from advisors. I think Mr. Carter would have a hard time learning the intricacies of the federal government in a short period of time; it might take several years before he felt familiar enough with the federal government to make it run effectively, to make the quick decisions about national security matters that often have to be made, and to implementing any of his campaign proposals. The presidency is not a place for on-the-job training; in fact it is the worst place for it. It is fine to talk about not being from Washington when you're campaigning; but it is not fine when you have to come to Washington to run a government with a \$400 billion budget. When Mr. Carter served his 4 years as Governor of Georgia, its budget was only slightly above \$1 billion.

(2) Mr. Carter's background is much different from the Lincoln, Roosevelt and Kennedy. All of them had served in Washington: Lincoln as a Congressman, Roosevelt as Secretary of the Navy and Kennedy as a Senator. They were familiar with the operation of the federal government in a way that Mr. Carter is not. They had served a useful apprenticeship before assuming the nation's most important office; Mr. Carter will only have 4 years as Georgia's Governor.

(3) I obviously do not think experience should be the sole factor upon which voters decide. But, in light of the complicity of the federal government and Mr. Carter's very limited record, I think experience should be a major factor.

VALUE OF EXPERIENCE

Suggested Carter Response

- (1) President Kennedy said there are many different paths to the Presidency, none automatically being better experience than another.
- (2) The path Mr. Ford chose was Congress. For 25 years he represented one Congressional district; he catered to its needs, he voted in the House, he became part of the Congressional insiders club, and he issued daily press releases; he was the chief Republican spokesman in the House of Representatives.
- (3) During that same period, I did a variety of things, getting many different types of experience--experience that cannot be obtained by staying in Washington as a Congressman: I was a naval officer, an engineer, a teacher, a businessman, a farmer, a state senator, and a governor. I lived in all parts of the country. I worked with all types of people--not just other Congressmen. And while I was governor of Georgia, I was administering a state government--exactly the same duty that Woodrow Wilson and Franklin D. Roosevelt had right before they assumed the Presidency.

- (4) So I think I have had a different type of experience than Mr. Ford--not an experience which sheltered me from non-politicians but also not an experience devoid of political and management training. If my Republican opponent's experience had been so valuable, why is he unable to get along with Congress, to restore the economy to the shape Mr. Nixon found it in 1968, to give a sense of direction to the government. Herbert Hoover and Mr. Nixon also had abundant Federal experience before they became President; and I don't think their records show that years of experience translates into good government and sound leadership.
- (5) We need more concern about moving the country forward; I am prepared to get the country moving again. My opponent's "experience" has tied him to the past, and I think he wants to keep us right where we are.

21. Major Accomplishments

(a) Basic Question

Public opinion polls show that although you have been in office over 2 years, many Americans are unable to name any major accomplishments by your Administration. What do you consider the major accomplishments of your Administration and why do you think so many Americans are apparently unaware of them.

(b) Basic Ford Response

(1) I have taken affirmative action in these major areas and have been affective in all three: I have restored trust to the White House and faith in the presidency; I have turned the economy around and moved it toward prosperity; and I have achieved the nation's first peace in over 15 years.

(2) The first two of those directly concern the subject matter for this debate:

(a) Trust - When I assumed office, the presidency was in disrepute; the nation had lost faith in its national leaders and institutions; and there was a lack of confidence in the nation's future. That has all been changed as a result of actions I have taken. I restored integrity to the White House by being candid with the American people, by being open with them, and my insisting that my staff and advisors follow the same priorities. As a result of this, Americans are again confident about the nation's future and are again able to trust their national leaders and institutions.

(b) Economy- When I assumed office, inflation was 12%, the economy was going into a recession, unemployment was increasing, and productivity was at a standstill. I have followed a steady and even course in handling these problems, and the result has been that after two years the nation is clearly on the road to prosperity. The economy has been turned completely around: inflation has been cut by more than half, more people are employed now than ever in the nation's history, productivity is up, consumer sales are up, and income is up. And that has all been accomplished without resorting to the multi-billion dollar proposals of the Democratic Congress, such as the Humphrey-Hawkins bill.

(3) I think the American people are aware of these accomplishments. I think they do recognize the unusual circumstances that I inherited and the substantial progress that I have made.

MAJOR FORD ACCOMPLISHMENTS

Suggested Carter Response

(1) Prosperity and trust are certainly desirable traits; and I have pledge to the American people that my Administration will take immediate steps to reach these goals. But I think the record is clear that my Republican opponent has not achieved these goals.

(a) Prosperity

- 1) By any standard the Republican management of the economy, whether it is over an eight year period or during just the last two years, has been an unprecedented disaster for the American people. If this is a Republican recovery I don't want any part of it. Let me tell you why:
  - a. Isn't it true that there are 7½ million workers unemployed today? Yes. Isn't this 2½ million more than were unemployed when Mr. Ford took office two years ago? Yes.
  - b. Isn't it true the unemployment rate today is 7.9%? Yes. Isn't this a higher unemployment rate than we've had at any time under any other President since the Great Depression? Yes.

c. Isn't it true that the 1968 dollar is today worth only 61¢? Yes. Isn't today's inflation rate of 6% greater than the rate we've had at any time between the Korean War and the inauguration of Richard Nixon? Yes.

d. Isn't it true that the average worker's weekly paycheck is worth less today than it was in 1968? Yes.

e. Isn't it true that there are fewer private non-farm jobs today than when Mr. Ford took office? Yes.

f. Isn't it true that housing starts today are lower than they were when Mr. Ford took office? Yes.

(b) Trust

1) I do not think Mr. Ford's record in restoring trust is any better than it is in restoring prosperity:

a. Appointments are still being made from the same tired old faces that served Mr. Nixon.

b. Appointments are still being made of individuals clearly unqualified or with clear conflicts-of-interest. For example: Andrew Gibson, FEA; Thomas Longshore, TVA

c. Financial disclosure has not been ordered for Executive Branch officials.

d. Executive Privilege is still being used with abandon.

e. Sunshine has still not been ordered for Cabinet Departments.

f. The appearance is widespread that governmental decisions, in the primaries and now, are being made solely on the basis of politics rather than the public interest.

(2) In my Administration, steps will be immediately taken to truly re-establish trust in the government. When I tell the American people trust has been restored, I will be able to prove it:

a. Executive Branch officials will have to make financial disclosure.

b. Individuals with conflicts of interest will not be appointed.

c. Sunshine will be ordered for the Cabinet Departments.

d. All government decisions will be made only in the public interest.

(3) General Remarks

Mr. Ford often excuses his record of nonaction by pointing to the difficult situation which he inherited from his predecessor, Mr. Nixon. It is true that Mr. Ford took office under traumatic circumstances.

But for a creative leader, that would have been an opportunity -- not an impediment.

The fact is that there is no reform to make government honest, open, and accountable, which could not have been adopted -- had Mr. Ford truly desired reform. There are no measures to move our economy off dead center that the people and Congress would not have supported with enthusiasm -- had Mr. Ford wanted to move, and had the confidence and vision to propose a direction.

Other Presidents -- Roosevelt, Truman, Johnson, for example -- came into office in trying times. The nation then cried out for leadership. And they got it. Franklin Roosevelt told the nation that the only thing it had to fear was fear itself. And he proved he was right, with action. Mr. Johnson took office in the dark night of John Kennedy's murder. He used that opportunity to pass the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and to pass the 1964 Tax cut -- which experts are all now agreed was the most brilliant and successful economic policy measure instituted since World War II.

We have to look upon the day in which Mr. Ford responded to the challenges of August 1974 from that perspective. The

people must judge which of Mr. Ford's actions then operated to increase public confidence, to restore public confidence in government and society -- and which of his initial moves operated to decrease confidence still further.