Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers, 1965-80 Folder Title: [Transcript – League of Women Voters, 02/20/1980] (1 of 2) Box: 247

To see more digitized collections visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material</u>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit: <u>https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories</u>

Contact a reference archivist at: reagan.library@nara.gov

Citation Guidelines: <u>https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-</u> <u>support/citation-guide</u>

National Archives Catalogue: <u>https://catalog.archives.gov/</u>

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS 1980 PRESIDENTIAL FORUMS

Candidates for the Republican Nomination

Wednesday February 20, 1980 8:30 p.m.

Manchester Central High School Manchester, New Hampshire

> Shorthand Reporter: Robert S. Toth, CSR

Statemide Reporting Service Certified Shorthand Reporters Barrington. New Kampshire 03825

1	
1	APPEARANCES:
2	LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS
3	Ms. Ruth Hinerfeld
4	MODERATOR:
5	Howard K. Smith
2	Congressman John Anderson
6	Former Governor John Connally
7	Congressmen Philip Crane
	Former Congressman George Bush
8	United States Sonator Howard Baker
9	United States Senior Senator, Robert Dole
10	Former Governor Ronald Reagan
10	
11	Eileen Shanahan, Senior Assistant Managing Ediptor, Washington Star
12	Joseph Kraft, Nationally Syndicated Columnist
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	- · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
22	
23	

(______

1 I'm Ruth RUTH HINERFELD: 2 Hinerfeld, National President of the League of 3 Women Voters. For sixty years, the League of 4 Women Voters has provided the public with non-5 partisan election information about issues and 6 about candidates. Tonight, here in Manchester, 7 New Hampshire, we proudly continue in that 8 tradition by presenting the first in our series 9 of 1980 Presidential Forums. 10 Our moderator and chief panelist is that 11 distinguished television correspondent, Mr. Howard 12 K. Smith. 13 MR. SMITH: Thank you, 14 Mrs. Hinerfeld, and good evening. The League of 15 Women Voters is pleased to welcome seven candidates 16 for the Republican Presidential Nomination. The 17 candidates are seated on the stage in a sequence 18 that has been determined by a random drawing. They 19 are, from your left to your right, Congressman John 20 Anderson, of Illinois; former Governor John Connally 21 of Texas; Congressman Philip Crane, of Illinois; 22 former Congressman George Bush, of Texas; the 23 Unites States Senator Howard Baker, of Tennessee;

Robert Dole, the senior U. S. Senator from Kansas; former Governor Ronald Reagan, of California.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Joining me in questioning the candidates tonight are two distinguished journalists: on my right, Eileen Shanahan, the senior assistant managing editor of the Washington Star; and on my left and your right, Joseph Kraft, the nationally syndicated columnist.

The first part of tonight's program will consist of questions from this panel to the candidates. In the first part of the forum, the candidate to whom a question is addressed will have two minutes to respond. The other six candidates will then each have one minute to comment or to react in any way. Later in the forum, the candidates will answer questions from the audience.

We would like to ask the auditorium audience not to applaud or to react in any way to questions or to answers or to comments. We would like to note also that the same forum opportunities have been offered to the candidates for the Democratic Party nomination; but so far, they have not seen fit to accept. I would like to ask these candidates

1 who are present, if any questions sound hostile, 2 they are not. They are meant to provoke responses 3 we think the public needs to hear. 4 The first question, I believe, is my own to 5 Congressman John Anderson, of Illinois. Congress-6 man Anderson, most Republicans now want us to be 7 firm in dealing with the Russians. Yet, in Des 8 Moines, all the candidates but you have opposed 9 cutting off grain to Russia. You joined the others 10 in opposing consideration of a draft, and you 11 especially have opposed defense spending increases. 12 How can we impress the Russians with our firmness 13 when candidates for the Presidency adopt attitudes 14 like those? 15 CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: First 16 of all, Mr. Smith, on the question of defense 17 spending, of course I have consistently supported 18 the pledge that was made by the President at the 19 Bonn conference in 1978 that there be a three per-20 cent increase in real terms. It was when, I think 21 in an effort to secure votes in the Senate for 22 SALT II, that he began to talk in terms of percent-23 ages of five and five and a half percent, without

relating those to what I conceived to be really rational programs adding to the defense of the country, but I drew the line.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

5

But to answer the broader part of your question, I think it is important that we use the kind of economic countermeasures, the cutoff of sales of grain, of high technology, that we stop our participation in the Olympics, to notify the Soviet Union of our intention to resist any further adventurism on their part.

There is another part of the equation, though, that I think is terribly important. That is that we demonstrate a capacity to deal with our problems here at home. I firmly believe that there is a certain inner strength of America that has to come⁻⁻ to the fore in times like these. These are times piled high with difficulties.

If you read the President's economic report, the number one problem confronting the nation is not Southwest Asia, even though he once described that as the most dangerous crisis since World War II he said that it was inflation that was the nation's number one problem. Now, to be sure, that was a

1 domestic report on the economy; but I think to the 2 extent that we do not deal effectively with infla-3 tion, with lagging productivity, and all of these 4 other problems that make up this whole complex of 5 an economy that today, I think, is performing far 6 worse than it was three years ago when Mr. Carter 7 took office .-- to the extent that we do not deal 8 with those problems, I think we undermine the 9 real strength, the real security of this country. 10 MR. SMITH: Governor Connally, 11 any comment or reaction? 12 GOVERNOR CONNALLY: First, I 13 think the Russians are going to be impressed by 14 things that they treasure, and that is strength. 15 Until we're prepared to rebuild a military strength 16 to this country, I don't think we're going to 17 impress them very much with anything. I certainly 18 think we should use whatever leverage we have, 19 economic leverage we have, to try to bring the 20 Russians to their senses. I think that we should 21 use whatever influence we have in the world to 22 turn the world against the Russians when they've 23 moved in an aggressive manner, as they have against

1 Afghanistan; but the thing that's going to be most 2 impressive to the Russians is whether or not we 3 restore some of the support for military capabilities in this country, which we permitted 5 to deteriorate over the years. 6 In 1970, 7.4 percent of our GNP went to the 7 military. Last year, 4.5 percent. That's not 8 going to impress the Russians, and it won't impress 9 them the next time. I think we have no choice but 10 to make a very, very substantial increase of 11 military appropriations for this country. 12 MR. SMITH: Mr. Crane? 13 CONGRESSMAN CRANE: A syndi-14 cated columnist, Charlie Reese, recently observed 15 that we shouldn't be unduly apprehensive of the 16 Soviets taking over Middle Eastern oil because 17 obviously there is more than they can use, so 18 presumably they would sell the surplus to us. If 19 you don't believe that, then there are some logical 20 questions we ought to ask ourselves about defense. 21 That is, why is it that we're building truck plants 22 for the Soviet Union? Why do we give them sophis-23 ticated ball bearing technology? Why did we give

them computer technology? Why are we giving them wide-body jet technology and so forth? We've got a schizophrenic policy in effect. I think it jeopardizes our national security If you're going to embargo grain, for interest. goodness sakes, let's embargo everything against the Soviets as a means of driving a lesson home to them. I think we should keep in mind that George Washington gave us the soundest counsel and has been counsel handed down since the ancient Greeks, that those who desire peace should prepare for war. This nation better rebuild its defense capabilities so as to guarantee the security of the United States and peace and freedom world wide. MR. SMITH: Mr. Bush? I believe CONGRESSMAN BUSH: that we should strengthen our defense. I believe that the Soviet Union at this time doesn't want war. I think they are confused by our President. I think they saw him fulfilling a campaign pledge about too many generals, too much defense, coming in, cutting way back on the Ford budget and then waking up three years into his Presidency and saying, "Hey,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23



we can't trust the Soviet Union."

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

My feeling is that we need to restore many of the cuts that he made, add carefully to them, and I believe that strength will deter Soviet aggression. Keep this country strong, and we can have two decades of peace.

> MR. SMITH: Senator Baker? SENATOR BAKER: Mr. Smith,

9

I don't think the Russians are confused. I think they've had the idea that they have had since World War II; and that is that Uncle Sam is a patsy. I think that the recent actions by President Carter in cutting the B-1 bomber and the delaying of the development of the MX missile, by reducing by 50 percent the size of the commitment to a modern American Navy, that they have the impression that we're flirting with some sort of unilateral disarmament.

19It is my opinion that, if we're going to pros-20per in this world, we have got to do what Teddy21Roosevelt said: "Walk softly and carry a big22stick." President Carter has cut most of that23stick into two. It's time that we focus on weapon

wetoms not just a percentage of an increase in

and the second a serve estimated in a primer on a configuration of the server is a primer of the server is a server of the ser

the defense budget; and that's what I would propose to do.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

Senator Dole? MR. SMITH: I think first SENATOR DOLE: of all, we must recognize that these are symbolic I haven't seen any Soviets leave Afghanistan acts. since all this was announced in December. I think beyond that we need to be very realistic. Since January of 1977, up until January of 1980, we reduced the so-called Ford budget by about \$60 billion insofar as defense is concerned.

It seems to me that the obligation is very clear; the American people demand it, the Congress 14 will do it, and I just believe the Republicans have 15 an opportunity. This is our opportunity. President Carter has fiddled it away. Despite all the talk about defense spending, we've got to keep our eye on one other thing; that's the meaningful arms limitation agreement. We have got to continue talking to the Soviets because the thought of nuclear war itself is unthinkable.

> MR. SMITH: Governor Reagan?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Abraham

1 Lincoln once said that those who criticise must 2 have the heart to help. I think that the Repub-3 lican Party has now found the moment when they 4 must come to the aid of this country. I agree 5 with much of what has been said here. 6 I myself disapproved of the embargo on grain, 7 not because I don't think we should embargo the 8 Soviet Union and keep things from them that would 9 be of help to them, but because it was a kind of 10 symbol; and I think it was for domestic consumption. 11 It actually hurt the American farmer more than it 12 hurt the Soviet Union. I believe that just stating 13 a figure for armament is not the answer to our 14 problems. 15 We have got to send some signals to the 16 Soviet Union that there could be a confrontation 17 down the road if they continue. One of those 18 roads, I would think, could be building what has 19 to be built in weaponry to once again be in a 20 position where the Soviet Union would not dare 21 lift a hand against the United States. 22 MR. SMITH: Thank you, gentle-23 The second question from Ms. Shanahan is to men.

Governor Connally.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

MS. SHANAHAN: Mr. Connally, many well-informed people in this country believe that what we are actually going to face next from the Russians in the Middle East and Asia is not a clear-cut invasion, but rather a program of systematic infiltration, subversion, attempt at toppling some of the shaky governments in that area, Iran, Pakistan, and maybe Saudi Arabia. How would you, as President, deal with that threat? Will the increased military spending you're talking about really deal with that?

GOVERNOR CONNALLY: I think actually that might well be the way the Soviets move. They clearly indicated that they were going to move in the Middle East in April of 1978 when they installed Mohammed Taraki as the first public head of the Afghan government. I think Afghanistan is a way station on their way and their march to the Persian Gulf and the Indian Ocean.

I think they have their people in Iran right
today. I have always thought that Ghotbzadeh was
probably a KGB agent. If not, he was at least a

Marxist. I think they clearly had a hand in some of the South Yemenites, who went into the City of Mecca and caused a disturbance and occupied the holy shrine there for two weeks -- I think they are clearly stirring up trouble all over the Middle East.

13

I think we have to do two things. I recommended 8 this on October 11th of last year, a month before 9 our embassy was occupied in Teheran. I think we 10 have to establish a very strong military presence 11 in the Middle East. I think we need a permanent 12 Navy, hopefully in the Island of Al Masirah, off 13 the coast of Oman, to guard the Straits of Hormuz. 14 I think we need to put major components of the Air 15 Force in the Middle East and in the Sinai or other 16 fields in the Middle East so that we have the 17 capacity to provide the military stability and 18 the security for all of the Middle East. 19 In addition to that, I think we need to forge 20

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

21

22

23

a new alliance in the Middle East with Israel; the moderate Arab states; Japan; the countries of Western Europe who have a vital interest, as vital as our own; as well as the United States being a

1 party to that alliance. I don't think there is 2 any question but that that is the most vital, the 3 most viable and the most vulnerable part of the 4 world today; and I think we have to use every 5 resource we have to try to bring about the stability 6 of that region, or the deterioration is going to be 7 disastrous for us. 8 MR. SMITH: Thank you, 9 Governor. Mr. Crane, do you have any comment? 10 CONGRESSMAN CRANE: Yes. T 11 think the first thing the United States must 12 reestablish is its credibility as a reliable and 13 trustworthy ally. The fact of the matter is, during 14 this Carter administration, we have betrayed friends 15 whether you refer to Teheran, where the President, 16 unilaterally broke a solemn treaty commitment and 17 sent a telegraphed message to every small country 18 that was an ally of the United States at that time, 19 to pulling the rug out from under the Shah. 20 I'm not making any brief in defense of the 21 Shah; but I can tell you that the world is a vastly 22 more dangerous place, and there is a greater risk of 23

international confrontation because the Shah is

gone than when the Shah was in control and providing a buffer against Soviet penetration, providing oil to the United States and to Israel during the Middle Eastern conflicts and simultaneously guaranteeing us vital, critically important listening posts on the Soviet border.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

I think in addition to that we should develop a third fleet to patrol the Indian Ocean so that we can maintain a strong and powerful presence in the area.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Bush?

15

CONGRESSMAN BUSH: My view is that, short range, we should be supporting Pakistan. We should be working with China. China looks at this as part of an encirclement of them. I look at it as though the Soviet Union, with an energy shortfall in the 80's, is trying to get down to the oil fields.

I think the bottom line is this: You do not build a foreign policy on broken commitments or on vacillation. So we have to turn it around, not on the short run, but the longer run, so that opposition forces, particularly the Soviet Union, knows

1 we're going to keep our word. That means we're 2 going to have to strengthen militarily. It means 3 we're going to have to go with the concept of a 4 three-ocean Navy. I don't favor permanent basing 5 of U. S. forces in the Middle East. I do favor 6 utilization of ports that have been offered for 7 reasons of projecting, if necessary, U. S. force. 8 MR. SMITH: Senator Baker? 9 SENATOR BAKER: Ms. Shanahan, 10 I think it's entirely possible that we'll see 11 Soviet infiltration in that region, following on 12 after Afghanistan. I think there may be a greater 13 danger, really; and that is the possibility that 14 you're going to see a Soviet peace offensive this 15 spring, this summer, and that America may once 16 again be lulled into a false sense of security. 17 Many may look back and say, "Well, you know, it 18 really wasn't as bad as we thought. Well, let's 19 abandon all those commitments we made to a stronger 20 Navy and a stronger Air Force and the like." That 21 is the danger I perceive. I hope that we will remember today that the 22 Soviets have always isolated between offensive 23

1 thrusts and retreat into a peace offensive. I think that we've got to show a foreign policy and a national defense commitment that is characterized by consistency. I think the Carter administration has shown that they've flip-flopped on the foreign policy, and I think that they have led us into the position where the Russians believe they can push on Uncle Sam and he'll never push back. MR. SMITH: Mr. Dole? . SENATOR DOLE: First, I think our foreign policy must be bipartisan. We take a look at the past few years, and we find about 12 countries who are now alienated from the West; they are tilted toward the Soviets. We find Cuban proxy forces in four other countries. We find three countries solidly in the Russian camp in the past three to four years. We're talking about countries with men under arms of 2 1/2 million or more. So it poses a real threat. I believe we ought to have a presence in Pakistan. We ought to draw the line and say, "This

2

3

4

.5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

bipartisan basis. We haven't had a bipartisan

is as far as you go." It ought to be done on a

1 foreign policy in this country for a number of 2 It's in our interest. It's in the interest years. 3 of the people of New Hampshire, in my State of 4 Kansas. The stakes are very high. Whoever is 5 elected in January has that responsibility, and we 6 can meet it as Republicans. 7 MR. SMITH: Mr. Reagan? 8 GOVERNOR REAGAN: I believe 9 that one of the first things that this country has 10 to do, if we are to preserve freedom and our leader-11 ship of the free world, is to have a grand strategy, 12 a plan for the decade of the 80's and for beyond. 13 that serves our interests and that gives us 14 contingency plans when things like Afghanistan 15 happen. The President destroyed our credibility 16 to a great extent when he told the Soviet Union, 17 with their troops massed on the Afghanistan border, 18 that we would take serious notice and there would 19 be serious consequences if they crossed into 20 Afghanistan. 21 Well, they crossed into Afghanistan. We 22 haven't done anything about it, frankly, because we didn't had the means to do anything about it. 23

My own belief is that, in addition to showing the 1 flag there in the Middle East, to indicate that they 2 might face a confrontation with us, we should have 3 in a plan -- I don't say this option is the only 4 one, but we should have a plan of touching them on 5 soft spots. For example, the suggestion I've made 6 about blockading Cuba---7 MR. SMITH: Governor, your 8 time is up, I'm afraid. 9 I've just GOVERNOR REAGAN: 10 11 stopped. Mr. Anderson? MR. SMITH: 12 CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Mr. 13 Smith, if indeed we have to fear further penetra-14 tion and infiltration by the Soviets of Saudi 15 Arabia and Iran, we ought to first stop and think 16 Why has that become such an attractive 17 why it is. target? It is because of our dependence on oil 18 coming from the Persian Gulf, 1.7 million barrels 19 a day. 20 If we want to reduce tensions, therefore, it 21 seems to me logically we ought to first address 22 that problem and try to reduce our dependence. 23

Then secondly, that would make it much easier for 1 us to secure the cooperation of the Japanese, of 2 the West Germans, of the French, of the other 3 nations in the western world and Japan that also 4 have a vital interest in the Persian Gulf, in the 5 Middle East. We ought to be busy working with them 6 right now to create the network of collective 7 security arrangements that would be needed to 8 present a united front to show some solidarity 9 against any further Soviet expansion. 10 MR. SMITH: Thank you, gentle-11 Now, for the next question from Mr. Kraft 12 men. 13 to Congressman Crane. MR. KRAFT: Mr. Crane, you're 14 known as the conservative's conservative; and you've 15 talked extensively on such issues as gun control 16 and abortion and prayer in schools. Why do you 17 think voters should choose a President on those 18 relatively narrow issues, rather than on such 19 major matters as inflation, energy and foreign 20 21 policy? First of CONGRESSMAN CRANE: 22 all, those have not been the issues that I have 23

focused this proportion of attention on. Rather, they are part of the package in an attempt to restore an emphasis on some very traditional and basic values. I have, as a matter of fact, campaigned first and foremost on the issue of inflation from the very first time I ran for Congress in 1969, right down to the present day, because it is still the overriding issue which, if left unresolved will lead to the destruction of our economy and, if that occurs, god forbid, the potential destruction of our political institutions as well. But I think those other issues are important moral values that provide the underpinnings that guarantees the survival of a humane and free and compassionate society; and I have indeed put stress But I have not been the only one who has on them. put stress on them. As you know, Governor Ed King defeated Michael

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

21

Dukakis, who had impeccable liberal credentials, in the neighboring state of Massachusetts on precisely those issues. And Massachusetts, the only state that went for George McGovern in 1972, is a state that has most recently restored prayer in the school

1	It's a state also that has a very strong feeling
2	that was manifested in that gubernatorial election
3	on such questions as abortion. It is a state that
4	is right now seeking to restore capital punishment.
5	I think those are issues that are troubling
6	many Americans; and I think we must focus attention
7	on those, just as surely as we concentrate on the
8	question of getting our economy back onto a sound,
9	robust growth track, just as we concentrate simul-
10	taneously on beefing up our defense capabilities to
11	
12	guarantee the security of the United States, and
12	just as we once more assume responsibility for
	providing critically important leadership during
14	these troubled times to promote our ideals of
15	peace and freedom world wide.
16	MR. SMITH: Mr. Bush, do you
17	have a comment?
18	CONGRESSMAN BUSH: My comment
19	is that it's understandable that there is great
20	interest in these issues. We're all speaking out
21	on them. People say that we haven't taken positions
22	on issues. Here's issues, papers (indicating), not
23	from these particular subjects, although we have

shorter ones on those; but it seems to me that people are looking for something -- not a single issue candidate. They're looking for something more reasonable, looking for strong leadership in the 80's.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The big issues are inflation, energy and the restoration of respect for this country around the world. Yes, it's appropriate that people ask questions on these single issues; but those issues aren't the issues that are going to decide who is elected President of the United States to lead this country for eight years in the 80's.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Baker?

SENATOR BAKER: Mr. Kraft, I think I understand why those issues are important because that's sort of the stuff that Presidential campaigns are made out of; and that is to test the point of view of individual candidates on matters of concern to the American public. In my opinion, there are three aspects of the Presidential campaign; one, what a candidate thinks about the issues that the country is concerned about at the moment; two, what a candidate has to say about what

1 he would do for the country in the future, the 2 new issues that haven't yet emerged; three, what 3 makes him tick. What kind of a President would he 4 be? How would he approach the problems of the 5 future? Does he believe in a strong staff, a 6 strong national defense? Does he believe in the 7 principality of the role of the Chief of State? 8 These are the things that make up a Presiden-9 tial campaign and makes it useful to the American 10 people. So I try to address each one of these 11 issues, and some of them are very, very difficult. 12 They are the stuff that Presidential campaigns are 13 made of. 14 MR. SMITH: Mr. Dole? 15 I didn't know SENATOR DOLE: 16 we had gotten around to the issues yet. I was 17 hoping that would come up before the campaign 18 Whether they are single issues -- all I ended. 19 hear is talk about momentum. I don't know that 20 momentum is an issue, but I hear talk about Little 21 Moe and Rig Moe; I don't know who is who. 22 Whatever the issues are, I think it is time 23 that we addressed them, certainly abortion,

1 certainly gun control, certainly energy, certainly 2 inflation. That's the responsibility we have, and 3 it's not too late for the people in this state to 4 find out what we know about these issues. 5 It would be refreshing if somebody asked me 6 about an issue instead of a poll. It also, in my 7 case, would be very helpful. 8 (Whereupon there was some 9 laughter from the audience.) 10 MR. SMITH: You're not supposed 11 to laugh, but we can't forbid it. Mr. Reagan? 12 GOVERNOR REAGAN: There isn't 13 much left, by the time you get to the end of the 14 line here, to be said about something of this kind, 15 except that is it possible that those so-called 16 single issues, to graft power, an expression of a 17 discontent on the part of the people, a feeling 18 that the old traditional values upon which our 19 civilization is built are fading away, that our 20 moral standards are declining. 21 I happen to be one that believes that inter-22 rupting a pregnancy means taking a human life. 23 When I think that 1,400,000 of those lives were

1 taken last year, legalized, I think the people out 2 here sense this and are hungry for a kind of 3 spiritual revival. I think our worry about the 4 family and the family unit and its decline is 5 because more and more we have seen a big, intrusive 6 government at the national level that has inter-7 fered more and more in the family itself, coming 8 between child and parent. 9 MR. SMITH: Mr. Anderson? 10 CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Obviousl 11 I would hope within this campaign we would avoid 12 single issue politics; but three specific issues 13 were mentioned in a question to Mr. Crane. So 14 rather than wave our position papers around, why 15 don't we declare what our positions are. On abor-16 tion, I am for freedom of choice. On the question 17 of gun control, I am for the licensing of concealabl 18 hand weapons. On the question of prayer in school, 19 I believe that when Mother sends Johnny and Suzy 20 off to the classroom in the morning she ought to 21 whisper in their ear and tell them, "Now, be sure and say a prayer before you begin your school day." 22 23 But I certainly don't want the State writing and

1 composing that prayer for Johnny and Suzy to recite. 2 I agree that these are issues that ought to 3 be discussed, and positions ought to be taken. 4 But the overriding question has to be: Where does 5 a candidate stand, really, on fundamental economic 6 issues? What is his program of defending and 7 securing the future of this country? 8 MR. SMITH: Mr. Connally? 9 GOVERNOR CONNALLY: Mr. Smith, 10 I have tried to talk about issues since this 11 campaign first started; and to draw the issue 12 clearly with the distinguished gentleman on my 13 right, I'm against abortions, and I'm against 14 Federal funding of abortions. I am against gun 15 I am for prayers in schools, and I am control. 16 for the development of an energy policy in this 17 country including greater utilization of coal and 18 the building of more nuclear power plants. I am 19 for doing something about inflation; and that means 20 stopping and slowing the rate of Federal spending, 21 to stop deficit spending. 22 I am for doing something about jobs and

increasing savings in this country and providing

23

the incentive to do it and increasing productivity, of reestablishing the family unit; but frankly, I don't get any questions about that from the press. I am like Bob Dole; all I get is what poll was last seen and what group of newspaper, composed of 14 people that they interviewed somewhere in the country. I would like for the press to concern itself with some of the issues that are fundamental to this country because we have some fundamental issues and that's---

11 MR. SMITH: Governor, your 12 time is up, I'm afraid. The next question is mine; 13 and you have anticipated it, Governor Connally. 14 It is to Mr. Bush, it's an enduring question, and 15 that's why I have to ask it again. The public is 16 manifestly distressed by the failure of everything 17 we tried to do with something about inflation. The-18 guidelines don't work. The Fed's high interest 19 rates haven't worked. Even if you cut or balance 20 the Federal budget, the Congressional Budget Office 21 says a balanced budget would reduce inflation very 22 little. What would you do that's not being done to 23 succeed as well as the Japanese have in cutting

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

inflation?

1

22

23

2 CONGRESSMAN BUSH: I would 3 disagree about whether a balanced budget would not 4 help towards breaking the back of inflation. It's 5 how you get in balance that counts. If you get 6 there by shoving people into higher brackets, 7 higher and higher tax brackets, that's not going 8 If you get there through two other to do it. 9 methods, it will. 10 Hold the growth of spending less than the rate of inflation. That is the first thing. The second 11 12 thing is: You need to stimulate production, invest-13 ment, risk taking, savings by a tax cut that is not going to risk making the deficit worse, but is 14 15 going to stimulate jobs, jobs in the private . 16 sector. 17 If you do those two things and couple them with 18 some kind of regulatory relief -- that means care-19 fully drawn legislation so the regulators don't 20 have more to say about it; that means sunset laws; 21

that means grading the Federal programs, like my

late friend, Billy Steiger, proposed. If you do

those three things, we don't need to be pessimistic

about the question of inflation; and you can get in balance. You can provide for the defense. The balance may take a year or two to get into it; but once you're there, if you do that and then start indexation, I believe we can do what other countries have done.

1

2

3

4

5

6

21

22

23

7 We can break the back of inflation, and we can 8 increase employment. We are pessimistic. When 9 President Ford came into office, inflation was 10 12 percent. He vetoed legislation that broke his 11 budget. Do you know what it was when he left? 12 Four-point-eight percent. We are wringing our hands 13 saying that we cannot break the back of inflation ... 14 I don't believe it. I believe this investment 15 oriented or supplied side economics will do it. 16 I believe if we can turn around and get more 17 Republicans in Congress, we can do something about 18 too much regulation. We can do it. We can solve 19 these problems in the 80's. 20 MR. SMITH: Mr. Bush, that's

the end of your time, I'm afraid. Mr. Baker?

SENATOR BAKER: On that,

George and I disagree on two elements of his state-

1 ment just now; one is the indexing of the tax rates. 2 The Constitution says that the Congress shall set 3 the taxes, to lay and collect taxes. I was in 4 Brazil once, a couple of years ago; and I asked 5 them, "Would you do it again, if you could do it 6 over?" And they said, "No, because inflation feeds 7 on itself when you index the tax rate." The 8 Congress ought to do that. 9 George didn't speak to it, but I understand 10 he is opposed to a Constitutional amendment that 11 would make it more difficult to spend in deficit. 12 I support an amendment that would do that; and in 13 particular, I support the Lugar Amendment. I 14 believe that a combination of fiscal restraint by 15 the administrative department, tax relief through 16 the Congress, not including the indexing of tax 17 rates, and the Constitutional amendment will 18 produce that result. I do not think it's an 19 impossible task. 20 Mr. Dole? MR. SMITH: 21 I think the SENATOR DOLE: 22 first thing, we have to go beyond the simplistic 23 solutions these Republicans do from time to time,

particularly when we're out of power. Somebody here may get elected, so we better take a look at what we're going to do. I would say, first of all, that we don't want to vallue-add a tax. Somebody is trying to promote that in the Congress. We do want indexing. Howard Baker is mistaken there, but he's right on a lot of things. We want to index the tax system. We also want tax credits . to increase productivity. We want to restrain the growth of Federal programs, not in Federal programs not cutting social programs; and we need some capital formation in America. We have got to put people to work. We are going to do that through the private sector. That's the Republican side, through the private sector. I would share the view that we need a Constitutional amendment for a balanced budget. MR. SMITH: Mr. Reagan? GOVERNOR REAGAN: Government causes inflation; government can end inflation. I would, on my first day as President, put a freeze on the hiring of Federal employees. I would then

start seeking a tax reduction in the income tax

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

rates across the board over a three-year period and reduce them by at least 30 percent in an effort to create jobs.

4 Every time unemployment goes up one percent, 5 it costs the Government \$20 billion more. If you 6 could make it go down two percent, it wouldn't be 7 a deficit; there would even be a surplus. I would, 8 in addition to that, take the punitive taxes and 9 regulations and remove them from the back of indus-10 try so that we could become more productive; and 11 thus, we wouldn't have to grindout that printing 12 press imitation money that's destroying the value 13 of our savings, our insurance and our pensions. 14 All of these things, I think, can be done, or 15 must be done. But the President right now is 16 suggesting an anti-inflation fight in which he is 17 going to allow unemployment to increase \$40 billion 18 worth. 19 MR. SMITH: Mr. Anderson? 20 CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Mr.

1

2

3

21

22

23

Smith, the guidelines indeed have not worked. One reason they haven't worked is because the ink was no sconer dry on the Dunlap Pay Advisory Board

standards of 7 1/2 to 9 1/2 percent before you had a union come in with a 12 percent increase; and I heard not one word of protest from the administration about that fact. I think we've had, as the late George Meany said, merely wishboning from the administration on any guidelines.

7 What we need is a President courageous enough 8 not to simply leave Mr. Volker standing there like 9 a little Dutch boy with his finger plugging the 10 hole in the dike and depending solely on high 11 interest rates. Instead, we ought to have a 12 President to be courageous enough to deal with the 13 kind of budget policy, fiscal policy that is going 14 to be needed to restrain demand. You have got to 15 have complementary budget policy, not simply rely 16 on monetary policy alone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

19

20

17I agree with the growth measures for the18economy recommended by Senator Dole.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Connally? GOVERNOR CONNALLY: First, I

would recommend the creation of an estate account
so that we don't tax savings. Anyone that can save
up to \$10,000 in this country, if they will put it

in a bank, savings and loan, or common stock or bonds, leave the income there along with the principal, they can leave it there for five or ten years with no income tax on it whatsoever. All taxes would be deferred. That would generate savings in this country, and capital which we desperately need. I recommend a change in the depreciation schedule in this country so that any new building of any kind, any character, for industrial or commercial purposes would bear a 10-year depreciation schedule; any equipment, five years; any rolling stock, three years; any Government-dictated

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

installations, one year. I think we can cure inflation. The two principal causes are energy and Government spending.

> I am against the indexing of taxes. When you start indexing salaries and indexing taxes, you've given up on the fighting of inflation. It has been----

MR. SMITH: Mr. Connally, I'm afraid your time is up. Mr. Crane?

CONGRESSMAN CRANE: First of

all, you have got to define your terms. Inflation is an expansion of the money supply in excess of productivity increases. That means that it's not caused by labor and not caused by business, and it's political scapegoating by Republicans and Democrats alike who try to pin that rap on either labor or business. This means that you have got to get control of the production of money. How do you do it? You have got to stop the

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

deficits. You can either depend upon electing angels to Congress -- you can forget that one -or you can buy a Constitutional limitation. Bind the rascals down with the chains of the Constitution, as Jefferson recommended; or you can go back to a gold standard.

The great virtue of a gold standard was that it provided an external discipline on the natural predisposition of the politicians to spend more than they take in; and it worked very effectively throughout history. And I would argue that, until we get back to a gold standard, we are not going to stop that production of the money; and we're not going to stop inflation. MR. SMITH: Thank you, gentlemen. Now the next question is from Ms. Shanahan to Senator Baker.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

23

MS. SHANAHAN: Senator, you and everyone else among the Republican candidates here on this stage have talked about slowing the growth of the Federal budget. Yet, of the \$52 billion increase that is in President Carter's budget for 1981, all but \$4 billion goes to the following things: defense increase, social security and other retirement programs, unemployment compensation, veterans' benefits, Medicare and Medicaid, and helping poor people pay their energy bills. Would you cut any of these; and if not, what would you cut? And please be specific.

15 16 SENATOR BAKER: I can be very 17 specific. That is that you are never going to be 18 able to balance the budget, increase our defense 19 spending and meet our social needs by cutting smalle 20 slices of the same pie. You are going to have to 21 bake a bigger pie. In order to do that, you are 22 going to have to cut taxes gradually and over a

period of time in order to stimulate productivity.

There are some things I would cut in the budget. There are some things that I would increase in the budget. For instance, I would increase general revenue sharing, which I believe is the most useful tool to reinvigorate local government that we have had in a decade or two. Some of the things that might be cut would be general administrative expenses for education, for instance, or for the general administration of what's left of HEW. I would transfer 10 percent of those funds from administrative costs into the classrooms, and I would try to reduce by 50 percent the general administrative cost of all of the Federal agencies and departments.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

19

20

21

22

23

15 Revenue sharing costs one half of one percent -16 in administrative costs and never more than one 17 percent. I believe that's a good example to follow 18 in the balance of it. I think that the important thing to recall is that not only do we need a tax cut to stimulate productivity in this country; but there is an automatic, built-in tax increase for every American right now as a result of payroll taxes, as a result of the fact that by the income

tax system as it's by us at the present time, for every dollar of inflation that occurs in this nation, there is a 1.6 times increase in the Federal revenues that are collected.

So we are in store for a tax increase in this country unless we can get on with the business of a tax reduction to reduce the burden of taxation and regulation. We can save some, but not much. The way to balance the budget and to meet our requirements is to stimulate this economy, to increase the tax base, to bake a bigger pie. MR. SMITH: Mr. Dole, do you

MA. SMITH: MI. DOLE, CO YOU

have a comment?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 MR. DOLE: I think what Yes. 15 we do is restrain the growth of programs. Repub-16 licans shouldn't fall into the trap of saying, "Well 17 I want to reduce all these social programs because 18 they're for poor people, and we don't represent 19 poor people." That may be a perception, but it's 20 wrong about our party. We need to do what 21 President Ford did, and that is restrain the growth 22 of some of the social programs and some of the 23 other programs.

1 In addition to that, we met this morning in 2 Washington on a conference report on the Windfall 3 Profits Tax. We've got \$227 billion in Windfall 4 Tax and about another \$300 billion in increased 5 revenues because of higher profits in oil companies; 6 and we're going to have some money to give to 7 mass transit, low income assistance. We're going 8 to have about \$124 billion within the next ten 9 years for tax cuts. Sixty percent of that Windfall 10 Tax is going for tax cuts. I think there is some 11 possibilities of additional revenue that maybe 12 hasn't been thought about. 13 MR. SMITH: Mr. Reagan? 14 GOVERNOR REAGAN: I believe 15 that the Federal Government ought to reinstitute 16 the Tenth Article of the Bill of Rights that says 17 that the Federal Government shall do only those 18 things that are specifically called for in the 19 Constitution. The Federal Government, as you 20 assert programs that properly belong back at the 21 state and local level, and I would like to see a 22 planned and orderly transfer of many of those 23 programs back to the states, back to the local

1. level, but transfer with them tax sources to pay 2 That's where I disagree a little bit for them. 3 on revenue sharing. I think revenue sharing is 4 far more efficient than the Federal grants-in-aid 5 with their red tape and restrictions on the use of 6 the money. 7 Transfer back tax sources, the great waste is 8 to be found in the high administrative overhead 9 that we get from a number of departments in Wash-10 ington. Those programs were never intended to be 11 there in the first place. I would start trans-12 ferring back with Welfare. 13 MR. SMITH: Mr. Anderson? 14 CONGRESSMAN ANDERSON: Mr. 15 Smith, I certainly would not balance the budget on 16 the backs of the poor and slash income support 17 programs. These are the people that are least able 18 to bear that particular burden. I look, however, 19 at a sector of the budget that has grown from \$23 billion in the fiscal year of 1970 to \$96.3 20 21 billion in this last budget submitted by Mr. Carter. That is Federal grants-in-aid, 448 programs in what 22 Neil Pierce has called this pinwheel of Federalism, 23