

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,
1965-1980

Series: XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

Subseries: A: Bob Garrick File

Folder Title: 10/24/1980, Economy Speech – TV
(1 of 2)

Box: 435

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

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

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

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

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

NEWS RELEASE

FOR RELEASE:

5:00 P.M.
Friday, October 24, 1980

CONTACT:

Lyn Nofziger or
Ken Towery
703-685-3630

THE HONORABLE RONALD REAGAN
TELEVISION ADDRESS - FRIDAY, OCTOBER 24, 1980

A VITAL ECONOMY: JOBS, GROWTH, AND PROGRESS FOR AMERICANS

Novelist Thomas Wolfe once wrote of our country, there is "a mighty music" to "the proud, glittering names" of places in America.

During this campaign, I have visited places in America with such proud names, each name synonymous with the growth and progress that once made the American economy the envy of the world.

Steubenville and Detroit, Youngstown and Buffalo, Pittsburgh and Seattle, Houston and Hartford and Jersey City and Lima, cities like New York and small towns like Greenville, Illinois--the very sound of these American names evokes a feeling of confidence and strength based upon what Americans have built through hard work.

But in many places the mighty music has been all but silenced. Where once there was the great, confident roar of American progress and growth and optimism, there is now the eerie,

- MORE -

ghostly silence of economic stagnation, unemployment, inflation, and despair.

If you are like most Americans, you and your family know the sound of that silence.

You experience it around the dinner table when there is a discussion of how to pay for the children's education.

You experience it in supermarkets when you pick up an item, look at the price, and--placing it back on the shelf--move on.

You or a loved one may have personally experienced that silence in the place where you once worked--when it had to shut down.

On street corners of our city neighborhoods it is a silence filled with anger and bitterness; on farms it is a puzzled silence, filled with questions of how things could go so wrong in a land as blessed as ours.

Yes, the mighty music of American economic progress has been all but silenced by four years of Mr. Carter's failures. This election will determine whether the nation and the world will ever again hear that great sound; will determine if the dinner table of your home and the supermarkets of your neighborhood will ever again be places where plans can be made and necessities can be purchased without the gnawing doubt and, yes, fear, brought by Mr. Carter's inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Carter recently was asked by a young woman why our country could not work out a solution to unemployment and inflation.

His response was startling even by the rather extraordinary standards he has set in this campaign. He said:

"You know, people tend to dwell on temporary inconveniences and the transient problems that our nation faces."

Unemployment a temporary inconvenience? Inflation a transient problem? These words from an American President?

Recently, he told a group of labor officials his opinion of the coming election. He said:

"It's more important than your income. It's more important than the quality of the house that you have. It's more important than the neighborhood where you and your wife might ultimately retire."

Is Mr. Carter's chance of reelection as important as what has been done to your income, your home, your neighborhood, and your family?

Douglas Fraser, President of the United Auto Workers, in a recent interview, was asked about the support I have been getting from union members all across America. Mr. Fraser, an avowed Carter supporter, said:

"There's an absolute correlation between unemployment and Reagan's support among blue-collar workers, including members of our union And we've been preaching for years that the workers vote their pocketbook. Now, if they vote their pocketbook this time, we're in trouble. This is the kind of economics that the President told us in May of 1977 at our convention that he would never tolerate unless the people understand . . .

this anguish, this feeling of hopelessness, I think our society is going to be in trouble."

Let me remind you that those are the words of someone who publicly supports Mr. Carter. They are an extraordinary indictment of the Carter record and they accurately portray the feelings of many union members and their families, as well as many other Americans.

If this is what one of Mr. Carter's chief supporters thinks of his policies, what should the rest of us think? Mr. Fraser says that if workers vote their pocketbooks in this election, "we", meaning Mr. Carter and his allies, are in trouble. But the problem is that American workers are in trouble now--and if they don't vote their pocketbook, who is going to do it for them?

By the very standards Mr. Carter himself uses to measure presidential failure, he has failed.

He promised to bring inflation down to 4 percent. It's now running at double-digit rates, and hit 18.2 percent earlier this year. The producer price index the past three months has averaged an annual rate of some 13 percent. In fact, between January 1977 and August 1980, consumer prices have risen 42.3 percent.

In the face of all this economic bad news, Mr. Carter has taken to telling voters that things will get better. But today we found the answer to that. The consumer price index released just this morning showed that the cost of living went up ^{to an annual rate of} 12.7 percent in September.

Inflation is not easing; it is rapidly rising. The double digit punishment of Jimmy Carter is not receding. At this rate it will continue to eat up your incomes, ravage those of you who are retired, and destabilize our entire economy.

No matter what Mr. Carter says, inflation is getting worse.

Right now, as I speak to you, nearly eight million American men and women are out of work. You or a loved one may be unfortunate enough to be one of them. Their distress is obvious--savings may be destroyed, houses may be lost, and families may go unfed.

As a candidate four years ago, Mr. Carter adopted what he called the "misery index." He added the rate of inflation to the rate of unemployment and for 1976 it totaled 12.5 percent. That was his "misery index" and he suggested that no President had a right to seek reelection with an index of 12.5 percent. Today by his own standard he does not deserve reelection. The misery index is two-thirds higher than it was four years ago--almost 20 percent.

Interest rates are again rising. The prime rate was only 6-1/4 percent in January 1977. It is 14 percent and rising today. The mortgage rate for new homes was 9 percent in January 1977. It is 13-1/2 percent or higher today. It is now estimated that only one in eleven young families can now afford to purchase a home--something that used to be the hallmark of the American dream.

Indeed, of all the sectors of the American economy, few have been hit so hard as housing. In 1979 our housing industry produced 1.7 million units. This year we'll be 500,000 short of that. To meet the real demand for housing, we should be building at least 800,000 more units this year.

When Jimmy Carter took office in 1977 a median priced new home sold for \$47,400. It cost \$306 a month to pay the mortgage on that home. Today that same home would cost \$556 a month--an increase of 81 percent in just over three years.

Even Jimmy Carter's Secretary of Housing and Urban Development admitted this last spring, conceding that "for many hard-working people, the American dream is denied because housing is growing beyond their reach."

Productivity has fallen six straight quarters, as America continues to fall further behind our industrial competitors around the world. American workers are ready to compete, but American companies don't have the new plants and equipment for them to do so. More and more American jobs are exported overseas, and new jobs are not being created here at home.

A little more than a week ago the President said we are all better off than we were four years ago. He could have looked at the report of his own economic indicators and learned that in purchasing power the average American is 8-1/2 percent poorer than he was four years ago.

Total industrial production grew 10.8 percent in 1976. Total industrial production has fallen 6.7 percent this past year.

That's not just a record of economic failure. That is failure on a scale so vast, in dimensions so broad, with effects so devastating, that it is virtually without parallel in American history.

The other day someone said: "The Carter administration is giving failure a bad name." And they haven't just failed last month or last year. They've been failing for four years.

On August 28th of this year Mr. Carter announced his fifth, "new" economic program. After four straight failures, it's no wonder he wanted to wait until after the election and submit it to Congress next year.

Mr. Carter has blamed OPEC for inflation. He's blamed the American people for inflation. He's blamed the Federal Reserve Board for inflation. The symbol of this administration is a finger pointing at someone else.

And on October 14th, after spending most of the first part of the campaign running away from his economic record, he finally made a speech on the economy. And he came up with a new list of who, or what, to blame for inflation.

The number one item on his list was, and I quote: "The failure to raise adequate revenues at a time of greatly increased public spending."

What that means in plain English is that he didn't raise our taxes enough.

Now, Mr. Carter has already imposed the two largest tax increases in our nation's history. And by 1981, he will have

succeeded in doubling the tax load on the American people--the equivalent of a tax increase on a family of four of more than \$5,000 a year. Now, I'd like to ask him: isn't that enough? Apparently not--according to his economic plan, annual taxes will go up \$86 billion next year alone, and \$500 billion over the next five years.

I would also like to ask him why government spending isn't to blame. He's increased government spending by nearly 60 percent in four years. It is this incredible increase in spending that has caused inflationary deficits--not low taxes. We don't have inflation because we are living too well. We have it because government is living too well.

Mr. Carter is acting as if he hasn't been in charge for the past three and a half years; as if someone else ran up nearly \$200 billion in federal red ink; as if someone else was responsible for the largest deficit, including off-budget items, in American history; and, as if someone else was predicting a budget deficit for this fiscal year that began October 1st of \$30 billion or more.

He has other scapegoats for inflation, such as oil price increases. He doesn't explain why Japan and West Germany, who import practically all their oil, don't have our high inflation rates and economies in a state of crisis.

Finally, he blames "the long decline in our productivity growth." I would like to ask him: which President has presided over six straight quarters of falling productivity? Which

President by 1981 will have increased the punitive tax burden on our economy by some \$300 billion? Which President has created two new cabinet departments and has increased the burden of federal regulations?

In the same speech Mr. Carter went on to misrepresent my economic program. You know, it's one thing when his administration jimmies its own economic figures to make its record look good, but when he starts jimmying my figures, it's going too far.

What our nation needs--what the American people want--is a humane economy, one that sees them not as interchangeable parts to whom unemployment is a "temporary inconvenience" but as individual human beings and members of families with feelings, hopes, and dreams.

Earlier this year, Vice President Mondale summed up unforgettably the approach of the Carter administration toward the economic suffering of millions. He said, speaking of inflationary problems, "We think what we're doing now will be using unemployment for a while. We know that."

I don't think the American people want an administration that talks about unemployment as something to be "used" against Americans. You don't "use" the suffering of human beings--you alleviate that suffering.

Tonight I want to share with you my vision of an economy that works for the people and doesn't seek to use them for policies made in Washington.

My plan, as I outlined in a speech in Chicago last month, is rooted in a strategy for economic growth, a program that sees the

American economic system as it is--a huge, complex, dynamic system--that can work if the American people get a chance to work.

Tonight, because of time limits, I can't go into the same detail I did in Chicago but I want you to know that I stand by the specific points I made in that speech. At the heart of that strategy for economic growth are eight major steps:

1. We must keep the rate of growth of government spending at reasonable and prudent levels.

2. We must reduce personal income tax rates and accelerate and simplify depreciation schedules for business in an orderly, systematic way to provide incentives to work, savings, investment, and productivity.

3. We must review regulations that affect the economy, and change or eliminate them to encourage economic growth.

4. We must establish a stable, sound, and predictable monetary policy.

5. We must promote the export of American products abroad.

6. We must revitalize American industry.

7. We must adopt an energy policy that will allow our economy to grow, and our standard of living to rise.

8. And we must restore confidence by following a consistent national economic policy that does not change from month to month.

One of the most critical elements of my economic program is the control of government spending. Billions of dollars of waste,

extravagance, fraud, and abuse in federal agencies simply are being ignored, for all practical purposes, by the Carter administration.

Let me give you one example--and there are, sadly, many--to show you what happens to the dollars you send to Washington.

A couple of years ago one of the worst scandals in the history of the federal government broke out in the General Services Administration, the agency that buys government supplies and manages federal property.

There were more than 130 indictments, and GSA auditors estimated they were looking for \$100 million lost to fraud and another \$130 million lost to mismanagement every year.

Mr. Carter's answer to all of this was politics-as-usual. The GSA mess is still not cleaned up and the men who tried to clean it up are no longer in the GSA.

Let me make a pledge to you tonight: If you give me the opportunity, I will put the corruption fighters back in charge at GSA to finish the job they started, and that goes for every department, agency, and bureau in the executive branch.

I am confident that we can squeeze at least 2 percent out of what otherwise would be spent in fiscal year 1981, adding 2 percent the next year, and so on, up to 7 percent by fiscal year 1985. And that is a modest projection.

Actually, I believe we can do even better. My goal will be spending reductions of 10 percent by fiscal year 1984.

I will appoint men and women in key positions who share my belief that it is the government and not the people that must cut back in spending. And I will work with citizens' task forces that will examine every department and agency.

This strategy for spending control does not require slashing necessary programs. To the contrary, I will defend the integrity of the Social Security system and work to improve those programs which provide for the disadvantaged and those in need.

The second major element of my economic program is a tax rate reduction plan. This plan calls for an across-the-board 10 percent reduction in personal income tax rates in each of the next three years. After that, we will index tax rates so that inflation doesn't force taxpayers into higher tax brackets.

Jimmy Carter says this can't be done. In fact, he says it shouldn't be done. He favors the current crushing tax burden because it fits into his philosophy of government as the dominating force in American economic life.

Official projections of the Congressional Budget Office show that by fiscal year 1985, if the current rates of taxation are still in effect, federal tax revenues will rise to over one trillion dollars a year. In 1981, the increase will take \$86 billion more than government took this year.

The President says my proposed reduction of tax rates would be inflationary. Well, let me ask him a simple question in economics. Why is it inflationary if you keep more of your earnings and spend them the way you want to, but it isn't

inflationary if he takes them and spends them the way he wants to?

The fact is this program will give us a balanced budget by 1983, and possibly by 1982.

We also need faster, less complex depreciation schedules for business. Outdated depreciation schedules now prevent many industries from modernizing their plants. Faster depreciation would allow these companies to generate more capital internally, permitting them to make the investment necessary to create new jobs, to help workers become more productive, and to become more competitive in world markets.

Another vital part of this strategy concerns government regulations which work against rather than for the interests of the people. No one argues with the intent of regulations dealing with health, safety, and clean air and water. But we must carefully re-examine our regulatory structure to assess to what degree regulations have cost jobs and economic growth. There should and will be a thorough and systematic review of the thousands of federal regulations that affect the economy.

Along with spending control, tax reform, and deregulation, a sound, stable, and predictable monetary policy is essential to restoring economic health. The Federal Reserve Board is, and should remain, independent of the Executive Branch of government. But the President must nominate those who serve on the Federal Reserve Board. My appointees would share my commitment to restoring the value and stability of the American dollar.

The federal government can also take a greater role in promoting American exports. I have suggested that we revise Export-Import Bank rules to assist in the export of automobiles. The government should also work to break down foreign barriers to our exports.

We must also revitalize American industry by exploring areas of patent law reform which would encourage increased innovation and inventing.

Finally, we must adopt an energy policy which will enhance our economic growth. We must implement a balanced energy program that will encourage prudent energy conservation, along with increased domestic energy production.

As soon as possible, we must end federal price, production, and allocation controls, which have discouraged energy production, and accelerate the leasing of federal lands. When fiscally possible, we must remedy the disincentive effects of the so-called windfall profits tax. Finally, we should streamline and reform regulations which block the use of coal and safe nuclear power, and we should encourage the development of alternative fuels, such as solar and biomass.

Finally, let me say something about one part of the American economic life that represents what I mean by a humane economy--the American home. Your home transcends mere economics. It is part of your life, not just a part of the economy.

The people--especially the young people--of this country should not have to suffer a continued housing crisis. An

administration committed to a housing policy that puts workers back to work, lenders back to making home loans, and young couples and all the people of this country into better housing--that kind of administration can turn the housing picture around.

As soon as fiscally possible, I will ask Congress to increase the amount of savings account income exempt from taxation, to encourage Americans to increase their savings and generate new capital for home loans.

And we'll explore some new ways of financing housing, and of stimulating housing rehabilitation in the neighborhoods of our large cities.

All of these specific steps, taken together, make up a comprehensive strategy. Instead of the on-again and off-again policies of Mr. Carter, I think we must have one coherent program that we can stick with.

Thus, what I am proposing is a strategy which encompasses many elements--none of which can do the job alone, but all of which together can get it done.

This strategy would depend on the will of the people to regain control of their government.

Throughout this campaign, I've been saying that the economy concerns more than mere statistics--it concerns people, families, human hopes, and human suffering.

Each American family has its own story about what the Carter economy has done. But the other day I came across a story that sums up what the American people have been through. The story is

all the more poignant because it concerns a child's disappointment.

It appeared in the Fort Wayne, Indiana, News-Sentinel and concerns a Fort Wayne fifth grader named Andrea Baden who wanted to buy a pair of roller skates. So, in the great American tradition, she saved her allowance until she had the money to buy them.

Andrea put it this way: "When I went back to the store the price had gone up. I saved more money but when I got back again, the price had gone up again. It's just not fair."

That's right, Andrea: What Mr. Carter has done to this country's economy just isn't fair. It just isn't right.

But Andrea has learned something as a fifth grader that Mr. Carter seems to have forgotten or not to have learned at all: inflation hurts people. It hurts when you want to buy a pair of roller skates--and it hurts when adults have to buy food and pay for heating and other necessities. It hurts older Americans who suffer unimaginably from what inflation does to the fixed incomes. And unemployment hurts even more.

This election is going to determine what kind of country Andrea Baden and millions of other American children are going to grow up in. Will it be a country in which everything keeps on going up in price, and jobs are harder to find and keep? Or will it be a country where, because of our efforts, beginning in January of 1981, savings will mean something, prices will be stable, and there will be jobs for people who want to work?

I would like very much to do something about that lack of fairness to hard-working Americans and, Andrea, to thrifty Americans like you.

I need your help, your support, and your prayers. But first of all, I need your commitment, your hope, and your belief in this great nation's ability to begin again.

It just hasn't been fair or easy for any of us for the past four years.

I think the time has come for fair play for Americans. If you agree, together we can have a new beginning, for ourselves and for our children.

Thank you and good night.

* * * * *

Speech file

To: M Anderson / Kevin Hoag

FROM: Bill Garen

A HUMANE ECONOMY:

JOB, GROWTH, AND PROGRESS FOR AMERICANS

*Desired by
0100
Garen at*

During this campaign, as I bring a message of hope and progress and growth across America, I am reminded of what novelist Thomas Wolfe once wrote about our country.

He said there is "a mighty music" to "the proud, glittering names" of places in America.

I have visited places in America with such proud names, each name synonymous with the growth and progress that once made the American economy the envy of the world.

Steubenville and Detroit, Youngstown and Buffalo, Pittsburgh and Seattle, Dallas and Johnstown and Jersey City and Lima, metropolises like New York City and small towns like Greenville, Illinois--the very sound of these American names evokes a feeling of confidence and strength based upon what Americans have built through hard work.

But in many places the mighty music has been all but stilled. Where once there was the great, confident roar of American progress and growth and optimism, there is now the eerie, ghostly silence of economic stagnation, unemployment, inflation, and despair.

If you are like most Americans, you and your family know the sound of that silence.

You experience it around the dinner table when there is a discussion of how to pay for the children's education.

2 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

You experience it in supermarkets when you pick up an item, look at the price, and--placing it back on the shelf--move on.

You or a loved one may have personally experienced that silence in the place where you once worked--before it had to shut down.

On street corners of our city neighborhoods it is a silence filled with anger and bitterness; on farms it is a puzzled silence, filled with questions of how things could go so wrong in a land as blessed as ours.

Yes, the mighty music of American economic progress has been all but stilled by four years of Mr. Carter's failures. This election will determine whether the nation and the world will ever again hear that great sound. This election will determine if the dinner table of your home, and the supermarkets of your neighborhood will ever again be places where plans can be made and necessities can be purchased without the gnawing doubt and, yes, fear, brought by Mr. Carter's inflation and unemployment.

Mr. Carter recently was asked by a young woman why our country could not work out a solution to unemployment and inflation.

His response was startling even by the rather extraordinary standards he has set in this campaign. He said:

"You know, people tend to dwell on temporary inconveniences and the transient problems that our nation faces."

3 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

Unemployment a temporary inconvenience? Inflation a transient problem? We hear such words coming from an American President and we can scarcely believe them.

Recently, he told a group of labor officials his opinion of the coming election. He said:

"It's more important than your income. It's more important than the quality of the house that you have. It's more important than the neighborhood where you and your wife might ultimately retire." (Washington Star, October 16, 1980, page 1)

I happen to be convinced that Mr. Carter's chance of reelection is not as important as what his policies have done to your income, your home, your neighborhood, and your family.

Douglas Fraser, President of the United Auto Workers, in a recent interview, was asked about the support I have been getting from union members all across America. This is what Mr. Fraser, an avowed Carter supporter, said:

"There's an absolute correlation between unemployment and Reagan's support among blue-collar workers, including members of our union And we've been preaching for years that the workers vote their pocketbooks. Now, if they vote their pocketbook this time, we're in trouble. This is the kind of economics that the President told us in May of 1977 at our convention that he would never tolerate. . . . unless the people understand . . . this anguish, this feeling of hopelessness, I think our society is going to be in trouble."

4 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

Let me remind you that those are the words of someone who publicly supports Mr. Carter. They are an extraordinary indictment of the Carter record and they accurately portray the feelings of many union members and their families, as well as many other Americans.

If this is what one of Mr. Carter's chief supporters thinks of his policies, what should the rest of us think? Mr. Fraser says that if workers vote their pocketbooks in this election, "we", meaning Mr. Carter and his allies, are in trouble. But the problem is that American workers are the ones who are in trouble now--and if they don't vote their pocketbook, who is going to do it for them?

By the very standards Mr. Carter himself uses to measure presidential failure, he has failed.

Mr. Carter promised to bring inflation down to 4 percent. It's now running at double-digit rates, and hit 18.2 percent earlier this year. The producer price index the past three months has averaged an annual rate of some 15 percent. In fact, between January 1977 and August 1980, consumer prices have risen 42.3 percent. Inflation continues to race ahead in double digits this year, eating up your incomes, ravaging you who have retired, and destabilizing our entire economy. The end of inflation is simply not in sight.

Right now, as I speak to you, nearly eight million American men and women are out of work. You or a loved one may be

5 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

unfortunate enough to be one of them. Their distress is obvious--savings may be destroyed, houses may be lost, and families may go unfed.

Consider the misery index, which combines the inflation and unemployment rates. When Mr. Carter took office it was 12.2 and he was complaining about it. It is now nearly 20. That's an increase of two-thirds in the misery being felt by the American people.

Interest rates are again rising. The prime rate was only 6-1/4 percent in January 1977. It is 14 percent and rising today. The mortgage rate for new homes was 9 percent in January 1977. It is 13-1/2 percent today. It is now estimated that only one in twenty young families can now afford to purchase a home--something that used to be the hallmark of the American dream.

Indeed, of all the sectors of the American economy, few have been hit so hard as housing. In 1979 our housing industry produced 1.7 million units. This year we'll be lucky to end up with 1.2 million. To meet the real demand for housing, we should be building at least 840,000 more units this year.

When Jimmy Carter took office in 1977 a median priced new home sold for \$47,400. It cost \$306 a month to pay the mortgage on that home. Today that same home would cost \$556 a month--an increase of 81 percent in just over three years.

Even Jimmy Carter's Secretary of Housing and Urban Development admitted this last spring when he said that "for many

hardworking people, the American dream is denied because housing is growing beyond their reach."

Productivity has fallen six straight quarters, as America continues to fall further behind our industrial competitors around the world. American workers are ready to compete, but American companies don't have the new plant and equipment for them to do so. More and more American jobs are exported overseas, and new jobs are not being created here at home.

Consider your standard of living. The average gross weekly earnings of the American worker has fallen 8.5 percent since Mr. Carter took office.

Take industrial production. Total industrial production grew 10.8 percent in 1976. Total industrial production has fallen this year at an annual rate of 7.6 percent.

That's not just a record of economic failure. That is failure on a scale so vast, in dimensions so broad, with effects so devastating, that it is without parallel in American history.

As I heard somebody say the other day: "The Carter administration is giving failure a bad name." And they haven't just failed last month or last year. They've been failing for four long years.

On January 21, 1977, Mr. Carter launched his first "new" economic plan, which included the ill-fated \$50 rebate. He withdrew this under congressional pressure. This was Carter economic failure number one.

7 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

On January 20, 1978, Mr. Carter announced his second "new" economic plan, which consisted of a variety of tax cuts. Congress approved a plan that bore little resemblance to his proposal. This was Carter economic failure number two.

On October 24, 1978, Mr. Carter announced his third "new" economic plan. Mr. Carter set wage and price standards and supported tightened credit. Many of the working men and women in America ignored these wage and price guidelines, which would have stopped them from keeping up with inflation. This was Carter economic failure number three.

Usually three strikes are out. But Mr. Carter kept on swinging--and missing.

On March 14, 1980, Mr. Carter announced his fourth "new" economic plan. He proposed a surcharge, or tax, on imported oil, credit controls, stronger wage/price guidelines, and a balanced budget. Congress and the courts knocked out his oil tax: the credit controls sent interest rates sky-rocketing and hurt consumers and businesses alike. His wage/price guidelines hurt workers even more than before. And the 1981 budget, instead of being balanced, will have an inflationary deficit of \$30 billion or more. This was Carter economic failure number four.

Finally, on August 28, 1980, Mr. Carter announced his fifth "new" economic plan. His proposals included a Social Security tax credit that barely offsets the tax increase that Mr. Carter signed into law in 1977; a refundable tax credit to help bail-out

8 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

companies that the Carter recession had damaged; increased federal spending for programs that have failed before; job restraining for workers who had been thrown out of work by the Carter recession; and an Economic Revitalization Board, which could be the beginning of industrial bail-outs that have failed in other countries.

Mr. Carter doesn't care enough to send this plan to Congress until next year. Not that I'm surprised; it will be Carter economic failure number five.

Now with a record like this someone has to take responsibility. Mr. Carter agrees with this in theory. But let's see who he says is responsible.

He has blamed OPEC for inflation. He's blamed the American people for inflation. He's blamed the Federal Reserve Board for inflation. The symbol of this administration is a finger pointing the other way.

And on October 14, after spending most of the first part of the campaign running away from his economic record, he finally made a speech on the economy. And he came up with a new list of who, or what, to blame.

The number one item on his list was, and I quote, "The failure to raise adequate revenues at a time of greatly increased public spending." What he means in plain English is that he didn't raise your taxes enough.

Now, Mr. Carter has already imposed the two largest tax increases in our nation's history. And by 1981, he will have

9 - DRAFT SPEECH ON ECONOMY

succeeded in doubling the tax load on the American people--the equivalent of a tax increase on a family of four of more than \$5,000. Now, I'd like to ask him: isn't that enough? Apparently not--according to his economic plan, taxes will go up \$86 billion next year alone, and \$500 billion over the next five years.

I'd also like to ask him why government spending isn't to blame. He's increased government spending by nearly 60 percent in four years. It is this incredible increase in spending that has caused inflationary deficits not low taxes.

Second, Mr. Carter blamed natural events, such as grain shortages. I'd like to ask him why natural events have not caused such persistently high inflation under other presidents.

Third, he cites "overstimulation of the economy." I have to ask, who is responsible for this "overstimulation"? Mr. Carter is acting as if he hadn't been in charge for the past three and a half years. He's acting as if someone else had run up nearly \$200 billion in federal red ink. As if someone else was responsible for the largest deficit, including off-budget items, in American history. And as if someone else was predicting a budget deficit next year of \$30 billion or more.

Fourth, he blames oil price increases. Yet why don't Japan and West Germany face such consistently high inflation rates? Why aren't their economies in such a state of crisis?

Finally, he blames "the long decline in our productivity growth." I'd like to ask him: which President has presided over

six straight quarters of falling productivity? Which President by 1981 will have increased the punitive tax burden on our economy by some \$300 billion? Which President has created two new cabinet departments and has increased the burden of federal regulations?

But Mr. Carter's speech didn't stop there. He went on to misrepresent my economic program. Unfortunately, this is nothing new. Mr. Carter seems to find it difficult to discuss the issues without distorting what I've said or done. You know, it's one thing when the Carter administration jimmies its own economic figures to make its record look good, but when Mr. Carter starts jimmying my figures, it's going too far.

What our nation needs--what the American people want--is a humane economy, one that sees them not as interchangeable parts to whom unemployment is a "temporary inconvenience" but as individual human beings and members of families with feelings, hopes, and dreams. Earlier this year, Vice President Mondale summed up unforgettably the approach of the Carter administration toward the economic suffering of millions. He said, speaking of inflationary problems, "We think what we're doing now will be using unemployment for a while. We know that."

I don't think the American people want an administration that talks about unemployment as something to be "used" against Americans. You don't "use" the suffering of human beings--you alleviate that suffering.

Tonight I want to share with you my vision of a humane economy, one that works with the people and doesn't seek to "use" them for policies made in Washington.

My plan, as I outlined in a speech in Chicago last month, is rooted in a strategy for growth, a program that sees the American economic system as it is--a huge, complex, dynamic system. That system can work if the American people get a chance to work.

Tonight I am not going to go into the same detail I did in Chicago because my time is limited. I want you to know, however, that I stand by the specific points I made in that speech, because they are as true tonight as they were when I first spoke them.

At the heart of that strategy for growth are eight major steps:

1. We must keep the rate of growth of government spending at reasonable and prudent levels.

2. We must reduce personal income tax rates and accelerate and simplify depreciation schedules in an orderly, systematic way to remove disincentives to work, savings, investment, and productivity.

3. We must review regulations that affect the economy, and change them to encourage economic growth.

4. We must establish a stable, sound, and predictable monetary policy.

5. We must promote the export of American products abroad.

6. We must revitalize American industry.

7. We must adopt an energy policy that will allow our economy to grow, and our standard of living to rise.

8. And we must restore confidence by following a consistent national economic policy that does not change from month to month.

There is an old American saying about candidates who share similar views. We say about them: "There's not a dime's worth of difference between them."

There's more than a dime's worth of difference between Mr. Carter's economic policies and my own. There's his record of eight million unemployed, double-digit inflation, the highest interest rates since the Civil War, and a generally deteriorating economy. That's the difference between us and Mr. Carter knows it.

He says my economic program won't work. I will admit he is an expert on economic programs that won't work. But I know my strategy for growth can work--but only with the help of the American people.

Let's look at how we can meet these challenges.

One of the most critical elements of my economic program is the control of government spending. Billions of dollars of waste, extravagance, fraud, and abuse in federal agencies simply are being ignored, for all practical purposes, by the Carter administration. Let me give you one example--and there are,

sadly, many--to show you what happens to the dollars you send to Washington.

A couple of years ago one of the worst scandals in the history of the federal government broke out in the General Services Administration, the agency that buys government supplies and manages federal property.

There were more than 130 indictments and GSA auditors estimated they were looking for 100 million lost to fraud and another 130 million lost to mismanagement every year.

Mr. Carter's answer to all of this was politics-as-usual. The GSA mess is still not cleaned up.

Let me make a pledge to you tonight: A Reagan administration is going to put the corruption fighters back in charge at GSA and they will be allowed to finish the job that they started. And that same spirit is going to be seen in every department and agency and bureau in the executive branch.

I am confident that we can squeeze at least 2 percent out of what otherwise would be spent in fiscal year 1981, and increasing amounts up to 7 percent by fiscal year 1985.

Actually, I believe we can do even better. My goal will be more spending reductions of 10 percent by fiscal year 1984.

To do so, I'll appoint men and women in key positions who share my belief that it is the government and not the people that must cut back in spending. And I'll work with citizens' task forces that will examine every department and agency.

This strategy for growth does not require slashing necessary programs. To the contrary, I will defend the integrity of the Social Security system and other programs which provide for the disadvantaged and those in need.

The second major element of my economic program is a tax rate reduction plan. This plan calls for an across-the-board 10 percent reduction in personal income tax rates phased in over three years in a systematic, planned manner.

Jimmy Carter says this can't be done. In fact, he says it shouldn't be done. He favors the current crushing tax burden because it fits into his philosophy of government as the dominating force in American economic life.

Official projections of the Congressional Budget Office show that by fiscal year 1985, if the current rates of taxation are still in effect, federal tax revenues will rise to over one trillion dollars a year. That will be a tax increase of 500 billion dollars--\$2,500 for every man, woman, and child in America.

Apparently, Jimmy Carter believes that the American people can't find better things to do with all that money than see it spent by the federal government. As I pointed out, he just told us that the reason we have inflation is that the government hasn't taxed us enough.

These large tax increases will create a growing surplus by 1985. These surpluses can be used either to fund additional government programs or to reduce tax rates.

That choice should be up to you.

We also need faster, less complex depreciation schedules for business. Outdated depreciation schedules now prevent many industries, especially steel and auto, from modernizing their plants. Faster depreciation would allow these companies to generate more capital internally, permitting them to make the investment necessary to create new jobs, to help workers become more productive, and to become more competitive in world markets.

Another vital part of this strategy concerns government regulation--but too often regulations work against rather than for the interests of the people, even though no one can argue with the intent of much of the regulation dealing with health, safety, and clean air and water. We must carefully re-examine our regulatory structure to assess to what degree regulations have cost jobs and economic growth. In my administration there should and will be a thorough and systematic review of the thousands of federal regulations that affect the economy.

Along with spending control, tax reform, and deregulation, a sound, stable, and predictable monetary policy is essential to restoring economic health. The Federal Reserve Board is, and should remain, independent of the Executive Branch of government. But the President must nominate those who serve on the Federal

Reserve Board. My appointees will share my commitment to restoring the value and stability of the American dollar.

Other necessary ingredients of any truly comprehensive economic plan include action to promote international trade. The most important action the government can take is to help make American industries competitive with foreign companies. The economic plan that I have just proposed will do that, by reducing the burdens of regulation and burdensome taxes, and reducing the burden of inflation.

The federal government can also take a greater role in promoting American exports. For example, I have suggested that we revise Export-Import Bank rules to assist in the export of automobiles. The government should also work to break down foreign barriers to our exports.

We must also revitalize American industry. My economic plan is a necessary first step. However, we must not stop there. For example, we must explore areas of patent law reform which would encourage increased innovation and inventing.

Finally, we must adopt an energy policy which will enhance our economic growth. We must implement a balanced energy program that will encourage prudent energy conservation, along with increased domestic energy production.

To increase domestic energy production, we must repeal federal price, production, and allocation controls, which have discouraged energy production, and accelerate the leasing of

federal lands. When fiscally possible, we must remedy the disincentive effects of the windfall profits tax. Finally, we should streamline and reform regulations which block the use of coal, and safe nuclear power, and encourage the development of alternative fuels, such as solar and biomass.

To encourage energy conservation, our economic program will help industry accumulate the capital necessary to build more fuel efficient plants and cars. We should continue tax credits which encourage, and eliminate federal regulations which unnecessarily inhibit, conservation, such as home insulation.

Finally, let me say something about the one part of the American economic life that represents what I mean by a "humane economy"--the American home. Your home transcends mere economics. It is part of your life, not just a part of the economy.

The people--especially the young people--of this country have to suffer a continued housing crisis. An administration committed to a housing policy that puts workers back to work, bankers back to making home loans, and young couples and all the people of this country into better housing--that kind of administration can turn the housing picture around.

My administration will put an end to regulations which unnecessarily drive up the cost of housing, or impede the adequate flow of mortgage credit to the housing industry.

As soon as fiscally possible, I'll ask Congress to increase the amount of savings account income exempt from taxation, to

encourage Americans to increase their savings and generate new capital for home and apartment loans.

And we'll explore some new ways of financing housing, and of stimulating housing rehabilitation in the neighborhoods of our large cities.

Thus, I envision a strategy encompassing many elements--none of which can do the job alone, but all of which together can get it done. This strategy depends for its success more than anything else on the will of the people to regain control of their government.

It depends on the capacity of the American people for work, their willingness to do the job, their energy and their imagination.

Throughout this campaign, I've been saying that the economy concerns more than mere statistics--it concerns people, families, human hopes, and human suffering.

The Consumer Price Index gives us a statistical understanding of complex economic facts--but it doesn't tell us about anguish and pain and anxiety and human suffering.

Each American family has its own story about what the Carter economy has done. But the other day I came across a story that sums up what the American people have been through. The story is all the more poignant because it doesn't concern an adult's tragedy but a child's disappointment.

The story appeared in the Fort Wayne, Indiana, News-Sentinel. It told of a Fort Wayne fifth grader named Andrea Baden.

Andrea wanted to buy a pair of roller skates. So, in the great American tradition, she saved her allowance until she had the money to buy them.

Andrea put it this way: "When I went back to the store the price had gone up. I saved more money but when I got back again, the price had gone up again. It's just not fair."

That's right, Andrea: What Mr. Carter has done to this country's economy just isn't fair. It just isn't right.

But Andrea has learned something as a fifth grader that Mr. Carter seems to have forgotten or not to have learned at all: inflation hurts people. It hurts when you want to buy a pair of roller skates--and it hurts when adults have to buy food and pay for heating and other necessities. It hurts older Americans who suffer unimaginably from what inflation does to the fixed incomes. And unemployment hurts even more. It hurts the human spirit--and sometimes it crushes that spirit.

This election is going to determine what kind of country Andrea Baden and millions of other American children are going to grow up in. Will it be a country in which everything keeps on going up in price, where savings are mocked by inflation and jobs are harder to find and keep? Or will it be a country where, because of our efforts, beginning in January of 1981, savings will mean something, where prices are stable, where the dollar is worth

something once again, and where there are jobs for people who want to work?

With the help of the American people I am going to do something about that lack of fairness to hard-working Americans and, Andrea, to thrifty Americans like you.

But I can't do it alone. I need your help. I need your support. I need your prayers. But first of all, I need your commitment, your hope, and your belief in our great nation's ability to begin again.

It just hasn't been fair or easy for any of us for the past four years.

I think the time has come for fair play for Americans. If you agree, together we can have a new beginning, for ourselves and for our children.

Thank you and good night.

FACT SHEET

October 24, 1980

219-432-5956

Andrea Bāden (pronounced with a long "a")
5306 Wapiti Drive
Ft. Wayne, Indiana 46804

BAY-DEN

Age 10
Fifth Grade at Aboite Elementary

According to The News-Sentinel of Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Andrea told of her repeated attempts to purchase an item that kept costing more money. After speaking with her mother we found that she was after what every little girl wants -- a pair of rollerskates. Each time she had saved enough money from her allowance, she went to the local department store only to come home empty handed -- the price of the skates had risen \$2-3.00 each time plus tax!

2402 S. Harrison St.
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46807
October 13, 1980

Reagan-Bush Campaign Headquarters
901 S. Highland Street
Arlington, Va. 22204

Dear Gov. Reagan and Campaign Manager:

Enclosed is a copy of a story in Saturday's Fort Wayne News-Sentinel which might be of some value to you in your campaign.

A little girl saved her allowance to buy something she wanted. Each of the times she had the amount saved and went to the store to make the purchase she found the price had gone up and she didn't have enough money! She said: "It's just not fair."

That is what Jimmy Carter and the Democratic Congress is doing to all of us, but there is a particular emotional appeal when such a thing applies to a child.

My husband and I are looking forward to the prospect of President Reagan in Washington this coming January! All best wishes!

Sincerely,

Marian D. Yaggy
(Mrs. Loren Yaggy)

Enc. 1

Fifth Graders Hear Candidates, Then Give Political Views

By GARY PENNER

Out of the mouths of babes come wondrous babblings that perhaps candidates for public office should take to heart.

Fifth grade Aboite Elementary students have proved even at an early age that they've already formed their own opinions on political candidates and how to cure the nation's ills.

Dan Coats, Republican candidate for 4th District congressman and his Democratic counterpart, John Walda, visited the classes recently at the student's request.

David Wendell said if he could, he'd vote for Walda "because I like the way he opened up. I liked his views on energy because I think we need more of our own energy instead of relying on foreign oil."

Coats gained the hearts of other students because "he was funny," Natasha Armer said.

Most students said their parents discuss politics at home "usually at the supper table," said Devin Stettler. Some of them agree with their parents' point of view, but Debbie Tanenhaus disagrees with her mom on the congressional race. "Mom wants Walda, and I want Coats," Debbie said.

John Morrow said he tries to persuade his mother's opinion, "but my mom doesn't really listen. She's trying to figure out who she really wants."

Walda and Coats discussed some election issues with the students, and putting together what they've learned elsewhere, the kids have come up with solutions to the prob-

lems faced by the nation's leaders.

Jimmy Carter, they say, is the major cause of inflation.

Natasha said inflation is caused by the high wages paid professional baseball players.

John said, however, inflation is caused by "people not buying enough American products. The foreign countries are out-producing us. When the foreign countries out-produce us, a lot of American money goes out of the country instead of staying here. That causes unemployment and that makes prices go higher."

Move over, Milton Friedman.

David Wendell is convinced inflation is caused by high oil prices. "Prices go up, then people have to get a raise from their boss. Then the boss has to mark his product up,

then another person has to go ask their boss for more money and it keeps going like that."

Inflation is obvious to young kids. They've seen it when mom takes them to the grocery, or when they experience the situation Andrea Baden found herself in. "I saw something at the store I wanted," Andrea said, "so I saved my allowance until I had the money to buy it. When I went back to the store, the price had gone up. I saved more money, but when I went back again, the price had gone up again. It's just not fair."

J.J. Foster saw inflation at work firsthand when he noticed the price of orange juice increase 50 cents in one week.

Weekly allowances among the group range from 75 cents to \$2. Some receive money from parents

only after doing odd jobs around the home. All agreed their money is hard to save.

Despite inflation and tight money in most families, Amy Stewart said she gave four pairs of shoes and a few dresses to a campaign for the needy through her church. "Then mom had to go out and buy me more clothes."

Unemployment hits pretty close to home for most of these kids too. If one of their parents hasn't been laid off, there's usually a friend whose parents are unemployed. Many told stories about friend's parents being laid off from "National Harvester."

All the students said they are looking forward to their 18th birthday so their opinions will finally be counted. Some, however, are a little unsure about the distant future. "Ev-

erything is going to cost so much," Andrea observed.

"That's why we're hoping to get somebody good in as president to handle things properly," said Ben Kern. John predicted if the situation continues as it has in the past, the poor people of America "will be just like the Cambodians."

"Some day, when a loaf of bread costs \$6, we're going to say 'these were the good old days,'" Debbie predicted.

"Hopefully, when I'm older — I want to be a dancer — I'll be paid enough to live well," Natasha said.

If David should someday fill the seat in the Oval Office, he'll "look back on today and see what decisions were made to make things go wrong. Then I'll make the right decisions."

The News-Sentinel

FORT WAYNE, INDIANA 46802 SATURDAY, OCT. 11, 1980 3A

No Fed Monies For Broadway

By DICK ISENHOUR

A fishing trip by one of the city's local development corporations has failed to net federal dollars for revitalization along the Broadway commercial strip.

But the corporation is not ready to pull up anchor, yet. It will instead cast its line in different directions, still hoping to land that prize catch.

The Near West LDC applied in July for a \$150,000 Neighborhood Self-Help Grant from the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. The grant was to be coupled with local monies for capital im-

nesses, comprises 80 members from the three neighborhoods and HUD did not feel membership was high enough, Moses added.

The section of Broadway that would have been covered by the grant, running from just south of St. Joseph's Hospital to Lavina Street, has long been a priority of not only the LDC but CD&P and the Redevelopment Commission. As such, the search for revitalization money has not ended.

Moses said the grant application will be rewritten somewhat and submitted for funding from the Triad

AFLOAT IN THE FORT

Navy Commissions Sea Cadets Here Oct. 18

By KEVIN LEININGER

You can't get much more landlocked than Fort Wayne, but that hasn't stopped organization of a Sea Cadet unit here.

The unit actually was formed in April, but will be officially commissioned by the Navy during a ceremony at the Naval and Marine Center

room instruction and military drills and procedure. Gregor said military discipline and dress are observed, but said no major discipline problems have yet occurred.

Mike Edgar, a junior at Snider High School, joined the cadets in

April and said he plans to join the Navy. He also said one cadet quit the program because there wasn't "enough discipline."

There are presently about six girls in the corps. One is Bobbette Carter of New Haven High School, who said

the girls seem to be "getting into" the cadet corps. She also plans to join the Navy, like her father.

Gregor said the unit will continue to accept new members. The corps meets Tuesday nights at the reserve center.

Andrea Baden
5306 Wapiti Dr.
Ft. Wayne, Indiana 46804

According the New News-Sentinel of Ft. Wayne on Saturday, Oct. 11, Andrea wanted to purchase a pair of shoe rollerskates. Each time she had saved enough money, she went to the local department store only to come home empty handed -- the price of the skates had risen \$2-3.00 each time plus tax! She found the only thing she could afford was the skate key.

Jeanne Winnick

(This story came from Andrea's mother who said those were her daughter's own words as printed in the Sentinel.)

FACT SHEET

October 24, 1980

219-432-5956

Andrea Bāden (pronounced with a long "a")
5306 Wapiti Drive
Ft. Wayne, Indiana 46804

BAY-DEN

Age 10
Fifth Grade at Aboite Elementary

According to The News-Sentinel of Ft. Wayne, Indiana, Andrea told of her repeated attempts to purchase an item that kept costing more money. After speaking with her mother we found that she was after what every little girl wants -- a pair of rollerskates. Each time she had saved enough money from her allowance, she went to the local department store only to come home empty handed -- the price of the skates had risen \$2-3.00 each time plus tax!

Σ 117

2402 S. Harrison St.
Fort Wayne, Indiana 46807
October 13, 1980

Reagan-Bush Campaign Headquarters
901 S. Highland Street
Arlington, Va. 22204

Dear Gov. Reagan and Campaign Manager:

Enclosed is a copy of a story in Saturday's Fort Wayne News-Sentinel which might be of some value to you in your campaign.

A little girl saved her allowance to buy something she wanted. Each of the times she had the amount saved and went to the store to make the purchase she found the price had gone up and she didn't have enough money! She said: "It's just not fair."

That is what Jimmy Carter and the Democratic Congress is doing to all of us, but there is a particular emotional appeal when such a thing applies to a child.

My husband and I are looking forward to the prospect of President Reagan in Washington this coming January! All best wishes!

Sincerely,

Marian D. Yaggy
(Mrs. Loren Yaggy)

Enc. 1

Fifth Graders Hear Candidates, Then Give Political Views

By GARY PENNER

Out of the mouths of babes come wondrous babblings that perhaps candidates for public office should take to heart.

Fifth grade Aboite Elementary students have proved even at an early age that they've already formed their own opinions on political candidates and how to cure the nation's ills.

Dan Coats, Republican candidate for 4th District congressman and his Democratic counterpart, John Walda, visited the classes recently at the student's request.

David Wendell said if he could, he'd vote for Walda "because I like the way he opened up. I liked his views on energy because I think we need more of our own energy instead of relying on foreign oil."

Coats gained the hearts of other students because "he was funny," Natashya Armer said.

Most students said their parents discuss politics at home "usually at the supper table," said Devin Stettler. Some of them agree with their parents' point of view, but Debbie Tanenhaus disagrees with her mom on the congressional race. "Mom wants Walda, and I want Coats," Debbie said.

John Morrow said he tries to persuade his mother's opinion, "but my mom doesn't really listen. She's trying to figure out who she really wants."

Walda and Coats discussed some election issues with the students, and utting together what they've learned elsewhere, the kids have come up with solutions to the prob-

lems faced by the nation's leaders.

Jimmy Carter, they say, is the major cause of inflation.

Natashya said inflation is caused by the high wages paid professional baseball players.

John said, however, inflation is caused by "people not buying enough American products. The foreign countries are out-producing us. When the foreign countries out-produce us, a lot of American money goes out of the country instead of staying here. That causes unemployment and that makes prices go higher."

Move over, Milton Friedman.

David Wendell is convinced inflation is caused by high oil prices. "Prices go up, then people have to get a raise from their boss. Then the boss has to mark his product up,

then another person has to go ask their boss for more money and it keeps going like that."

Inflation is obvious to young kids. They've seen it when mom takes them to the grocery, or when they experience the situation Andrea Baden found herself in. "I saw something at the store I wanted," Andrea said, "so I saved my allowance until I had the money to buy it. When I went back to the store, the price had gone up. I saved more money, but when I went back again, the price had gone up again. It's just not fair."

J.J. Foster saw inflation at work firsthand when he noticed the price of orange juice increase 50 cents in one week.

Weekly allowances among the group range from 75 cents to \$2. Some receive money from parents

only after doing odd jobs around the home. All agreed their money is hard to save.

Despite inflation and tight money in most families, Amy Stewart said she gave four pairs of shoes and a few dresses to a campaign for the needy through her church. "Then mom had to go out and buy me more clothes."

Unemployment hits pretty close to home for most of these kids too. If one of their parents hasn't been laid off, there's usually a friend whose parents are unemployed. Many told stories about friend's parents being laid off from "National Harvester."

All the students said they are looking forward to their 18th birthday so their opinions will finally be counted. Some, however, are a little unsure about the distant future. "Ev-

erything is going to cost so much," Andrea observed.

"That's why we're hoping to get somebody good in as president to handle things properly," said Ben Kern. John predicted if the situation continues as it has in the past, the poor people of America "will be just like the Cambodians."

"Some day, when a loaf of bread costs \$6, we're going to say 'these were the good old days,'" Debbie predicted.

"Hopefully, when I'm older — I want to be a dancer — I'll be paid enough to live well," Natashya said.

If David should someday fill the seat in the Oval Office, he'll "look back on today and see what decisions were made to make things go wrong. Then I'll make the right decisions."

The News-Sentinel

FORT WAYNE, INDIANA 46802 SATURDAY, OCT. 11, 1980 3A

AFLOAT IN THE FORT

Navy Commissions Sea Cadets Here Oct. 18

By KEVIN LEININGER

You can't get much more landlocked than Fort Wayne, but that hasn't stopped organization of a Sea Cadet unit here.

The unit actually was formed in April, but will be officially commissioned by the Navy during a ceremony at the Naval and Marine Corps Reserve Center Oct. 18.

room instruction and military drills and procedure. Gregor said military discipline and dress are observed, but said no major discipline problems have yet occurred.

Mike Edgar, a junior at Snider High School, joined the cadets in

April and said he plans to join the Navy. He also said one cadet quit the program because there wasn't "enough discipline."

There are presently about six girls in the corps. One is Bobbette Carter of New Haven High School, who said

the girls seem to be "getting into" the cadet corps. She also plans to join the Navy, like her father.

Gregor said the unit will continue to accept new members. The corps meets Tuesday nights at the reserve center.

No Fed Monies For Broadway

By DICK ISENHOUR

A fishing trip by one of the city's local development corporations has failed to net federal dollars for revitalization along the Broadway commercial strip.

But the corporation is not ready to pull up anchor, yet. It will instead cast its line in different directions, still hoping to land that prize catch.

The Near West LDC applied in July for a \$150,000 Neighborhood Self-Help Grant from the U.S. Department of Housing & Urban Development. The grant was to be coupled with local monies for capital improvements along the strip and to set

nesses, comprises 80 members from the three neighborhoods and HUD did not feel membership was high enough, Moses added.

The section of Broadway that would have been covered by the grant, running from just south of St. Joseph's Hospital to Lavina Street, has long been a priority of not only the LDC but CD&P and the Redevelopment Commission. As such, the search for revitalization money has not ended.

Moses said the grant application will be rewritten somewhat and submitted for funding from the Triad Partnership, a relatively new fund-

TO: KEN KHACHIGIAN

OR MARTIN ANDERSON
FROM GAVIN

October 23, 1980

Send Garrick
23 Oct 16 30 PM

TO: GOVERNOR REAGAN
FROM: BOB DOLE
SUBJECT: ECONOMIC SPEECH

DOLE'S COMMENTS

This memorandum contains my comments on the economic speech which is scheduled for delivery Friday. Generally, I think the speech is very good. It hits hard on our best issue and should be effective. The following are my specific comments:

1. On page five, line two, you may want to substitute "homes" for "houses" and in line 14, "essence" for "hallmark".
2. On page six the point is made that for the last six quarters productivity has fallen. New figures are due on October 27 and many experts believe they will show a slight productivity increase. I do not believe this is troublesome since the statement will predate the new figures. It is worth noting for the debate, however.
3. On pages six and seven, the speech recites the litany of Carter economic plans and concludes with the rhetorical device of repeating, "This was Carter economic failure number one (or two, etc.)". The speech does not in every case detail why the specific Carter plan was a failure. You may want to preface the last sentence of each paragraph with "And the economy only got worse".
4. On page seven, line 14, I would substitute "ten cent per gallon gasoline tax" for "surcharge, or tax, on imported oil". I am afraid that in its current form no one will know what is being referred to.
5. On page nine, line five, you may want to substitute "will almost double again in" for "\$500 billion over". Most people have no idea what a billion dollars is. They understand the doubling of their taxes, however.
6. On page nine, line 22, I would add "which are much more dependent on OPEC oil" after West Germany. Without this line, I do not think it will be apparent to your listeners that Japan and West Germany have bigger oil import problems than we do.
7. On page 11, line 14, you may want to substitute "limit" for "keep". "Keep" may suggest that the growth of government spending now is reasonable and prudent.

TO: Jim Brady, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver
FROM: Bob Garrick

8. The last paragraph on page 12 talks about controlling government spending. After the first sentence you may want to briefly make the point that stopping the increases in government spending is more important to a balanced budget than actual cuts in existing programs. Indeed, if current law spending was only modestly increased in the next few years we could afford even larger tax cuts than we have been talking about and still have a balanced budget.

Along this same line, the second sentence of the second to the last paragraph on page 13 appears not to be accurate. A cut of 10 percent in spending by 1984 below current levels would be nearly impossible. You may want to replace this sentence with one that reads, "My goal will be to reduce the current projected level of spending by 10 percent by fiscal year 1984".

9. The description of your individual tax rate reduction proposal on page 14, line seven is also not technically accurate. I would strike "phased in over" and insert "each year for". As currently written it suggests that the total tax cut would be 10% not 30%. You may also want to make a brief reference to tax indexing after paragraph two on this page. Tax indexing is a good issue that you have used effectively.

10. A specific reference to new regulation under Carter would be useful at the end of the fourth paragraph on page 15. A reference, for example, to the increase in the size of the Federal Register under Carter may make the point.

11. The sentence that begins on page 17, line eight, should be divided into two sentences. In its current state it is difficult to follow.

* * *

I hope that these comments are helpful. Good luck with the speech and I am looking forward to watching the debate on Tuesday.

FROM: GAVIN

TO
→ KEN KHACHIGIAN

October 23, 1980

TO: ~~BILL GAVIN~~

FROM: SEN. BOB DOLE

SUBJECT: REAGAN SPEECH ON THE ECONOMY

SUGGESTIONS:

1. I believe it is most important that Mr. Reagan get across the point that we now have a leader who is helpless to control inflation and unemployment. Carter's sense of helplessness gives the American people a sense of hopelessness.

Carter has taken away our sense of hope and Reagan will restore that. Reagan will make a difference. Reagan will stop inflation. Reagan can do the job. This is hope. Things can be different. Four more years of Carter will be four more years of the same policies.

2. I also believe it is important that Reagan come on strong in this speech and that this not be another play-it-safe speech.

It is important that Reagan make it clear he will decrease government spending.

I suggest you mention how many appropriation bills Jimmy Carter has vetoed compared to how many Pres. Ford vetoed. You could put Reagan on record as saying if the Congress sends him excess spending bills he will veto them.

There is not a commitment to a balanced budget in the speech. If Reagan has made such a commitment it should be in the speech.

Everyone, including Carter, knows if the present situation continues, the 1981 deficit will be between \$40 and \$60 billion. Carter has accepted this. Reagan should say this is totally unacceptable to him and he will not allow the budget deficit to be this high if he is elected. He will veto spending bills.

Interest rates cannot come down with the budget deficit this high.

(2)

3. I suggest Reagan make it clear he will decrease taxes as soon as he has excess government spending under control.

One way to decrease government spending is to give the government less money to spend. You can do this by decreasing taxes.

4. Reagan must make it clear and strong that he will break the back of inflation. This can be done and he will do it.

If you stop budget deficits interest rates will come down, business investment will go up, and productivity will go up.

5. I suggest the speech be perfectly clear and as strong as possible on what Reagan will do for the economy. He will reduce government spending, he will decrease inflation and break the back of inflation, he will reduce interest rates.

6. I do not believe point 1 on page 11 is nearly strong enough.

7. Point 2 on page 9 is not clear. There has been a severe drought, but there is not a grain shortage. Production is high even in spite of the drought.

8. I suggest a word or words be found to replace the word humane. I understand what you're trying to say but just don't believe this word gets the point across.

9. In a few places the wording get complex and the figures sound like a speech to the American Economic Association. I feel many people will get lost. I believe the speech could be simplified in a few places.

10. I would suggest the music theme be brought back into the middle of the speech and somehow be brought back into the end of the speech. I believe this would help develop a theme and tie the speech together.

11. Mr. Carters six economic mistakes are given too much detail and it sounds like they might have worked if the Congress or someone else hadn't sidetracked them. The blame should be put clearly on Carter as the ideas were bad.

*Send Garrick
22 Oct 3:55 pm
EOT*

TO: Jim Brady, Marty Anderson, Ken Khachigian, Lyn Nofziger, Mike Deaver
FROM: Bob Garrick

Oct. 22 1980

To: Martin Anderson
From: Bill Gavin *Bill*
Re: The Economic Speech--Alan Greenspan Suggestions

*Fax'd to R plane
601-329-2090
10/22/80 5:20 pm
Bill Hart*

By this time Alan has probably already called you, but he asked me to pass on to you the following, just in case he missed you:

1. What is RR's position on refundable tax credit? Accelerated depreciation is good only for those with tax liabilities. Does RR want to say he is for the refundable tax credit? Alan says we should think about his. (This refers to the "steel and auto" language on p.15)
2. On oil price controls: do we want to "repeal" them or do we want to phase them out? We say "repeal" in our draft(p.16).
3. On p.17, the next to the last paragraph beginning: "My administration will put an end..." This is John McClaughry's insert and Alan said "Do we know what regulations we're talking about?". John says "Yes we do--in fact this stuff comes directly from the Green Bay speech and I know what regulations we are talking about"

If you have any questions on this, talk to John directly.

Oct. 22 1980

To:Bob

From Gavin

Re:Minor Correction of quotation in Economic Speech

On p. 3, where we are quoting Doug Fraser,the fourth line
of that quote---we have "pocketbooks"(plural).It should
be the singular--"pocketbook".

When you are speaking to Ken, just tell him
about this.No need to send this by dex.

Reagan & Bush

Reagan Bush Committee

901 South Highland Street, Arlington, Virginia 22204 (703) 685-3400

NEWS RELEASE

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE:

Wednesday, October 22, 1980

CONTACT: Lyn Nofziger or
Ken Towery
703-685-3630

INFLATION, ENERGY AND UNEMPLOYMENT

TO BE TOPICS OF REAGAN'S MAJOR ADDRESS FRIDAY

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- Inflation, energy, and unemployment will be the subjects of Ronald Reagan's second major 30-minute national television address on the issues of the presidential campaign.

The speech is scheduled for 10:30 P.M. EDT, Friday, October 24, on ABC.

Reagan outlined a nine-point foreign policy plan to promote world peace in his first speech on the issues last Sunday.

"The response to Sunday's address shows conclusively that the public wants an intelligent discussion of the issues," said William Casey, campaign director.

"Each candidate for the presidency must recognize the obligation exists to inform the public fully on their positions," Casey said.

Casey said Reagan would continue to focus on the issues until Election Day.

* * * * *