## 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 – 1980 Presidential Forum, Midwest Region Republicans, 03/13/1980] (2 of 2)

**Box:** 247

To see more digitized collections visit: <a href="https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material">https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material</a>

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

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

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

National Archives Catalogue: <a href="https://catalog.archives.gov/">https://catalog.archives.gov/</a>

sending them that they're sending back to us in the form of weapons and threatening us.

MODERATOR SMITH: Gentlemen, I am afraid we're going to have to switch from foreign affairs due to our merciless schedule. I want to ask you some practical questions about politics.

If you become president, any one of you, your first duty will be to have the vision and the information to provide programs and plans to meet our problems. But then your second duty may be much more difficult, that is, getting Congress to accept your plans and programs.

I talked to President Nixon some time ago and he reminded me six years ago he offered the first fuel program and Congress wouldn't pass it. I talked to President Ford and he said four years ago, five years ago he offered the second program. Carter offered one. It was paid no attention to. Now he's getting the scraps of his program at last.

How-- what makes you think you could either persuade or do successful battle with Congress to prevent your proposals and messages from going into the wasterpaper basket on Capitol Hill?

Mr. Crane?

. 9

Melenti, head of the Motion Picture Association,
had an interesting article recently on what ingredients
the next president should have. He said first he
should be an educator and secondly a communicator.

The purpose of both is to cut through so much of
the lack of public understanding of the nature of
the problems, and by communicating that effectively
to the American people you can then, I think, depend
totally on the American people to put the sentiments
or to apply the pressure on the members of Congress
to do the right thing even if they're doing it for
the wrong reasons, namely, just to hold office.

Now, let me give you a case in point.

You know, the American people are totally confused about the energy situation. And one third of them blame OPEC, one third of them blame the Department of Energy, and one third blame big, bad oil.

The president has demagogued at the expense of the oil industry in this country and has tried to create the impression on the part of a lot of Americans who cannot believe that they would have a president sitting in that White House who would either not tell them the truth or would engage in some kind

of deception for whatever kind of reason. And I submit to you that that's exactly what the president is engaged in.

The fact of the matter is if you looked at his solution to this problem with his alleged windfall profits tax on big, bad oil, that's not a tax on big, bad oil, it's an excise tax on a barrel of oil at the wellhead, it clobbers little oil independents in this country who find 90 percent of the new oil.

I haven't seen any evidence of big oil down there lobbying against it, and why should they? Because their profits are coming from international operations. And if we increase domestic supply, that's going to reduce our dependence on their exports from foreign operations into this country.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush, the question is how would you presuade Congress to pass your programs and it's not about energy and oil. How do you do that?

MR. BUSH: Well, some of us haven't had much success lately.

MODERATOR SMITH: Well--

GEORGE BUSH: Frankly, I don't think we're

4 5

going to have the status quo. I think there's something going on in the country, change. I believe you're going to see Republicans continue the trend it started in '78. I think you're going to see some Democrats reach kind of a conversion in terms of recognizing that stimulating the economy through the kind of tax cuts three of us are talking about and balanced budgets and this approach, I think it's going to be-- and then part of it is party discipline.

Now, let me put the question this way.

I want to be president. And I believe, obviously

I wouldn't be sitting here if I didn't think I'd

win the nomination, but you have a party organization.

I will support the nominee of the Republican Party. I feel I have a moral obligation to do it.

That signal goes out to your troops in the Congress.

And I'd just like to ask would you do that, Ron? And would you do that, John? Would you? I think you have to ask that question.

MODERATOR SMITH: I think Mr. Anderson-JOHN ANDERSON: I tell you those were words
as truly spoken by a former Chairman of the Republican
National Committee under Richard Nixon. You're

talking about moral obligation.

GEORGE BUSH: Would you support the nominee of the party? Will you support the nominee of the party?

JOHN ANDERSON: George, you don't have to point your finger at me. Really, don't get so excited.

GEORGE BUSH: Will you support him?

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, you know in Nashua-this is very nice. Tonight I'm sitting with you
actually and with Mr. Reagan and Mr. Crane. In Nashua
we couldn't get you to let us debate.

GEORGE BUSH: Well, I'd accepted a different agreement.

But would you support the nominee of the Republican Party?

JOHN ANDERSON: I expect to be the nominee of the Republican Party. I fully expect to be able to support the nominee of the party, yes, I certainly expect to be able to do that. But, I have said this.

GEORGE BUSH: Well, that's a change of position.

JOHN ANDERSON: I have said this, Mr. Bush.

That I think we are living in a new and different

age, and you referred to it yourself. And I believe

there is a new politics that is waiting to be born in this country that thinks when we have had two crises in just two months, when we have the Democratic Senate Majority Leader quoted in the press yesterday as saying that he thinks the president ought to go on national television and declare a national emergency, I think the issues transcend the kind of narrow partisianship that you represent.

I believe that a new coalition of voters in this country composed of Democrats, Independents and Republicans. And you apparently believe in that kind of coalition when you were trying to get some Democratic votes in South Carolina.

GEORGE BUSH: I still do, John. I still do. But I will support the nominee of this party.

JOHN ANDERSON: I believe, I believe that the issues today, the issues today that the American people are concerned about, inflation, the decline of productivity, the fact that we've got these interest rates at astronomical heights, and that this economy is threatened, as I said, with almost national bankruptcy, to sit and talk as a mere partisan in that context bothers me a great, great deal.

MODERATOR SMITH: I think Governor Reagan has

something he wants to say about this.

RONALD REAGAN: Yeah, Howard, can I answer the question you asked.

MODERATOR SMITH: Please.

RONALD REAGAN: How do you get the Congress to go along with a Republican president?

Well, for eight years I was the Governor of the most popular state in the United States.

And that state, when I became Governor, was as bankrupt as the Federal Government is today. And I had a majority of Democrats, hostile Democrats, in both houses of the legislature.

And yet we secured the welfare reforms,

we secured—well, we took the state away from

bankruptcy. I succeeded in giving back to the

taxpayers over the eight years \$5,700,000,000 in

tax rebates and tax credits. Our bonds got a triple

"A" rating, the reform of welfare cut a 40,000 increase
in the welfare load to an 8,000 a month decrease.

And it was all done with a Democratic legislature.

And what Phil said about communicating, when I was faced with the opposition to all of those things, and I was, Democratic legislature -- when you tell a Democratic legislature you want to give back

an \$850,000,000 surplus to the people, that's like getting between the hog and the bucket. You get buffetted about a bit.

But I took my case over their heads to the people. And I told the people what it was we were trying to do. And I learned there that it isn't necessary to make the legislature see the light, just make them feel the heat.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: John, I want to be up front with you, John, because you've done something most recently that I cannot support, and I cannot imagine any Republicans supporting it, if you want to know the truth.

We have not had a shot at that United

States Senate, a realistic chance, in a quarter of
a century or more. Now, you signed a fund raising
letter for such progressive members of that Senate
as George McGovern, Frank Church, John Culver, Birch
Bayh, some of the most vulnerable people-- I'm not
talking about the issue, John--

JOHN ANDERSON: Will you yield?

PHILIP CRANE: Yes, I'll be happy to as soon as I finish.

It's not the issue, John. It's a question of a Republican signing a fund raising letter to try and keep those prominent, in my judgment, most ultra and extreme left-wing Democrats in the United States Senate, and you had a primary contest that I stayed out of last time, John. I didn't get involved in that race. It was a conservative challenging you. You had everyone from Jack Kemp to Gerry Ford come in there to campaign for you. The Republican Party has faithfully supported you for 20 years. And I think that is an ingratitude, John, it's an ingratitude that is sufficient that you forfeited the expectation of any support from Republicans.

JOHN ANDERSON: Will you yield?

PHILIP CRANE: Just one final note.

You know, honest men can disagree, and I have respected you, John, throughout the years even though I disagree with you. But keep in mind-- you know Don Riegle never voted with us. And your support for the GOP majority last year was 9 percent.

Well, Don Riegle finally saw the light.

He saw where he was and he crossed the aisle. So did Ogden Reed in New York. So did Peter Peyser.

And how can you come here before a group of Republicans

or ask for a Republican nomination when you have taken the position that you will not support a Republican candidate?

JOHN ANDERSON: Phil, I admire and I respect you, too. But the support rate is not 9 percent, that isn't true. But the letter, that's the important thing.

PHILIP CRANE: No, last year John it was 9
percent. Congressional Quarterly has you at 9 percent.

JOHN ANDERSON: That's not so. But the letter was not a fund raising letter for George McGovern, for Frank Church, for any of these other people.

What it was was a letter designed to raise funds for an organization which is supporting the principle of freedom of choice. And in the text of that letter it was pointed out that good men of both parties, and the names of two Republicans were mentioned in that letter, good men in both parties are being threatened with exorcism. They are to be exorcised from the political realm. They are to be driven out of political life simply because of the stand that they have taken on a single issue.

I happen to believe, Phil, that in the times that we live today, dangerous and critical as

they are, that single issue politics is very devisive. And that to simply say that you're going to drive somebody completely out of politics because of that particular issue, I don't believe it's correct. I happen to believe in freedom of choice. I'm not going to go out and try to defeat somebody who happens not to share my view on that particular issue. I don't happen to think that that is the central issue before the country today. I think it's the economy.

And that letter, any fair reading of the text of that letter will indicate that it is designed to raise funds for the organization not for those individuals who are mentioned in the text of the letter. And I just have to insist on a correct interpretation.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan is enjoying this too much. I think he should say something about it.

RONALD REAGAN: Well, I was just sitting here thinking that if George McGovern and Frank Church, Birch Bayh, Culver of Iowa and some of those others Democratic Senators, when in this next election if the Republicans can hold their own and gain nine of the 24 Democratic seats that are up, we will control one house of the Congress for the first time

in more than a quarter of a century.

I don't think that they have to be defeated on just that issue in which you happen to agree with them on. I can find you 50 reasons that Frank Church and those other gentlemen should not be in the United states Senate anymore. I don't care whether it's for the one issue or the 50, I'll do everything I can to see that they get defeated.

JOHN ANDERSON: I am not endorsing any of those people. I certainly agree.

But I do not think we want to see American politics come to the point where we try to drive good men out of public life simply because they are attacked on a single issue. I'm against that.

RONALD REAGAN: That's where we disagree. I don't think they're good men.

MODERATOR SMITH: Let me ask everybody one question. Will all of you agree to support the--any one of you who becomes the Republican nominee for president?

GEORGE BUSH: I will.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane.

PHILIP CRANE: I won't. I cannot support you, John, for what you've done.

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, my answer to that question, Howard, goes back to the answer that I gave a few moments ago. I cannot try to build a new politics in this country and structure a new coalition and tell people that I am doing it on the basis that there are certain very fundamental issues that are so important that they literally relate to the survival of life as we have always known it on this planet and not be-- and not think that those issues are critical importance, and then repeat the old shibboleth. And I admire you for the statement that you've just made, strange as it may seem, Phil. Then repeat the old shibboleth that I'm simply going to embrace any candidate regardless of what his views are. I can't do that. That is not the new politics. That is not the new coalition we need in this country.

1

2

3

5

7

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

PHILIP CRANE: Let me just ask one quick question, Howard.

John, if there were a candidate running on the position or the platform of unilateral disarmament of this country, is that not a single issue? Would that not be a single issue?

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, it actually, I think,

involves an awful lot of things. That involves the whole complex of foreign policy issues.

PHILIP CRANE: No, I'm talking about unilateral disarmament, unilateral disarmament. That's a single issue, John.

JOHN ANDERSON: That involves the whole complex of issues. That involves the whole complex of defense issues. That would be central.

PHILIP CRANE: John, you are as skillful a man on the floor in debate as I've encountered in my career. But I'm telling you that's a single issue, John, and it's an issue upon which the republic's fate would hinge, and I'm telling you that that's enough to retire a man right there.

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, I'm not for unilateral-I'm not for--

MODERATOR SMITH: Let me sum up. Two of you do not agree to support any nominee from this room.

RONALD REAGAN: Well, my record is clear. In the past I have always held out for Republican unity, and I've always held out for supporting whoever the party-- is the nominee when the contest if finally over.

But, John, you really would find Teddy

Kennedy preferable to me?

JOHN ANDERSON: No, I -- if you could have been with me on the campus of Bradley University two nights ago, you would have been proud of me, I'm sure, because I took Teddy Kennedy apart on a list of at least seven issues where we have very fundamental disagreements.

are a friend, and I want to be very honest with you, is that I do believe that on this whole question, as I have read your basic speech, and maybe that isn't the total exposition of your views. I didn't find anything in that basic speech other than that the United States must rearm, rearm. That was the war cry that was issued, and there was nothing about the corresponding obligation that I think we have to try to travel the road toward peace.

MODERATOR SMITH: I think-- I think, gentlemen-I think you've made your point.

Now, I still want to hear from Governor Reagan. Will you support any man on this platform who's nominated for the Republican presidential nomination?

RONALD REAGAN: I'm still waiting for John to

answer.

MODERATOR SMITH: I think that the two said they would not. You're the only one whose answer I haven't heard.

RONALD REAGAN: Well, this is very difficult now in this position that I seem to be hearing a cry for another party here. And I have to ask myself if he is really running as a Republican to be the titular head of the party as well as our nation.

JOHN ANDERSON: Can I very quickly--

MODERATOR SMITH: Since you are under assault you have an opportunity. Make it short, please, Congressman.

JOHN ANDERSON: Can I very quickly say,

Governor, that I have learned that if you compete

in the Republican primary by the laws of that state

you cannot run on a independent ticket. And, believe

me, I'm going to be competing in California for the

159 delegates of that state. So don't worry--

RONALD REAGAN: It's 168.

. JOHN ANDERSON: I'll take all of them.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush.

GEORGE BUSH: Well, it seems to me the choice is Jimmy Carter or Kennedy on one side and those

running on the Republican on the other. And I have no difficulty saying I would support the Republican nominee against four sitting here or Gerald Ford or anybody else that I can conceive would be a serious candidate if the alternative was Jimmy Carter or Ted Kennedy. I'm sorry, I don't understand all this talking about all these big issues. Everybody wants peace. The question is how do you get there.

JOHN ANDERSON: George, I agree, you don't understand talking about the issues.

GEORGE BUSH: But the question is this holding back sanctimoniously talking about some coalition to divide a minority party is no way to take control of the Senate, no way to change the direction of this country.

RONALD REAGAN: George, I'll even throw in Jerry Brown, especially I'll throw in Jerry Brown.

GEORGE BUSH: I just don't understand.

PHILIP CRANE: You know, I said previously to your letter, John, and some of your most recent statements that the least qualified Republican in this race was infinitely preferable to what the Democrats had to offer. And when I say I couldn't support you it's because I think, John, you have not

demonstrated fidelity to the party and that's come up since. And I would argue that had you been in the Democratic primary race, you would have been far and away the classiest, most talented Democrat that could have run in this contest. You're head and shoulders above Jimmy, and you're head and shoulders above Teddy and head and shoulders above Jerry Brown. But I'm arguing you're in the wrong party.

JOHN ANDERSON: I didn't know we had a loyalty test in the Republican Party. I really didn't.

MODERATOR SMITH: Ladies and gentlemen, I think we have exhausted that topic, we know where everybody stands now. There's so many topics that we haven't covered that I'm going to ask for a special effort from the candidates.

A while ago I said your general positions had become clear on issues. I would like to ask you to let me name some issues and you tell me briefly, even though the public has heard what you've said, they haven't memorized what you've said, where you stand in one sentence on the issues.

First of all, draft registration. Just a sentence.

PHILIP CRANE: I'm opposed to draft registration.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: I favor draft registration, I oppose the draft, I support the volunteer army.

RONALD REAGAN: I oppose draft registration and know that the president at the time that he favored it had a report from the Selective Service Director that it would only shorten the time period for a draft army if it was needed by a few days and it wasn't worth the bureaucracy it would create.

MODERATOR SMITH: That's two sentences, one of which was very, very long.

RONALD REAGAN: I thought I put a semicolon in there.

MODERATOR SMITH: Congressman?

JOHN ANDERSON: I am opposed to draft registration.

It is intended to lead, I believe, to the reinstitution of a peace time draft to which I am also opposed.

MODERATOR SMITH: Wage and price controls, Mr. Crane.

PHILIP CRANE: I am totally opposed and always
have been opposed and was outspokenly opposed when
Richard Nixon did it; it is as wrong today as it
was then because it attacks symptoms and not the cause

of the problem.

MODERATOR SMITH: Ambassador Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: Inasmuch as wage and price controls lock in inequities and have failed under Democrats and Republicans, I oppose wage and price controls.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan.

RONALD REAGAN: I oppose them, and they failed back when Diocletian tried them two thousand years ago in Rome and he used capital punishment to enforce them.

MODERATOR SMITH: I was very young then.

RONALD REAGAN: I'm the only one here old enough to remember.

MODERATOR SMITH: Congressman Anderson, I'm sure you don't remember that. Wage and price controls.

JOHN ANDERSON: I am opposed to wage and price controls, although I do believe that the administration has singly failed to maintain any reasonable wage and price guidelines, and, therefore, if inflation does not abate that we should look at a tax-based incomes policy.

MODERATOR SMITH: How about nuclear power which seems dead in the water in this country. Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: Nuclear power continues to be the safest, the cheapest and the cleanest form of new energy to come on stream. I not only support nuclear power, I support the breeder reactor.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

. 7

GEORGE BUSH: I support nuclear power and implementation of the Kimminey Commission Report recommendation.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: I agree with them.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson.

JOHN ANDERSON: There should not be an expansion of the nuclear power program unless within one year Congress has put on the books a definitive statute which selects an appropriate technology to deal with the storage and management of waste and also the legal mechanisms and procedures whereby that could be accomplished.

MODERATOR SMITH: Boycotting the Olympics.
Mr. Crane.

PHILIP CRANE: I favor the boycot of the Olympics
the very night the president suggested that they
may lose some tourist business over there back in
January and insisted at the time that if we could

find an alternate site, all well and good. But whether or not we could find an alternate site or not, I think it was wrong to consider going to Moscow for the Olympics.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: The Soviet people don't really know what their government, their troops have done in Afghanistan. They do know about the Olympic games, and the truth will filter down when those games are cancelled, and because the aggression was so clear and so brutal, I support the boycot of the Olympics.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: I would like to see them held some place else rather than Moscow. I think it would be hypocritical to go there, and I think we ought to, maybe from this, get the inspiration to put the Olympics permanently back where they started in Greece and hold them there every four years.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: I support the Olympic boycot and agree that a permanent site for the Olympiad, perhaps in Greece, would be the best solution.

MODERATOR SMITH: The Equal Rights Amendment.
Mr. Crane?

pHILIP CRANE: I voted against the extension of the Equal Rights Amendment. I think it is redundant, because I think the 14th Amendment provides the adequate safeguards women are concerned about with respect to access to jobs and equal pay for equal work.

. MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: I voted for or sponsored and support the Equal Rights Amendment.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: I'm for ER. I can't go along with A. I would like to see equal rights by statute and we did it in California and corrected discrimination against women economically and in other ways wherever we found it by statute. I'm opposed to the amendment.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: I wholeheartedly endorse the Equal Rights Amendment and alone among the Republican candidates supported the extension legislation which is the only way to make sure that that amendment will become part of the Constitution of this country.

MODERATOR SMITH: I would like to ask a final question. Has Henry Kissinger got a political future?

Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: I've indicated one of the reasons

I want to stay in this race until we get to Detroit

is in the event Gerald Ford gets into the race he

indicated he'd like to put Henry Kissinger back in

at State, and I want to make sure he never gets back

in at State.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: I'm sure he has a political future, but I don't believe he would be the Secretary of State in my administration.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: Nor in mine, and if he has a political future, there are all sorts of sidelines to it, studies, commenting, writing columns and so forth.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: I think Secretary Kissinger has made some wonderful contributions in the course of his distinguished career. I do believe that his political future among some candidates has become somewhat clouded by virtue of his recent mission to California beseeching former President Ford to run again.

1 2

MODERATOR SMITH: So now we're going to have some questions from the floor. And the first is from Mr. Bruce Begesky. All of the candidates will answer this question briefly.

MR. BRUCE BEGESKY: Gentlemen, I'm receiving unemployment compensation that covers my living expenses. Even though I wish to work, I have been forced to turn down job offers because they do not pay as much as unemployment.

What would you do to change the situation?

PHILIP CRANE: Well, I think very frankly that

unemployment compensation is already overly generous.

And I would argue that you should not be turning

down a job opportunity if it presents itself because

you are putting a strain on some other person who's

trying to feed his family and pay the taxes that

carry you in unemployment when you've already

acknowledged that you had job offers you've turned

down because you didn't like the pay differential.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: The system has to be changed so nobody can make that kind of statement where jobs are available but he does better to not work. The system must be reformed so that kind of abuse is

eliminated. Welfare rolls are down and that's good.

But that doesn't mean that it's been perfected. And

what you need to do is help people who want to get

a job and can't, not a guy who can get a job and

doesn't take it.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: Well, I have to answer the same way, that I think this is one of the great faults in the program. We found in California, however, that when we required people who were on assistance and were able bodied to work at useful community projects in return for their grant, that we then, even in the midst of the 1973-'74 recession, funneled 76,000 able bodied recipients of grants into private enterprise jobs while unemployment was increasing.

You're absolutely right, that the system has gotten so out of balance that today a man with a family will find that he actually, when he considers taxes on what he would earn in a job, that a man many times will find that his benefits would make it necessary for him to get \$20,000 a year in order to equal the benefits that he is getting tax free from the Government, and that is absolutely wrong. There's no excuse for that.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

1

2

3

5

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, I certainly must agree that any able bodied young American, and you appear to be such from your appearance, ought to be working rather than drawing unemployment compensation if a job is available.

Now, the minimum wage in this country at the present time is \$3.10 an hour which works out to \$6,200 a year. I don't happen to know whether or not you are married and whether you're supporting a family or not, but it would seem to me that you ought to be accepting those job offers if for no other reason. You will be preparing yourself and acquiring the kind of job skills that you need to take your place in the world of work. And I have even favored the youth opportunity wage that would give teenage unemployed people in this country a chance to go work at 85 percent of the minimum, simply so that they can have that opportunity to gain work experience. And I would hope very much that you would make that decision.

MODERATOR SMITH: The next question from Mr. Donald Neltnor.

MR. DONALD NELTNOR: Gentlemen, if elected

president what would be your plan to solve the problems of the northern industrial cities like Chicago. Specifically, what would you do to stimulate the local economy and reduce innercity unemployment, improve education, and would you continue revenue sharing?

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: That's a big mouthful. Let me say first of all that when we address the problems of urban areas that one must recognize that there are some reasons, and the reasons, I think, go beyond just the climate. For some cities in the sun belt to be thriving at the same time other northern cities are suffering. And I think one of the reasons is because of the hostile tax climate for business in many of our northern cities.

I think the Federal Government, too, has to assume responsibility. In Youngstown, Ohio, recently for example, Youngstown Sheet and Tube had a plant that went under there and one of the reasons why it went under was because of the application of an EPA reg that according to union officials I spoke to was the straw the broke the camel's back. And as the former mayor told me at that time, he said,

"You want to see urban blight? This is how it starts. We just lost 4,600 taxpayers, and we lost the tax base of that plant."

As far as education goes, I think we have got to develop a sound, healthy vocational technical training program in our schools, and that's not just in the inner city, that's throughout the suburban areas and rural areas, too. We've sorely neglected vocational technical training.

On the revenue sharing question, frankly I don't like revenue sharing. I like it better than categorical grant made programs, but I think a superior approach would be to enable a person to get a credit against payment of his Federal income taxes for "X" percent of that going to Springfield in our home state of Illinois in the form of payments to the state, another percentage going to the county and another percentage going to the municipality in which you live. That would prevent the bureauccrats in Washington from skimming money off the top, and secondly it would give local communities and local states the flexibility to determine the kind of programs they wanted and how they chose to address them.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: I favor revenue sharing. I believe that job training credits, job tax credits to get business to locate in areas of high unemployment, and that would be important. I believe mass transit is important. I believe reading, writing, arithmetic, fourth "R", respect, in schools to give people a real shot at a job when they get through. In some of these cities it's terribly difficult. And I think that means Government assistance. But you can't in just 30 seconds say it all. But it has to be stimulation of the private sector.

And then on the housing side I favor
in existence Section 8 housing as opposed to building
these kind of ghetto containing monsterous concrete
things. And that would be a cheaper way of solving
your-- assisting the cities with their housing needs, too.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: 75 percent of the people in the country live in cities. And what we really have now with the Federal aid to the cities, including inner cities and so forth, is Chicago sending its money to Washington, and some of that is used to help Philadelphia and Detroit and New York and so forth.

•

Y

But New York and Detroit and Philadelphia are sending their money to Washington to help Chicago and Indianapolis and St. Louis and there is an administrative overhead to this round trip of our money.

The Federal Government is trying to be all things to all people and dictate how that money will be spent when it comes back to the city. Wouldn't it make more sense if we stopped that round trip and the deduction of that carrying charge in Washington and left the tax sources at the local level for local government to not only be responsible for the tax, but to be able to establish their own priorities as to where the money is going to be used and how it should be spent.

The Mayor of Macon, Georgia, just recently was telling me that Washington has got a big grant for him which he can't turn down. If he takes this grant he has to rebuild all the buses in Macon, Georgia, to provide for the handicapped. But he said in Macon, Georgia, they found out that if they have their own way in spending that money instead of taking Government orders that they could for a much lesser amount establish a contract with the cab companies that any handicapped person could call and

get a cab any time they wanted it to go any place they wanted to go instead of rebuilding all the buses.

It is time, I think, for not only local rule to be given back, local autonomy, but sources of revenue that the Federal Government has usurped should be given back, and the cities themselves will do a better job of spending that money than they have to when they take the dictates of the Federal Government.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, Mr. Smith, as I remember it the question related specifically to the City of Chicago, and I would say that perhaps given the current tensions that exist between Mayor Byrne and the Carter administration because of her support of another candidate that maybe the quickest remedy of that case would be some change in administration at either end.

But I recall, for example, Secretary

Goldschmidt's decision to withhold more than 2

billion dollars in discretionary highway funds for

this area because of the political implications. And

I was outraged, and I think properly so, and condemned

the Secretary for that decision.

I do believe that on the larger question of Federal aid to cities we must have an urban strategy that recognizes that many of our great cities particularly in the upper midwest and in the northeast, because of the flight to the sun belt have lost some of the industrial base that they once had. And housing stock has deteriorated. And I believe--I made a speech for a half an hour this afternoon to the National Neighborhood Development Association in which I outlined a very long program about specific steps that I would recommend in an urban strategy. I think that instead of all the emphasis by the Department of Housing and Urban Development on new housing that we have to develop the idea of rehabilitation. We've got to preserve existing housing stock. We've got to be more interested, I think in preserving the basic intrastructure of our cities, paying attention to the streets, the maintenance and the repair of streets.

1

2

3

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

New York, for example, the Mayor the other day said it would take 40 billion dollars over the next 10 years and they only had 1.4 billion dollars they could budget for the repair and maintenance of basic services within the city.

MODERATOR SMITH: Could you round that out, Congressman?

JOHN ANDERSON: I think the emphasis has to be made to that.

MODERATOR SMITH: All right. Time is getting upon us.

The next question, the third question from Robert Harris.

MR. ROBERT HARRIS: Gentlemen, my question is this. If during your presidency you had occasion to appoint a justice to the United States Supreme Court, which justice presently serving on the Court would you most like your appointee to emulate and why?

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: To one who is a strict constructionist as they say and one who takes the intent of the founding fathers when they drafted that Constitution very seriously, I'm not enthralled with any member of the United States Supreme Court today. I'd like to replace all nine of them. And, in fact, I really think that Thomas Jefferson's concern about the potential tyranny in a Federal judiciary was a concern that really speaks to the kinds of aggressive

courts that we've had in the past 25 years. Frankly, I think the Federal judiciary has involved itself in vastly too many areas where we should not be seeking ultimate resolution of problems, but rather enjoy a little bit of tolerance for diversity which to me was one of the greatest strengths of the country and that means keeping the Feds out of state business for the most part.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: Well, I hate to be left in responsive to get into names on the Court. I'm colored by friendship for some of the justices that I know, have great respect for them. But I don't think it's right to sit down and say which of the justices would emulate your-- what I would say is this.

I want strict construction. I want scholarship. I don't want somebody that's going to conform with me on every single issue, wouldn't seek that out. I'd seek out excellence and an ability to interpret the Constitution of the United States.

But I'm not going to give you-- click off one name out of nine, and I do have respect for the institution of the Court, and I disagree with Phil, I have respect for this Court.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan?

RONALD REAGAN: Well, I don't-- I'm not going to pick out a name. I frankly wouldn't know that much about their records. I think there are a few, they're usually on the minority side of the question that they decide that I would find myself more approving of. But I just wondered about something, because my mind went to one of the great all time justices of the United States Supreme Court, John Marshall, who wasn't even a lawyer. Maybe that's what's wrong.

I think I have to go along with what's been said. I believe that the Court has dangerously in recent years usurped some of the problems of the Legislature and that we need to restore the separation of power between Executive, Legislative and Judiciary, and I would want one who was a Constitutionalist, who believed in interpreting the Constitution, not rewriting it.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: Well, Mr. Smith, we in Illinois, of course, are very proud of Justice John Paul Stephens who was appointed to the high Court by President Ford. However, I wouldn't want to restrict

I think my consideration of that appointment to a single individual presently serving either. And I would agree that judicial experience although important, and I would certainly want to consult with members of the Bar and the Judicial Conference and so on. I can think back on a man, Hugo Black, his prior judicial experience was being a police court judge and after that, of course, served two terms or three in the United States Senate. Again, I think he left his mark as one of the distinguished jurists of this 20th century.

So I think I would want a man who was broadly compassionate, who had great humanitarian instincts, a man who realizes that this country and its people are constantly evolving and changing and who would make a great progressive record on that Court.

MODERATOR SMITH: Well, gentlemen, the time has now come for the closing statements. Each of you has one minute, just one minute to make a closing statement.

Mr. Crane?

PHILIP CRANE: First of all, I want to quickly congratulate the League of Women Voters for sponsoring

13.

these kind of national town meetings. I think it's healthy, I think it's desirable, I think it provides the electorate with an understanding, better understanding at least of the nature of the candidates.

And I am still waiting expectantly to see our Democratic counterparts engage in a similar exercise, because the quicker they do, the quicker we'll elect a Republican president in November and simultaneously get a Republican Congress.

And I would say further that the Republican Party at this moment in history, I think, is in the best position, not because as Republicans we have any unique monopoly on truth. But we certainly have alternatives that are calculated to guarantee that we can get the nation back on a growth track, that we can restore the incentive, that we can practice the kind of restraint in Federal spending and Federal interference in our lives that's essential if we're going to preserve freedom for all Americans, Democrats and independents included, and simultaneously guarantee a defense capability superior to all others in this world.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Bush?

GEORGE BUSH: Well, it's my conviction that the

United States is coming out of a recent period in history that will prove to be an anomaly. Post Viet Nam, Watergate, election of a president that was not experienced. I believe that we should be optomistic Americans. I realize these problems are great, but if we emphasize productivity and show our compassion, not by Government spending, but by getting jobs and raising the level of education, we can make things better for people at home. And if we keep our defenses up, we can deter an aggressive Soviet Union, we can keep strong and thus guarantee two decades of peace.

I believe this firmly. I think my experience qualifies me to be president, and I need your support.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Reagan.

RONALD REAGAN: In 1776 Thomas Payne said to the American people in these 13 little colonies were trying to become a nation that we had it in our power to begin the world over again. I think he was talking to and about the people of those 13 colonies. I feel that way about the people of the United States.

I had an experience that taught me that it's true that if you turn to the people of this

country instead of Government intervention, if you turn as I did when I was Governor, and I think that that was the second top executive government position in the United States, because it is the most popular state, California, and as I say, had the same problems that we face today nationally. And I turned and asked for volunteer help to come in to go through Government bureaus and agencies and come back to me with recommendations as to how modern business practices could be put to work to make Government more effective and more economical. And that is why we were able to give back \$5,700,000,000. brought back 1,800 recommendations and we implemented 1,600 of them. And I just believe that the greatest issue-- we've talked about all these other things I think all of them rise from one thing.

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

. 9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

We have seen over recent decades a policy of intervention in the people's affairs by Government that goes beyond what was ever intended by the Constitution of the founding fathers. And it is time to have leadership in Washington that will get Government off the people's backs, remove the road blocks and turn the people of this country loose to achieve the great things that they have achieved

before and which they can achieve again.

And I would like to have your support because that's what I would like to do is free the people of this country.

MODERATOR SMITH: Mr. Anderson?

JOHN ANDERSON: Mr. Smith, I was once asked what is the most important attribute of a presidential candidate. Is it character, is it experience, is it the ability to put together the nuts and bolts of a great political machine? I said all of those things may be important, but I think you've missed the point. The most important thing is does the candidate have a vision for the future of the country. In addition to that vision, does he have some new ideas, some creative ideas that are designed to solve the problems of the people.

I have tried to be honest during this campaign, sometimes, I think, maybe almost painfully honest in my response to the specific questions that have been put to me. Because I believe so very fundamentally that we are facing a crisis in the history of this country, and that the candidate that ought to be nominated and elected as the next president of the United States ought to be that candidate who

is willing to face very specifically, not talk in the same old glib generalities and the platitudes and the pieties of past campaigns about leadership and greatness and strength and power and all the rest, but someone who is willing to do what I have been willing to do in prescribing, programatically and very specifically where cuts in the Federal budget must be made, knowing full well that that may step on the toes of this or that particular interest group. Prescribing a specific program on how to deal with the energy program, to cut down the awful drain on this economy, 90 to 100 billion dollars a year flowing overseas, tearing up the very fabric of the American economy. That hasn't earned me the undying gratitude and support of everyone.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

But I'm going to continue this campaign on the theory and on the belief that that's the kind of president the American people are looking for.

MODERATOR SMITH: Gentlemen, that concludes our forum for this evening. I want to-- on behalf of the League of Women Voters I'd like to thank the candidates for joining us here in Chicago and keeping interest not only alive, but growing in the American electoral process.

.

17.

Our next forum series will take place on April the 22nd, if the Democrats join us, and the 23rd for the Republicans in Houston, Texas.

We invite the candidates and you, the American public, to join us as the process of choosing the next president continues.

Thank you and good night.

(Which were all the proceedings had this date.)

STATE OF ILLINOIS )

SS:
COUNTY OF C O O K )

I, BARBARA BARNARD, being first duly sworn, on oath, says that she is a court reporter doing business in the City of Chicago; that she reported in shorthand the proceedings given at the taking of this hearing and that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of her shorthand notes so taken as aforesaid, and contains all the proceedings given at said hearing.

Certified Shorthand Reporter

17 SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO

18 before me this 18 day

of March, 1980.

Notary Public