



SENATOR BOB DOLE

Temporary Chairman

1976 Republican National Convention News

FOR RELEASE MONDAY, P.M.,
AUGUST 16, 1976

CONTACT:
Janet Anderson 467-1927

SENATOR BOB DOLE CITES DEMOCRAT CANDIDATE AND PLATFORM FOR DECEPTIONS

Senator Bob Dole told Republican delegates at their opening night session here that the Democrat platform "is a collection of deceptions." "I'd be afraid to stand on that platform, much less try to run on it," Dole said. "It isn't safe."

As the nominating process got underway, Dole, a former Republican National Committee Chairman, acknowledged that the Party came "divided -- for the moment -- as to who shall be the next President of the United States -- but we come firmly united in the conviction that he shall be -- and for the good of our nation -- must be, a Republican President."

Responding to Democrat hopeful Carter's repeated accusations that the Republican campaign would be one of distortion and half-truths, Dole said, "The Democrat Party doesn't know what its candidate stands for . . . and the Democrat candidate doesn't think we have a right to know."

"He thinks it is wrong to question him," Dole said. "He says it is a sign of desperation on the part of those who would question him. He says we are avoiding the 'issues' when we question him. He says it is a personal attack when we question him.

"I have news for him," Dole told the packed Republican crowd at Kansas City's Kemper Arena. "It isn't wrong, it isn't desperate, and it isn't personal."

"It's democracy," Dole said.

The farm-belt Senator then went on to cite contradictions between the Democrat candidate's record and his most recent political statements.

Dole urged the conventioners to "give Americans a candidate who will speak in public as he does in private, a candidate whose record matches his rhetoric, a candidate who will carry one story, one set of principles, and one vision to all our people."

(full text attached)



SENATOR BOB DOLE

Temporary Chairman

1976 Republican National Convention News

FOR RELEASE MONDAY, P.M.,
AUGUST 16, 1976

CONTACT:
Janet Anderson 467-1927
Bill Wohlford 471-1400, ext. 727
or ext. 1772

SPEECH DELIVERED TO THE
REPUBLICAN NATIONAL CONVENTION
BY SENATOR BOB DOLE
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI
AUGUST 16, 1976

REPUBLICANS UNITING

It is an honor to welcome you here tonight. It is an honorable task which brings us here.

We come divided -- for the moment -- as to who shall be the next President of the United States -- but we come firmly united in the conviction that he shall be -- and for the good of our nation -- must be, a Republican President.

As we look back on the convention held in New York last month -- with its smothered voices and missed opportunities and quiet capitulation to a force it hardly understood -- we cannot fail to be sympathetic as we consider that we have two candidates supremely qualified to occupy the highest office in the land, and they have none at all.

There are those, we know, who fervently hope that the preferences which divide us will prove stronger than the principles which have bound us together.

Let those who entertain false hopes recall that the Republican Party was born in strife. And if Abraham Lincoln could give to history a united America, this convention can certainly give to America a united Republican party.

Throughout the Democrat primaries, the candidates had much to say about each other's inadequacies -- and we could agree with everything they had to say.

In the days and weeks ahead, however, they should not be judged merely by what they say, but by what they neglect to say. They should be judged not only by what they take credit for, but by what they fail to take credit for.

THE DEMOCRAT RECORD

After all, was it a Republican administration that embroiled this wonderful country of ours in a devastating war in 1961?

No.

Was it a Republican administration that forced this nation into cruel and crippling inflation?

No.

Was it a Republican Congress that entangled our people in a regulatory web that puts government into every aspect of our lives?

No.

- 2 -



Was it a Republican Congress that mushroomed federal spending programs from less than 200 in 1960 to well over a thousand today?

No.

Was it a Republican Congress that raised its own budget from \$49 million to \$767 million in the last 22 years?

No.

Was it a Republican Congress that rejected every Administration effort to pass a comprehensive energy program?

No.

Was it a Republican Congress that rejected every Administration effort to enact legislation to reorganize government?

No.

Is that a record to be proud of?

No.

It is a disgrace.

You know it.

I know it.

The American people know it.

And their platform advocates nothing but more of the same.

I'd be afraid to stand on that platform, much less try to run on it. I'm surprised our regulatory agencies haven't looked into it. It isn't safe.

It is weak. It tilts so far left that any of us would slide off. But worse than that, it is a collection of deceptions.

DEFICIT SPENDING

It has much to say about federal deficits, but nothing to say about the irresponsible Democrat spending programs that caused those deficits.

It criticizes deficits, and at the same time it criticizes the President for vetoing Democrat spending programs which would increase the deficits.

It criticizes deficits, but it neglects to mention that it was their own Vice Presidential candidate who sponsored legislation to increase the deficit by \$9 billion for even bigger government spending programs.

But the worst of it, my fellow Republicans, is that the same platform which criticizes deficits calls for spending programs that would cost, at a very conservative estimate, more than \$100 billion a year out of the pockets of the American taxpayers.

Ladies and gentlemen, I challenge the Democrat ticket to give the American people a full accounting of how their spending program would be paid for. Either that platform is a fraud or their spending program is a disaster. I challenge them to public debate on an issue which could mean the life or death of the American economy.

Read their platform, and you will see there a short history of the philosophical bankruptcy of a once great party.

- 3 -

The Democrat platform points with pride to an unemployment rate of 3.6% in 1968, when they were voted out of office. They neglect to mention the fact that they kept well over a half-million of our young men and women out of the labor market by sending them off to war in Vietnam.

The Democrat platform calls for comprehensive national economic planning. We already have an economic plan for this nation. It is called free enterprise.

Anything wrong with that?

Why not let it work?

The Democrat platform insists that "we must prevent irresponsible and inflationary sales from the American granery to foreign purchasers." In other words, they would embargo grain shipments abroad.

But their Vice Presidential candidate is telling the farmers they would not embargo grain shipments abroad.

Deceptions. Contradictions.

Even the production of their platform gave them away. They went to New York to coronate a candidate. The outcome was a foregone conclusion.

PUBLIC PLATFORM PROCEEDINGS

Yet even with a locked-up convention, they didn't have the guts to conduct their hearings in public. With all their platitudes about sunshine laws and open debate, their platform was patched together in secrecy.

We have come here with the nomination sharply contested, with every opportunity for harsh disagreement, and we did all our work in front of television cameras, the press, and the people. We produced a platform we can be proud of. And we produced it in a way we can be proud of.

All the deception and contradiction in the Democrat platform, however, are nothing compared to the candidate himself.

As the proceedings began in New York, millions of Americans hoped the Democrat candidate would finally answer some of the questions he managed to avoid answering throughout the primary campaign. Their hopes were in vain.

The Democrat party gave its nomination to a political quick-change artist.

DEMOCRAT CANDIDATE NO TRUMAN

He claims to stand in the tradition of Harry Truman. But Harry Truman did not hide behind a fog of generalities. He did not feel compelled to tell people he was honest -- his record showed that he was honest. He didn't go around asking people to trust him -- he didn't give them any reason not to trust him.

When he went to the people, he spoke with one tongue and what he said in New Hampshire he said in New Mexico: He didn't have one view of civil rights for blacks and another for whites, he didn't have one policy for the poor and another one for the rich.

We know that our friends in the other party, no less than we in our party, love this country, seek its best interests, care for the prosperity of our people and the peace of our land.

As Republicans and Democrats, we differ on the policies required to achieve the common goals we share as Americans. But in the past, each has always known what the other stood for and where they stood.

That isn't the case now.

- 4 -

The Democrat party doesn't know what its candidate stands for.

The American people don't know.

And the Democrat candidate doesn't think we have a right to know.

He thinks it is wrong to question him. He says it is a sign of desperation on the part of those who would question him. He says we are avoiding the "issues" when we question him. He says it is a personal attack when we question him.

I have news for him. It isn't wrong, it isn't desperate, and it isn't personal.

It's democracy.

It's the way our American political system operates.

He may have gotten his party's nomination by default. But he's not going to get the Presidency that way.

We haven't convened in the "Show Me" State for nothing. The buck stops here and so does the baloney.

I am amazed at the candidate's defensiveness about the purity of his intentions and the impropriety of anyone questioning those intentions.

THE POWER OF ARROGANCE

In his critique of the early and middle 60's, Democrat Senator J. William Fulbright condemned what he called the arrogance of power. But the Democrat candidate for 1976 has shown that the arrogance of power is nothing compared to the power of arrogance.

Trust me, he says. I will never lie to you.

Where I come from, trust is something to be earned. In the meantime, I think we ought to cut the cards. We've had the New Deal, the Fair Deal and now somebody wants to give us a fast deal that would surely end in an ordeal.

When a man is as reluctant to be questioned as this one is, there is usually a reason. In this case, there are lots of reasons. The record shows the man is a mass of contradictions.

"TRUST ME"

Listen to his own words: "I have unique experience. One of the strongest and best of these is my relationship with poor people. That's where I come from."

Is that true?

Listen to what a report from the United Steelworkers Union says about the candidate's so-called unique experience with poverty: "Carter's family has long been among the wealthiest in Sumter County, Georgia. Carter's father was a wealthy landowner and politician who made his money 'sharecropping' out his land to impoverished blacks -- the most exploitative labor system in American agricultural history since slavery."

It goes on to say, "When his father died, Jimmy Carter inherited a fortune," and that he was the wealthiest of the Democrat candidates for President.

This is the man who goes about saying: "Trust me."

Listen to his words: "I'm the first child in my daddy's family who ever had a chance . . . My house had no running water or electricity."

And yet his autobiography says: ". . . adjacent to our house, between the house and store, we had a tennis court. . . ."

- 5 -

No running water -- and they had a tennis court.

When he went into the Presidential primaries, Carter said, "I do not favor a Constitutional amendment to prohibit busing. It would be divisive. It's an emotional issue."

And yet, when he was governor of Georgia, he asked the state legislature to propose a Constitutional amendment to prohibit busing.

Furthermore, he advocated a school boycott to support the proposal. Is that any way to handle a "divisive," "emotional" issue?

No.

When he spoke to the Democrat Governors in Washington last December, he said we should cancel the B-1 bomber.

But when he spoke in Omaha, headquarters of the Strategic Air Command, a few months later, he said he would continue development of the plane.

In 1970, he accused his opponent, Carl Sanders, of selling out to the "big unions" by favoring repeal of right-to-work laws.

In 1976, when he was asking for money to finance his battle against big labor in Pennsylvania, he told his money-raisers that he had not advocated repeal of Section 14-B.

Two weeks later in Wisconsin, looking for labor support, he said, "I think 14-B should be repealed, which would permit the abolition of right-to-work laws."

This is the man who asks Americans to trust him.

Can labor trust him?

No.

Can business trust him?

No.

In December, the New York Times was quoting him in favor of recognizing Cuba.

But, in January, speaking in Florida, where most of the Cuban expatriates are located, he was against recognizing Cuba.

You look at the record and you'll find the same contradictions on abortion, on his concern for minorities, on government reorganization -- the list goes on.

Look at his record on tax reform.

When he ran for Governor in 1970, he said, "My platform is based on no over-all tax increase."

But, when he became Governor, he proposed the state's first tax increase since 1955. During his term, per capita state tax collections increased by 51%.

Again and again and again, he indicts himself with his own words.

No wonder the man is complaining in advance that we're going to take a look at him.

But if you look hard enough, you will find a few statements you can rely on.

In his acceptance speech, for example, he said the primaries were "a kind of humbling experience . . ."

You bet they were. Every place he had any serious opposition, he got beat.

- 6 -

Which suggests that the Democrats aren't any happier with their candidate than we are.

Therefore, my friends, let us give Americans a candidate they can be happy with -- a candidate who will speak in public as he does in private, a candidate whose record matches his rhetoric, a candidate who will carry one story, one set of principles and one vision to all our people. This is the task that brings us here. It is an obligation we have always met before. It is a responsibility to which we are more than equal.

FUTURE STRONG AND GOOD

So my fellow Republicans, we gather here at the end of a turbulent eight years. It has been a time of trauma, yes -- but it has also been a time of triumph.

We have seen a long and vicious war ended, and the difficult work of peace well begun.

We have seen a nation stumbling in uncertainty about its basic institutions, but we have also seen a nation's faith in itself restored by wise and honest and patient leadership.

We cannot ignore the abuses of power of a number of recent national administrations, including our party.

But we know that the heart of this nation -- just as the heart of our own party -- is strong and good.

One of the greatest honors of my life was to have been able to serve for nearly two years as the Chairman of this Grand Old Party.

I believe I know the soul and the sinew of our party, and I know that those who believe we have already seen our finest hours have much to learn about the party of Abraham Lincoln, of Teddy Roosevelt, of Dwight Eisenhower . . .

We are a party of great men and women, yes. But, more importantly, we are a party of great principles.

We were born in the terrible struggle for freedom in America. In those days, the issue of human freedom was one which many did not understand -- or said they didn't. Today the struggle for human liberty goes on. Where once the issue was whether some could control the lives of others, today the issue is whether government should control the lives of all. And that issue remains to be resolved.

When Secretary Seward took the Emancipation Proclamation to President Lincoln for his signature, Lincoln took his pen, dipped it in the ink, moved his hand to the document and then withdrew his hand and dropped the pen. He did this twice and still had not signed the Proclamation.

Finally, he said to Seward: "I have been shaking hands since nine o'clock this morning, and my right arm is almost paralyzed. If my name ever goes into history, it will be for this Act, and my whole soul is in it. If my hand trembles when I sign the Proclamation, all who examine the document hereafter will say: 'He hesitated'."

OUR HERITAGE

My fellow Republicans, there is our heritage. In the largest sense, it is the American heritage, but I do believe that we as Republicans have a special obligation to be true to that heritage.

In the days and weeks ahead, we will question, examine, and debate the great issues of our time -- of social justice, of fiscal integrity, of national defense . . .

- 7 -

My fellow Republicans -- my fellow Americans, let us so conduct ourselves in this time, that if past generations should rise up to determine what we have done with the heritage they gave us -- we would be found worthy.

And let us so conduct ourselves in the defense of our heritage that when future generations look back at what we have done in this time, none will have cause to say: "They hesitated."