HRC DEBATE PREP 50+ QUESTIONS <u>December 13, 2015</u>

PERSONAL/POLITICAL

1. Trust/Authenticity: Can the American people trust you?	1
2. Don't agree on anything: Bernie said?	4
3. Emails: First question	6
4. Emails: Second question	7
5. Apologies: Why is it so hard for you to admit you made a mistake?	8
6. Clinton Foundation: Will WJC and Chelsea remain involved?	9
7. Big Govt: Is the Era of Big Government back?	10
8. Benghazi: What should you have done that you did not do?	11
9. Woman President: Does your gender make a difference?	14
10.Obama: What do you think Obama's biggest mistake has been?	15
11.Get things done/gridlock: How will you work with R Congress?	16
12.Get things done/vs Obama: What will you do differently?	17
13.Too Much Money: Does your wealth/Wall Street ties hurt you?	21
14.Trump: Why do you think Trump has been such a success?	22
DOMESTIC POLICY	
15.Cost of plans: How will you pay for your policies?	24
16.Capitalism/socialism redux: Should US be like Denmark?	31
17.Econ/Jobs: What is your plan to grow the economy and create jobs?	33
18.Inequality: How will you approach income inequality differently?	37
19.Minimum Wage: Why \$12 instead of \$15?	40
20.Wall Street: Why won't you call for reinstating Glass Steagall?	40
	42
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate?	50
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate?	50
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it?	50 55
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate?22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it?23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP?	50 55 61
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it? 23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP? 24.Rural: What will you do for rural America?	50 55 61 65
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it? 23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP? 24.Rural: What will you do for rural America? 25.Women/Families: What about small biz owner and paid leave?	50 55 61 65 69
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it? 23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP? 24.Rural: What will you do for rural America? 25.Women/Families: What about small biz owner and paid leave? 26.Immigration: How could you get Congress to pass reform?	50 55 61 65 69 72
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it? 23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP? 24.Rural: What will you do for rural America? 25.Women/Families: What about small biz owner and paid leave? 26.Immigration: How could you get Congress to pass reform? 27.K-12: Do you support the common core? Testing?	50 55 61 65 69 72 83
21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate? 22.Healthcare: Has Obamacare worked? What is wrong with it? 23.Trade: Did you flip-flop on the TPP? 24.Rural: What will you do for rural America? 25.Women/Families: What about small biz owner and paid leave? 26.Immigration: How could you get Congress to pass reform? 27.K-12: Do you support the common core? Testing? 28.K-12: Have you changed your position on charter schools?	50 55 61 65 69 72 83 84

32.Campaign Finance: Why do you have a SuperPAC in the primary?	96	
33.SuperPAC: Will you tell your SuperPACs not to attack Democrats?	98	
34.Criminal Justice: Were 90s policies to blame for mass incarceration?99		
35.Marijuana: Would you legalize marijuana?	104	
36.Gun violence prevention: How will you prevent gun violence?	106	
37.Energy & Climate Change: Why is your plan better?	111	
38.LGBT: Would you allow anyone to refuse to serve LGBT people?	117	
39.Abortion: Do you support a restriction on abortion after 20 weeks?	122	
40.Abortion: Do you continue to support fetal tissue research?	124	
41.Veterans: Are our veterans are getting the care they need?	125	
EODELCN DOLLOW		
FOREIGN POLICY		
42.Iraq: How can Americans trust you on war when you voted for Iraq?	128	
43.ISIS: What would you do to combat the threat from ISIS?	130	
44.Syria: Do you still support arming the resistance in Syria?	138	
45.Islam: Should we call this "Islamic terrorism"?	141	
46.Terrorism: Are we safer now than 7 years ago?	142	
47.Refugees: How would you approach Syrian refugees?	143	
48.Iran: What if Israel launched an attack on Iran?	144	
49.Libya: Do you have any regrets or second thoughts?	146	
50.Regime change: Are you too quick to support regime change?	148	
51.Russia: Do you think President Obama has been tough enough?	150	
52.China: What would you do to change US policy toward China?	154	
53.Af/Pak: Do you still support US troops in Afghanistan?	156	
54.Civil Liberties: Did you raise concerns publicly before Snowden?	158	
55.Encryption: Do you support mandatory backdoors for devices?	163	
56.Nuclear weapons: Why did you say it's the #1 natl security issue?	164	
57.Tech & ISIS: What would you do to disrupt ISIS online?	165	

HRC DEBATE PREP: 50+ Questions

PERSONAL/POLITICAL/GENERAL TOPICS

1. Trust/Authenticity/Flip-Flops: Whatever the question is.

- My entire life, I have been fighting for people even when I was told not to try. Like when I went to Beijing to speak out for women's rights over the objections of some in the U.S. government. Or when the pharmaceutical industry spent millions to defeat universal health coverage, but I kept fighting until we secured coverage for 8 million children with the Children's Health Insurance Program.
- When you fight to change the status quo, and take on powerful forces, people can come at you pretty hard. And through it all, the American people have learned that I never quit. And they can trust me to fight for them no matter what comes my way.
- Let me give you an example. When I first ran for the Senate, the first First Lady ever to run for Senate, people asked, can we trust you? I earned the trust of the people of New York and then, after they elected me, I fought my heart out for them every day. And I delivered. Better health coverage for our national guardsmen. \$20 billion in aid to help New York rebuild after 9/11. Helping rural upstate farmers sell their products in New York City. And when I ran for Senate a second time, they elected me with an even greater margin.
- Then, after I ran for President in 2008 against President Obama -- and there was a lot of water under *that* bridge -- he trusted me to be his Secretary of State ... and we made a great team.
- So here's what people can trust: they can trust that I'll fight for equal pay for women. They can trust that I will fight to raise incomes for families and raise the minimum wage. They can trust that I will take on the prescription

drug companies, so we can get families' costs under control. Everything I've told you in this campaign I will fight for, you can trust that I will give it my very best. Your fights will be my fights.

After a couple of attacks from Sanders (can't trust you to stand up to special interests) or O'Malley (poll tested not principled):

- I appreciate Senator Sanders/Governor O'Malley's strong feelings, but I don't need any lectures on courage/fighting for principles/leadership from either of them.
- I took on the insurance industry and the pharmaceutical companies to fight for universal health care in the '90s. They spent tens of millions of dollars to defeat health care and to attack me personally. But that didn't stop me. I kept fighting until we passed the Children's Health Insurance Program that covers eight million children.
- When I was First Lady, I took on the Government of China and some in our own government who didn't want me to speak out on women's rights at a UN Conference in Beijing. But I spoke out anyway because it was time someone told the truth about the sexual trafficking, forced marriages, and other outrages that women endure in too many countries.
- And I've taken on oppressive leaders all around the world, standing toe to toe, eye to eye, to condemn their human rights abuses and religious persecution and LGBT discrimination.
- So with all due respect, I have walked the walk and talked the talk on progressive principles, not just from the safety of a blue state but all over this country and all over the world. And that's exactly what I will do as President.

If Sanders or O'Malley really bear in on the flip-flop issue:

- My values have never changed I am still fighting for the same things today as I have for over three decades in public service. That doesn't mean our positions should stay static -- when we learn more, absorb new information, and take into account the many ways the world has changed.
- Everyone on this stage has changed, too.
 - Senator Sanders voted against Ted Kennedy's immigration reform bill in 2007 – but then voted for comprehensive reform in 2013.
 - When Governor O'Malley was mayor of Baltimore, his police department made mass arrests—and now he champions criminal justice reform.
- That's a good thing. It's what separates us from the Republicans. Some of those folks sound like they haven't changed their views on women's rights since at least the 1950s—or their views on the economy even after their policies drove us into the ditch. We're Democrats we believe in evidence and I'm certainly not going to apologize for that!

- 2. "Virtually Everything": Senator Sanders once said "I disagree with Hillary Clinton on virtually everything." [OR: Any question that is an invitation to explain that Sanders overblows the differences and that the real differences are with the Republicans].
 - Senator Sanders even said once that he "disagrees with [me] on virtually everything."
 - I was VERY surprised to hear that he said that.
 - If Senator Sanders disagrees with me on virtually everything, then he disagrees with me that:
 - o Women should have the right to make their own health care decisions
 - o That climate change is real, and we need to take action
 - o That we need criminal justice reform
 - o That women should get equal pay for equal work
 - So, I don't think its true that we disagree on virtually everything. We definitely do disagree on *some* things for example, gun control and the NRA. I was for the Brady Bill, he voted against it five times. I am against immunity for gun manufacturers, he supports it.
 - But if I had to name a person I disagree with on "virtually everything," I would probably pick someone like Ted Cruz. Not one of my democratic primary opponents.
 - We just can't lose sight of the fact that the real battle in this election will be joined in 2016 with the Republicans what unites us in this primary is so much greater than what divides us. But what divides us from the Republicans will be what this election is really about.

In the first debate you said Republicans were your enemies. (Or, O'Malley: I don't think of Republicans as my enemies.)

- [Smile] My goodness, I was having a lighthearted moment when I said that. Look, my dad was a Republican.
- Here's the reality: I will work with anyone if it means getting things done and moving our country forward.
 - I worked with Congressman Tom DeLay—an extremely conservative Republican—to reform our foster care system. I worked with Lindsay Graham to expand healthcare coverage – Tricare – to National Guardsmen and women.
 - With John McCain to raise funds for a rehab facility for wounded warriors at Fort Sam Houston.
- But even as I know how to find common ground, I know how important it is to stand my ground against policies that would do serious damage to our country.
- And listening to the Republican debate, what they had to say about their own plans was alarming. Donald Trump said that working people's "wages are too high" in America. And not one of them disagreed. Who are these people talking to?
- And then, get this, the Republican candidates said that they believe that the
 economic crash of 2008 happened because there was too much oversight of
 Wall Street, not too little. I thought at first they were joking. But they
 weren't.
- These are the differences that this election is really about. The next President will have to do both fight for what will move this country forward *and* fight against the forces that want to take us backward.

3. Emails: First question (whatever the question is)

- I appreciated what Senator Sanders said in the last two debates that people are sick and tired of hearing about my emails. Thank you, Bernie, for recognizing that.
- The people who are not sick and tired of discussing my emails are the Republicans.
- In October, I testified before Congress and answered questions for 11 hours. I answered every question they had. And at the end of it all, when they had their press conference, and the Committee Chairman admitted that they couldn't name a single new thing they had learned in those 11 hours.
- So why are the House Republicans still talking about this? Why have they spent almost \$5 million of your tax dollars? Because they think it benefits them politically to try to hurt me. They have admitted this and bragged about it publicly.
- So while the Republicans talk about <u>my</u> email, I am going to keep talking about how we are going to solve <u>your</u> problems. How to make sure wages go up and college debt goes down. Equal pay for women and affordable prescription drugs for seniors.
- These things are why the Republicans are fighting so hard against me now because they know that these are the things I have fought for all my life and they know how hard I will fight for them if I am president.

If Sanders comes hard:

• I think I preferred Senator Sanders' answer when we were on stage together in Las Vegas for the first debate. But I guess what happened in Vegas stayed in Vegas.

4. Emails: Second question (whatever the question is)

- [SHORT specific answer to specific question asked....]
 - o If *FBI*: The Department of Justice is working through their process.
 - o If "are you blaming the Republicans": just start with answer below.
 - o If why are you going to Congress: I've been asking for a year to go to Congress and testify, and I plan to keep my word. But...
 - o If *deleting personal emails*: I've turned over everything that is work related, and the State Department has already returned hundreds of pages that they have deemed to be personal. I didn't need to retain my personal emails, so I didn't. But...
 - o If *are there more shoes to drop*: I've turned over all of my work-related emails, and the Department is working through them. That's their process. But...
- But after that hearing a couple weeks ago, where I answered every question they had, there can be no more doubt about what is really going on here. The Republicans in Congress are running one of the longest investigations in our history. They've spent 4.9 million dollars in taxpayer money. And they've admitted it's all about politics.
- Now, I will let the Republicans keep talking about my emails if that is what they want to do. But I am going to keep talking about you tonight and every day of this campaign.

- <u>5. Apologies</u>: It took you a long time to apologize for your Iraq war vote, but you finally did. It took you a long time to apologize for conducting government business on a private email server, but you finally did. Why is it so hard for you to admit you made a mistake?
 - I believe the most important thing is to take responsibility for your actions. But it's just as important to learn from your mistakes.
 - When I was First Lady and fought to secure universal health care, we didn't succeed, and I still have the scars to show for it. But I kept on fighting, and worked with Ted Kennedy and with Republicans to help create the Children's Health Insurance Program, which today covers eight million children.
 - After I lost the 2008 primary, President Obama asked me to be his Secretary of State. He put his trust and faith me and I was honored to work for him and for our country.
 - I've always believed—and I learned this from my mom—that everybody falls down. Everybody makes mistakes. But what matters most is whether you pick yourself up and keep on fighting for what you believe in.

- <u>6. Clinton Foundation</u>: If you become President, will the Foundation that bears your name continue to raise funds from foreign governments? From companies that have business before your administration? And will your husband and daughter be involved with those private donors?
 - The Clinton Foundation has done amazing work for so many people and that work should and must continue.
 - At the same time, as President, I won't permit any conflicts between my work for the American people and the Foundation's good work. So I'll do whatever it takes to avoid conflicts.
 - But I am so proud of Bill and Chelsea. More than 9 million people can get more affordable medicine to treat HIV and AIDS because of the Clinton Foundation. Millions of American children have access to healthier food. Women entrepreneurs are starting businesses around the world.
 - The work of the Clinton Foundation is changing lives and saving lives and I don't want that work to ever stop.

- 7. <u>Big Govt</u>: Sec. Clinton, your husband once famously said that the Era of Big Government is over. But in this campaign, all of the Democratic candidates are proposing hundreds of billions if not trillions in new spending and massive tax hikes. Is the Era of Big Government back?
 - Republicans talk about Big Government to distract people from focusing on how little they do for working Americans. The Republicans certainly don't cry "big government" when they are proposing subsidies for oil companies; or protecting tax loopholes for big corporations; or trying to interfere with women's right to make her own health care choices.
 - I want to keep building on the things that our government does well and fix the things that don't to make sure we have a smart government that works for all of us.
 - That means health insurance for millions of Americans. Clean air and clean water. Investing in cutting-edge research and cures for diseases. Requiring mortgage lenders to explain what they're selling in plain English.
 - [Potential contrast]: All of us on the stage share this same basic belief a faith that government can and should be a force for good. But there are differences between us. I believe that we can achieve great things as a country without several trillions of dollars in new spending, without adding to the debt, and without raising taxes on working people and middle class families.

- <u>8. Benghazi</u>: Is there anything you should have done, as Secretary of State, that you did not do, that might have saved the lives of the four diplomatic personnel lost at Benghazi?
 - This is deeply personal for me. I asked Chris Stevens to go to Libya as our Ambassador and the loss of Chris and the other three Americans who died was devastating to me personally, to the State Department family, and to the United States.
 - Sending people into harm's way is the hardest choice a leader has to make. Far and away, my greatest regret from my time as Secretary of State is that not everyone who went into the field came home safely.
 - There are many in the Republican Party who have used this tragedy to try to score political points. The four Americans who died in Benghazi were all extraordinary people who wanted only to serve our country. The truest way we have to honor them is not to cook up conspiracy theories, or appropriate their memories for political purposes, but to do better for those who continue their work.
 - There are also some who take the attack in Benghazi as a sign that we should pull back from our overseas engagements. Retreat is not the answer. It won't make the world any safer. And it's just not who we are as Americans.

If pressed: But what exactly are you taking responsibility for?

- I have lost a lot of sleep thinking about what I could have done differently, or any of us could have done differently.
- To me, taking responsibility meant getting to the bottom of what happened and doing everything I could to make sure it didn't happen again.

TRICKY BENGHAZI QUESTIONS

You appeared to say at your Benghazi hearing that the State Department was the source for your claim that 90-95 percent of your emails were captured by the State Department. But the State Department says that is not true. What is the basis for your claim?

- Of the more than 30,000 emails that I provided to the State Department last year, more than 90 percent were sent to or from a state.gov email address. That is clear from looking at the emails that were provided for release by the Department. These messages would have been captured in the State Department's record system. It has since been learned that the State Department's archiving system did not maintain every email, but that does not change the fact that these messages were captured by State's system and thus should have been available.
- [Pivot to issues]

At your hearing in October, you also seemed to explain what happened to the missing 15 emails between you and Sid Blumenthal, suggesting you had no reason to consider them work-related. Does this mean that you in fact deleted them as personal?

- That is not what I said. The fact of the matter is, any emails from Sid that I had, I provided to the State Department.
- [PIVOT TO AFFIRMATIVE EMAIL ANSWER ABOVE]

Your email with your daughter on the night of September 11, 2012 suggests that you considered the attack to be an act of terrorism and yet days later, you received the caskets at Andrews Air Force and again referred to the video. Doesn't this prove that you were covering up the true motivation for the attack?

- Before I sent that email, it has been widely and publicly reported that Ansar al-Sharia, a terrorist organization, claimed responsibility online. They subsequently retracted that claim.
- The very next day I called it an "attack by heavily armed militants" on our compound. The President spoke of an act of terror in his remarks the next day as well.
- But that first night, it was important that we send a clear message to countries across the region, because we had reason to believe that there could be attacks at other embassies as well. And there were.

Senator Rubio has said your emails with your daughter proves you to be a liar. Why did you mislead the victims' families if you privately believed it was terrorism?

- I'm not surprised that Senator Rubio would go on the attack. I'm sure his advisors told him that recycling conspiracy theories would help him boost his standing with the far right wing of his party.
- This ground has been covered for years and it was covered again last week. This was the fog of war. There was a lot of different information coming in. My public and private statements reflect what we understood at different points during that week. The same goes for Susan Rice.
- And what eventually emerged is a mixed picture that suggests that this was BOTH a terrorist attack AND the video played a role. And the terrorist ringleader we captured has cited the video as a cause.

- <u>9. Woman President</u>: There are two men up here, plus you. Should voters vote for you because you are a woman? Does your gender make a difference?
 - Of course it does. First, I think it would make an enormous difference to women and girls in this country and around the world who are wondering when the most powerful country on Earth is going to use some of that power to break through the hardest and highest glass ceiling.
 - Being a woman *does* make a difference it is impossible for me to separate
 my experiences as a woman from who I am and the kind of leader I would
 be.
 - Because I have seen the injustices that women *still* face in this country today
 when they earn 77 cents for every dollar that a man earns.
 - I have seen the tremendous pressures that working moms face, when they try to juggle a job, children at home. Perhaps a call from school that their child is sick and needs to come home. Or a call from an aging parent that they need a ride to the doctor. I know what it is like to try to balance all of that.
 - We need a President who is going to take this on, and keep fighting for women, for children, for families. I'm tired of Republicans saying I'm playing the gender card when I talk about these issues. If fighting for child care and paid leave and equal pay are playing the gender card, then deal me in.

.

10.Obama: What do you think President Obama's biggest mistake has been?

- Let me start by saying that I don't think President Obama gets nearly enough credit. When he took office, we were losing 800,000 jobs a month. Now we've seen 66 straight months of job growth. The unemployment rate is down to 5%. And the auto industry is thriving.
- And he won the seemingly impossible fight to finally get health insurance for millions more Americans. Made real progress on climate change.
 Protected DREAMers from deportation. Did so much we can be proud of.
 All in the face of relentless Republican obstruction and opposition.
- Obviously there have been places where I disagree with the President –and I've said that. I disagree with his decision to allow oil companies to drill in the Arctic.
- But I'm not running for President Obama's third term—or for my husband's. I'm running for my <u>first</u> term. And I've laid out an ambitious agenda to create good-paying jobs, raise incomes, expand fairness and dignity for working families and help them meet the new challenges they face.

- 11. Getting Things Done/Gridlock in Washington: Most pundits believe that at least one, if not both, houses of Congress will remain in Republican hands after 2016. What will you do differently from what President Obama did to get a Republican Congress to act on your proposals?
 - Since I started at the Children's Defense Fund 40 years ago, I've always done things the same way.
 - I start with my values that when families are strong, America is strong.
 - o <u>I really listen to people</u>—to understand the challenges they face.
 - And then I get to work -- to figure out solutions so that we can meet those challenges together.
 - I've worked across the aisle to get things done and I don't quit when the decisions are hard or the negotiations get tough. I know how to find common ground and I know when to stand my ground.
 - When I was First Lady, I worked with Congressman Tom DeLay—an
 extremely conservative Republican—to reform our foster care system.
 Because we both saw that too many children were falling through the cracks.
 - When I got to the Senate, I worked with people who had criticized me in the
 past. I partnered with Lindsey Graham to expand health care for National
 Guard members. In fact, nearly every Republican I served with co-sponsored
 at least one of my bills. At State, I worked with Republican Dick Lugar to
 pass a treaty that reduced our nuclear arsenal to the lowest level in 50 years.
 - And I know when to stand my ground. I stood up to President Bush when he
 tried to privatize Social Security. And when he tried to keep women from
 getting the morning-after pill over the counter. Because we just can't afford
 to play politics with retirement security and women's health.
 - Finding common ground when I can standing my ground when I must that's how I'll get things done for all Americans as President.

- 12. Getting Things Done/Obama Failed: How will you get things done where Obama fell short? He'll leave office having not secured a deal to fix the immigration system; will likely not succeed in reforming gun laws...etc.
 - First of all, I don't think President Obama gets nearly the credit he deserves. He got a lot done. He dug our economy out of the Great Recession. Saved the auto industry. Passed the Affordable Care Act. Established new rules of the road for Wall Street. And got America's economy back on its feet 13 million new private sector jobs.
 - So while the last two Democratic presidents had to spend a lot of time cleaning up after Republican Administrations [or Presidents named Bush], the next Democratic president will have the opportunity to build on progress already made. And that's what I will do.
 - I know how to find common ground across the aisle to get things done. I know how to work with governors, mayors, nonprofits, and the private sector—and that's what it's going to take to address the biggest economic challenge we face and get wages rising again for hardworking Americans.
 - But I also know when to stand my ground. If Congress won't act on comprehensive immigration reform, I'll use executive authority to protect more hardworking immigrants from deportation. If they won't take on the scourge of gun violence, I will close the gun show and Internet sales loopholes through executive action.

Sanders: The Way to Get Things Done is a Political Revolution.

• I agree with Senator Senators – we have to mobilize the American people. That's what I've been talking about on this campaign. And that's what separates Democrats from Republicans.

- We Democrats want everyone who is eligible to vote to get out there and vote and have their voices heard. That's why I've proposed that every American should be automatically registered to vote when he or she turns eighteen.
- But Republicans don't want more people to vote; they want fewer. I think what Republican governors and legislatures have been doing across the country is shameful. Cutting back on early voting, requiring an ID to vote and then closing down the drivers' license centers where you get it. It's hurting African-Americans, women, and young people.
- You have to really stop and think what does it mean about a party's plans and ideas if they want fewer people to vote on them? What part of democracy are they afraid of?
- So we have to mobilize people. But actually breaking the gridlock will require leadership. And tenacity. Being able to go the distance. That's what I've always done and it's what I'll do as President.

KEY POINTS/BACKGROUND: Getting Things Done

YOUR "Getting Things Done" Narrative

- Over my years in public life, I've come to understand that you need to know how to find common ground, like I did...
 - When I worked with Ted Kennedy and Republican Senator Orrin Hatch as First Lady, to create the Children's Health Insurance Program, which covers 8 million kids. Or with Republican Congressman Tom DeLay to reform the foster care system.
 - When I worked with Lindsey Graham, as a Senator from New York, to expand health coverage to National Guardsmen and women when they aren't on active duty. 360,000 people are enrolled in such coverage today.
 - o Or to get \$20 billion in aid for New York, to help it rebuild after 9/11.
 - When I worked with Republicans and Democrats to make it easier for family members to use the Family and Medical Leave Act to care for severely wounded soldiers.
 - And when John McCain and I teamed up to raise funds for to build a state-of-the-art rehabilitation facility for wounded warriors.
 - o When I secured 13 Republican votes to ratify the NEW START treaty and built the international coalition to put in place the toughest sanctions regime in history, ultimately bringing Iran to the table to negotiate the nuclear deal.
- And you need to know how to stand your ground, like I did...
 - When I sat in the Situation Room and advocated that the President authorize the raid that took out Osama bin Laden.
 - When I pressured the Bush FDA to keep Plan B available over the counter.
 - When I fought for women at home and abroad, telling the world "women's rights are human rights."

- When I called out leaders who threatened Internet freedom and invested in helping digital activists in more than 40 countries with oppressive governments.
- When President Obama and I gate-crashed a secret meeting to bring the Chinese, the Indians, and the Brazilians to the table to agree for the first time to curb their carbon pollution in Copenhagen.
- But I've always fought for the same things—to give every child the chance to live up to his or her God-given potential. To strengthen American families. To stand up for women. And to address the challenges that keep families up at night. That's why...
 - o I helped start HIPPY, a program to support low-income families in Arkansas, that today works in 21 states, helps thousands of kids, and boots a child's lifetime earnings by more than \$40,000, at a cost of just \$3,500 per child.
 - o I launched the Arkansas Single Parent Scholarship Fund, which has awarded more than 33,000 scholarships to single parents to help them go to college.
 - o I pushed for a federal law to mandate insurers pay for new moms to stay in the hospital for at least 48 hours after they give birth
 - I helped New York farmers and rural small businesses expand their horizons through a Farm to Fork and an e-commerce program.

- 13.Too Much Money: At a time when Democratic voters are looking for a more populist direction, what do you say to those who say that the tens of millions you and your husband have made from speaking fees; the close association with top Wall Street supporters; the big money donors and so on make you the wrong choice for this time?
 - Bill and I have been very fortunate. Neither of us came from wealthy families. We're really grateful for the opportunities we've had.
 - But this election is about the American people and who they can count on to fight for them.
 - I took on big drug companies and insurance companies in the 1990s when I fought for universal health care. I called out Wall Street for rising foreclosures that were kicking people out of their homes when I was a Senator from New York. I challenged the world 20 years ago in China to recognize that women's right are human rights and human rights are women's rights.
 - Whether we're talking about big companies, big countries, big challenges—I don't shrink from a fight.
 - That's why I'm taking on the pharmaceutical companies who are gouging families on their prescription drugs. That's why I'm taking on the corporations who want to buy our elections and the Republicans who want to stop you from voting. That's what I'm fighting for.

14.Trump/Republican GOP candidates: Why do you think Donald Trump has been such a success this year? Do you think that Trump's appeal and Sen. Sanders' appeal are related -- both outsiders?

- [If Sanders is the prompt]: Please, let's not even mention Senator Sanders and Donald Trump in the same sentence. I have my disagreements with Senator Sanders but I will defend him against any efforts to compare him to Donald Trump!
- I can't think of any candidate for President in my lifetime who has said as many, insulting, and offensive things about as many Americans as Donald Trump has in this campaign. What he is practicing isn't politics it's poison. He called hardworking immigrants "rapists' and "drug dealers". He demeaned women. He mocked the disabled. He proposed forcing every Muslim American to be on a watchlist.
- His campaign is not about Making America Great it is about spreading
 Hate in America. I'm proud to have been the first person on this stage to
 speak out against his hate months ago and I am proud to do that tonight.
 When we stand up against this hate, we stand up for true American values.
- What is more, the real danger goes beyond what Donald Trump has said. It is that the other Republican candidates agree with him on issue after issue.
- Every single Republican running for President supports more tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and the largest corporations.
- They all want to repeal the Affordable Care Act which the Republicans in Congress have voted to do 54 times. And throw 18 million people off their health coverage.
- They all want to let Wall Street go back to writing its own rules—either by repealing Dodd-Frank, or knocking its teeth out.

- They all want to defund Planned Parenthood. And to let politicians interfere with women's deeply personal healthcare choices.
- And none of them supports a *true* path to citizenship. Or full equality and non-discrimination for LGBT Americans.
- I think it is pretty clear what the real choice in this election is about. There are differences between us on this stage and yes, those differences are important. But it is night and day between us and the Republicans.

DOMESTIC POLICY

15. What Does It All Cost: Secretary Clinton, how will you pay for your plans? Be specific.

- Right now, in America, we have the opportunity and the responsibility to do big things to help families get ahead and stay ahead. Families haven't gotten a raise, but their costs for everything from health care to college are going up.
- I think we can accomplish a lot together, and my plans are ambitious. The difference is who pays. I think we can do this *without* taxing the middle class. Because what the middle class needs right now is a raise, not a tax hike.
- So I have an agenda that will rebuild our nation's infrastructure, invest in clean energy and manufacturing and create millions of good-paying jobs.
 Make college affordable for every American, and tackle the crushing burden of student debt. Build on the Affordable Care Act to rein in out-of-pocket costs.
- But I will pay for my proposals by asking the wealthiest Americans to pay their fair share –not the middle class. I'll close the special tax loophole for hedge fund managers. Require millionaires to pay at least 30% of their income in taxes. End tax breaks for big corporations that help them stash money overseas.
- Some have said it takes "courage" to tax the middle class; I disagree. Courage means standing up to the wealthiest and most powerful and calling on them to pay their fair share, so that our country and our families can get ahead.

Moderator follow up

If pressed on the total costs of YOUR plans, in terms of new spending or new taxes:

• I believe we need to make new investments in our country and we can't afford to wait—in our infrastructure, in sectors like advanced manufacturing and clean energy, and in our own people through education and access to quality, affordable health care. That is how we'll create good paying jobs, and get incomes rising again.

- All together, the investments I've proposed will total around \$100 billion a year, and I've identified ways to pay for all of it, without adding to the debt and without raising taxes on the middle class.
- So I invite everyone to go to my website, **Hillaryclinton.com**, where I've laid out my specific ideas for how we're going to get things done.

If pressed on: many progressives and economists have said that by making a pledge not to tax households making under \$250k, you cannot accomplish big things. President Obama made a similar pledge in 2008, and it arguably prevented him from passing bold initiatives like paid leave.

- President Obama did make a similar commitment in 2008, as did I not to raise taxes on middle-class families. And he has gotten some big things done. The Affordable Care Act. Progress toward student loan reform. New investments in clean energy, to bring our dependence on foreign oil to its lowest point in decades.
- [Pivot to above: ... I think we can accomplish a lot. My plans are ambitious; the difference is who pays for them.]

If pressed on: does your pledge mean a tobacco tax, higher cigarette tax, tax on sugary soda, gasoline tax, or congestion tax, are all off the table?

• There are certain proposals like increasing the excise tax for tobacco, or for other products with negative impacts on health and safety, that I would put in a different category. Fees like those are really aimed at changing behavior and improving public health outcomes. I have not proposed anything like that yet, but I would not take it off the table.

• If carbon tax: That's not part of my plan. I will slash subsidies for oil and gas development and reform existing federal leases to ensure taxpayers are getting a fair deal for development on public lands. I have a comprehensive, ambitious plan to tackle climate change starting on day one using the laws and authorities we already have. [Pivot to goals]

Back and forth with Sanders

Sanders: I don't need to go much further than the top 1% of the whole country, to pay for my proposals.

- With all due respect, I just don't think Senator Sanders is being forthright about the impact of his plans. Multiple experts have concluded he's proposing around \$18 or \$19 trillion in new spending. That's almost a 40% increase in the federal budget—which will inevitably mean raising taxes on the middle class. Any suggestion to the contrary isn't being straight with the American people.
- Now, I have a different view. I think we should be raising peoples' wages, not their taxes. And that's why [pivot to general economic message].

ONLY IF he mentions Denmark or Scandinavia.

- I respect Senator Sanders. But I have to say, I'm concerned about the model he is holding up for how this all can work. He just mentioned [Denmark or Scandanavia.]
- Denmark has the highest tax burden of any developed country in the world. Middle class families pay 55% tax rates, and then on top of that, a 25% sales tax. Now, I'm not saying that he's going to do precisely what is done in Denmark, but that's what it costs in the country he holds up as his example.

ONLY IF he mentions paid leave and a "cup of coffee":

• I take a backseat to no one in terms of guaranteeing paid family and medical leave. I just think we can do it without asking the middle class to pay.

• So that's where we disagree – Senator Sanders believes the middle class should foot most of the bill, I don't. But we agree on the need for a plan that gives workers 12 weeks of paid leave and seven paid sick days a year. This isn't just the right thing to do, it's the smart thing to do...

ONLY IF he cites his healthcare proposal, and says it will cost a family making \$50k only \$1k in taxes, and they'll save \$5k in premiums:

- This is what I mean about being forthright about the plans we lay out. Senator Sanders has proposed a health care bill in Congress several times since 1995 in fact, 9 separate times. And when you take a hard look at that bill, it actually introduces a \$4,500 tax increase on a family making \$50,000 a year.
- And it's not at all clear that he could deliver any benefits in return. Working families are going to be asked to pay more in taxes on the hope that this whole plan works. But it's a plan that turns control of everyone's healthcare over to states including Republican governors like Paul LePage and Terry Branstad.
- And not only that, even if the whole system does work, there will be a lot of working people will *still* be significantly worse off than they are under the Affordable Care Act. They will be asked to pay much more in taxes, without getting any new benefits.
- So I don't think we should be start over. We should be building on the Affordable Care Act.

Sanders: I am disappointed that Secretary Clinton is proposing policies that are "Republican lite." That she is now backing off of single payer. And parting with the Democrats in Congress on paid leave. We need to go a lot further.

- [If he says "Republican lite"]: I am sure Donald Trump and Ted Cruz would be surprised to hear you say I sound like a Republican!
- But honestly, I'm glad that Senator Sanders has recently become a Democrat. I just don't think that gives him the right to lecture anyone on whether their ideals are true to the party. I've spent my life fighting for the ideals of the Democratic Party. And that's what I am proposing now. Build on President Obama's successes with the Affordable Care Act, and make it better. Build on the President's successes to expand college access by ensuring that no student who will have to borrow money for tuition at a public college. Build on the work of President Kennedy and Johnson to expand access to affordable child care.

BACKGROUND: ECONOMY / PLANS

KEY FACTS:

Sanders' Proposals: What Does it all Cost?

The following external estimates have now been made for the total cost of Sanders' plans:

Washington Post (11/13/15): \$18.5 trillion, including:

- \$15 trillion for healthcare spending
- \$3.5 trillion in other spending, including \$1 trillion in infrastructure.

Wall Street Journal (9/14/15): \$18 trillion, including:

- \$15 trillion for healthcare spending
- \$1 trillion for infrastructure spending
- \$1.2 trillion for Social Security spending
- \$750 billion for college
- \$319 billion in paid leave

Austan Goolsbee (11/13/15): likely over \$20 trillion, due to \$5 trillion in non-health spending. In addition to the WSJ piece, he includes:

- \$700-800 billion for energy (through rebates for his proposed carbon tax, and new energy investments)
- \$500 billion \$1 trillion in childcare (but one plan considered universal was \$1.6 trillion)
- \$70 billion in pre-k

Tallying it all up, Senator Sanders' plans cost \$18-20 trillion over the next 10 years. An additional \$18 trillion in spending is a 37% increase in the federal budget, and calls for a 43% increase in federal taxes, over the next decade.

Senator Sanders' recent claims about the costs of his plans:

- Claims he will raise \$6 trillion in new revenue over 10 years, half from the FTT, from corporations and the wealthy. (USA Today, 11/25/15)
- Continues to assert that he does not "have to go much further" than taxing the top 1% to pay for his campaign proposals. (ABC, *This Week*, 10/18/15).

BACKGROUND: ECONOMY / PLANS

• Still will not identify the top marginal tax rate: "We haven't come up with an exact number yet, but it will not be as high as the number under Dwight D. Eisenhower, which was 90 percent." (Iowa Debate)

- Still has NOT provided details of his healthcare plan beyond the bill he has introduced 9 times, or his universal childcare plan.
- Claims the healthcare bill he introduced in the Senate would mean a family making \$50,000 → pays \$1,100 in new taxes, but saves \$5,173 in not paying premiums.
- Still will not specify if his single-payer plan would raise tax increases for middle class families. "It will be progressive and based on the ability to pay," according to his policy director. (USA Today, 11/25/15).

Sanders' Proposals: Who Will Pay?

Our econ team conducted an analysis of raising \$19 trillion over 10 years from the wealthy (we used \$19 to be conservative). The findings were that to raise \$19 trillion over 10 years from the wealthy, Sanders would need to impose extraordinary increases in their effective federal tax rates. Namely:

- To raise \$19 trillion from the top 1%, those earning over \$737,000 in 2020, we would have to raise their effective federal tax rate from 33% to 87%. If you include state and local taxes, of about 9%, you are talking about taxing close to 100% of income.
- To raise \$19 trillion from the top 5%, those earning over \$300,000 in 2020, we would have to raise their effective federal tax rate from 30% to 62%.
- To raise the money from the top 20%, those earning over \$150,000 in 2020, we would have to raise their effective federal tax rate from 26% to 44%.

Bottom line: The truth is that it is virtually impossible to fund all of Sanders' plans from the top 1% of the income scale. We would first need to increase those individuals' effective federal tax rates to 87%. And then, when you consider their state and local taxes, you are talking about taxing close to 100% of their income. The middle class is going to have to share some part of the burden.

- 16.Capitalism/Socialism Redux: Senator Sanders you have defended your position as a democratic socialist in recent weeks, pointing to President Roosevelt and to countries that are able to guarantee healthcare, college, and other services for their people. Is America ready for a socialist president?
- I just have a different view from Senator Sanders. I believe in American capitalism. Let's be clear: When we talk about capitalism, we are talking about the foundation of the American economy and the American dream.
- From the smallest businesses like my dad's ... to innovative companies like Apple to traditional companies like Corning, a 160-year old company in upstate New York that makes the glass in smartphones.
- That's American capitalism. It built the greatest middle class on Earth.
- But from time to time we absolutely need to rein it in because despite progress we've made, the system is still out of whack. We have to make sure Wall Street serves Main Street and not the other way around. We need to make sure that opportunity is as universal as talent.
- And sometimes, we need to step in to save capitalism from itself, as Teddy Roosevelt did and Franklin Roosevelt, and other great Democratic presidents. Get American capitalism working for American families again. That's what I intend to do as President.

KEY FACTS:

Comparative middle-class taxes

- Denmark imposes a top income tax rate of around 55%, on top of a VAT of 25%. The 55% income tax applies to any family making \$65,000 or more. For families making below that, the income tax rate is about 40%, comprised of a labor market tax (8%), a health care tax (5%), a municipal tax (25%), and a church tax (an additional 15% income tax is added to income exceeding about \$65,000). The 25% value-added tax is similar to a sales tax, but assessed at each level of production. (For some goods, the tax is much higher—Denmark has a 180% tax on car purchases).
- Sweden has a top income tax rate of around 55%, on top of a VAT of 25%. The 55% income rate applies to families making over \$70,000.

Comparative overall tax burden

- Denmark has the highest overall tax burden of any OECD country as a share of GDP at 48.6%.
- Sweden has the fifth highest overall tax burden of any OECD country as a share of GDP at 43%.
- The OECD average tax burden as a share of GDP is 34%. In the United States, it is 25%.

Business climate

• Forbes has repeatedly found Denmark to be the best country in the world to start a business. Denmark waives or significantly reduces many taxes (VAT, vehicle tax) for businesses and the Danish government does a lot to encourage start-ups to move to Denmark. Sanders may be prepared to deploy this fact on the debate stage, though he has not referenced it in press.

17. Econ/Jobs: What is your plan to grow the economy and create jobs?

- Wages haven't budged in years, but the cost of everything keeps going up ...child care, college, prescription drugs, you name it. Families are working harder just to stay in place. I think America's supposed to be a place where if people work hard, they can get ahead and stay ahead.
- So first, I'll make the investments we need to create more good paying jobs. Invest in infrastructure and innovation and small business. Take the tax breaks Republicans give to big oil and develop more clean energy. Boost research. Advanced manufacturing.
- Second, I'll make sure that work pays. Raise the minimum wage. Ensure equal pay. And I've got a new idea—to reward companies that share profits with their employees.
- Third, I'll make our tax system fairer. I'll close loopholes for Wall Street money managers, oil companies and millionaires. And give tax relief to the middle class.
- Fourth, I'll fight for policies that help parents balance work and family. Like universal pre-K and paid leave and more support for people who take time out of the workforce to care for kids or elderly parents.
- Finally, I'll help more young adults by making college affordable, expanding apprenticeships, and keeping student debt from holding people back.
- That's my plan, and I'm going to wake up every day fighting for families, fighting for fairness, fighting for you.

Small business / Ex-Im / NMTC contrast:

- I want to be the small business president. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy. I can't tell you how many people I've met here in New Hampshire, and across the country, who want to start or expand a small business but can't. Because it's too hard to get a loan. Because they have student debt. Because the deck is stacked against them.
- Or because politics in Washington are standing in the way. Take the Export-Import bank. Since 2007, it has supported more than \$400 million in exports from small businesses in New Hampshire. Like Boyle Energy Services & Technologies in Concord, which relies on loans from the Bank to compete for energy projects around the world against huge companies like Chevron.
- This is a place where Senator Sanders and I disagree. He has consistently opposed the Ex-Im Bank. Even though every other advanced economy has programs to help their businesses export. And 95 percent of our potential customers are overseas.
- And I want to expand the New Markets Tax Credit, which Senator Sanders also voted against. This is a successful program that steers investment to struggling communities. Here in New Hampshire, it has resulted in over \$200 million of economic activity from redeveloping mill buildings in Claremont, to building the thriving Midstate Health Center in Plymouth.

OPPONENT POSITIONS:

• **Sanders**: \$15 minimum wage; expanded overtime; strengthen right to organize; "reverse" bad trade deals like NAFTA, PNTR and oppose new ones. He has proposed a \$1 trillion infrastructure/jobs program (over a decade), and a \$5.5 billion (over 1 year) youth jobs program (over a year). He will use talk of a political or economic "revolution." He will mention taxing billionaires and big corporations, his FTT. HRC = establishment.

• **O'Malley**: \$15 minimum wage; expanded overtime; more collective bargaining rights; "good trade deals not bad ones" – like Korea. <u>He will tout his Maryland record</u>: raised minimum wage to \$10.10, made Maryland "the number one state in innovation and entrepreneurship."

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS:

- YOU have been a champion for hardworking families and people for three decades in public life. Helped create early Head Start; worked with Sen. Ted Kennedy to pass SCHIP; as Senator from New York, helped farmers sell products and connect small businesses to international markets; as Secretary of State, fought back against unfair trade practices from China and exports increased 50% during YOUR time there.
- Contrast with Sanders on Export-Import Bank: I strongly support the Export-Import Bank, which supported 1.3 million jobs over the last 6 years, both directly at businesses and indirectly throughout the supply chain. Senator Sanders disagrees he allowed it to expire this year, and said the Ex-Im bank is "corporate welfare at its worst."
 - While 90% of Ex-Im's transactions help small businesses, 81% of the dollar volume of transactions in FY 2013 went to medium and large businesses, and 76% of the dollar volume went to the top 10 beneficiaries.
 - Boeing received the largest amount of assistance in FY 2013 of any single company, at \$8.3 billion; other major beneficiaries were GE (\$2.6 billion) and Caterpillar (\$1.3 billion).

BACKGROUND: ECON/JOBS

• <u>Key 1990s stats (WJC record):</u> 23 million new jobs; median family income up 17%; family incomes up in <u>every</u> quintile; child poverty fell by 4 million; Black and Hispanic child poverty fell by 30%.

• Public Investments → Jobs

- 75% of all Nobel Prize winners in Chemistry and Physics had NSF funding.
- o Govt invested \$3.8 billion in Human Genome Project→ \$965 bn in economic output
- Every dollar spent on infrastructure yields between \$1.50 and \$2 in economic activity

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS:

How are your economic proposals different from President Clinton's?

- First let me say, I'm very proud of my husband's record on the economy. 23 million new jobs, middle class family incomes went up by 17%, child poverty fell by 4 million.
- But today, our challenges are different . . . and I'm not running for my husband's third term, I'm running for my first term . . .

How are your economic proposals different than President Obama's?

- First of all, I believe President Obama doesn't get nearly enough credit ... Saved the auto industry, imposed new rules on Wall Street, and provided health care to 16 million people. Brought unemployment down to 5%. All in the face of unrelenting Republican opposition.
- Now we're standing again, but we're not yet running. Corporate profits are at near-record highs, but paychecks for most people have barely budged.
 We need to raise incomes for hard-working American families
- [Pivot to your 5-part plan]
 - o Public investments to create jobs
 - o Raise wages minimum wage, equal pay
 - o Tax system fairer
 - o Work and family paid leave
 - o College affordable

18.Inequality: All the candidates in this race are talking a lot about income inequality. How would your approach be different from your opponents' and from President Obama's?

- Today, top CEOs make 300 times what the average worker makes. The top 25 hedge fund managers make more than the all kindergarten teachers in this country combined. It's completely upside down and backwards.
- President Obama's challenge was stopping our slide into a Second Great Depression. Our challenge today is different. It is making sure that incomes rise for everyone. I've got a 5-point plan.
 - o *First*, create more good-paying jobs so paychecks go further. Invest in infrastructure, research, innovation, and clean energy.
 - Second, make sure that work pays. Lift the minimum wage back to its highest level. Enforce equal pay for women. Encourage companies to share profits with their employees.
 - o *Third*, overhaul the tax code. Make the wealthy and corporations pay their fair share and give middle-class families a break.
 - Fourth, I'll fight for policies that help parents balance work and family. Like universal pre-K and paid leave and more support for caregivers.
 - o *Finally*, I'll make college affordable and keep student debt from holding people back.
- As President, I promise you this. I will get up every single day and fight to raise incomes for <u>all</u> hardworking Americans so you can get ahead and stay ahead.

Republican contrast:

• The Republicans also have a recipe for how to raise incomes: middle class workers should just work longer and harder. Virtually ALL of them want to raise the retirement age. And virtually NONE of them want to raise the minimum wage. Chris Christie said he is "tired of hearing about the minimum wage," and Donald Trump recently said America's "wages are too high." They don't think we can afford things like paid leave and sick leave. But they do think we can afford more tax cuts for big corporations and wealthy families—to stack the deck even more against the middle class.

What about the role of technology/globalization? [Rubio says we can't raise the minimum wage because robots will take our jobs]?

- When it comes to technology and innovation, I have confidence in our future. This is America. I think that we can have technological innovation and high wages. [If they mention Rubio by name: For a guy who says he's the candidate of the future, he's painting a really bleak view of the future!].
- But this is why it matters who is elected President. It is the job of a president to make sure that we have the right policies in place so that technological changes create more opportunities, not fewer. We need to take the currents of technology and globalization and make them work for all of us.
- How do we do that? First, make our tax system fairer. Second, make
 college affordable for every American, and make sure people can get the
 training and skills they need at every stage of their lives. Third, invest in
 infrastructure so that all communities have access to markets, to innovation,
 to high-speed internet.
- There will always be those who try to scare us about change and innovation but this is the sort of thing that America has always done, and I am confident we can do it again.

KEY FACTS:

- Inequality is the highest it's been since the 1920s.
- 100 CEOs have as much money in retirement savings as 116 million Americans do—41% of families.
- 90% of the gains we've made in the recovery are going to the top 1%.
- If over the past 35 years, American families saw their incomes rise at the same rate as top CEOs, they'd be earning \$650,000 a year.
- A child born into a family earning \$20,000 or less has just a 9 percent chance of earning more than \$100,000 as an adult. (Bottom quintile → top quintile)
- Half of kids from high-income families have a bachelor's degree by age 25. Just 1 in 10 kids from low-income families do.

19.Minimum Wage: Two of your opponents have called for raising the minimum wage all the way to \$15/hour. You have only said \$12. Why?

- Think about this. If we raise the minimum wage, one of four working moms would get a raise. That's not just an economic issue, it's a family issue.
- And most of the Republicans running for President don't think we should raise the minimum wage some of them don't even think we should have a national minimum wage at all. Donald Trump said he thinks working peoples' wages in America are "too high." And not a single person on the stage contradicted him. I mean, seriously: who are these people talking to?
- I don't believe that and neither do Senator Sanders or Governor O'Malley. So here's what we need to do. We should raise the minimum wage to the highest it's ever been in this country, even adjusted for inflation. From \$7.25 today to \$12 an hour. And after that, I'd index it to the median wage, so it keeps rising over time.
- I think the federal minimum wage is just that—a minimum, a floor. I also believe that there are places in the country where the minimum wage should be higher than that, because the costs of living are higher. It costs more to live in New York City than in Little Rock, Arkansas. That's why I stood with fast food workers in New York, and with people in Los Angeles and Seattle, in their fight for \$15.
- But I won't be satisfied with just fixing the minimum wage—I've got a plan to raise incomes for all Americans so they can afford a middle class life.

OPPONENT POSITIONS:

• **Sanders**: \$15 minimum wage.

• O'Malley: \$15 minimum wage. Maryland: raised to \$10.10.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS:

- A \$12 minimum wage would bring the federal minimum wage <u>back</u> to its historic high from 1968, in inflation-adjusted terms.
- A \$12 minimum wage would mean a raise for 35 million people 1 in 4 private sector workers.
- It would mean a raise for 25% of working moms.
- It would mean a raise for 40% of *single* working moms.
- Krueger op-ed: A \$15 minimum wage would be unprecedented in terms of international comparison

<u>20.Wall Street</u>: Why won't you call for "breaking up the banks" or reinstating Glass Steagall?

- Wall Street ran the economy off a cliff in 2008, walked away with barely a scratch, and stuck Main Street with the bill. I called them out then. And I still think they need more accountability. Here's what I'd do.
- First, limit the size and power of the big banks and make sure they can't gamble with your deposits.
- Next, take on risk throughout the entire financial system. At investment banks, hedge funds, and the shadow banking system. What Senator Sanders has proposed would *not* have stopped Lehman Brothers, or AIG, or Bear Stearns, three of the biggest culprits of the financial crisis. AIG got a \$180 billion taxpayer bailout. My plan would stop that from happening again.
- Finally, my plan holds people accountable when they break the law—including sending them to jail when it's called for. I'll make it easier for prosecutors to bring cases. And if companies are paying fines for wrongdoing, I'll make sure those fines eat into executives' bonuses.
- So with all due respect to my opponents: my plan is tougher, more effective, and more comprehensive. That's the conclusion Nobel laureate Paul Krugman reached.
- And it's also telling that I'm the only candidate on this stage who is currently the subject of attack ads from hedge fund billionaires. Because they know that my agenda is to stop their agenda.

Pivot to Republicans (for a follow up)

• But the truth is everyone on this stage believes we have to hold Wall Street accountable – it's the Republicans who right now are trying to repeal the

Dodd Frank reforms altogether. They think Wall Street needs <u>less</u> accountability. Less oversight.

- Wall Street is spending tens of millions dollars right now on lobbyists trying to weaken the measures that President Obama put in place. Trying to get rid of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau even though it's already returned \$10 billion dollars to 17 million people who were cheated or defrauded.
- The Republicans may have decided to forget about the financial crisis that devastated our families and our economy—but I haven't.

Sanders/O'Malley: Hillary Clinton is too close to Wall Street to change it. Over the course of her career, she raised \$35 million from Wall Street – more donors than anywhere else—and close to \$6 million in this race so far.

- I think it's telling that two hedge fund billionaires have started a Super PAC and are running ads against me right now in Iowa, New Hampshire, and Massachusetts. Because they know that my agenda is stopping their agenda.
- So it's important that we deal with facts.
 - Less than 3% of my campaign funding has come from the investment and securities industry. You can look that up on opensecrets.org.
 - I've raised more money from students and teachers than from donors on Wall Street.
 - o 90% of my donors are small donors.
- And I have stood up to Wall Street time after time. When I was in the Senate, I said no to privatizing Social Security, which would have been the biggest Wall Street give-away ever. I proposed measures to rein in executive compensation that were folded into President Obama's Wall Street reform law. Called for an agency like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau before the crisis.

• So, why do you think my opponents are talking about political donations? It's because they don't want to talk about our plans—because they know mine goes further than theirs. Here's what I'll do. First, limit the size and power of the big banks and make sure they can't gamble with your deposits.

- Next, take on risk throughout the entire financial system. Because it's not just the big banks. We have to take on investment banks, insurance companies, the shadow banking sector.
- Finally, hold people accountable when they break the law—including sending them to jail when it's called for.
- Because what happened in 2008 can never happen again.

Sanders/O'Malley: I'm sorry, but the easiest things you could do to rein in the big banks right now, you're refusing to do. Glass Steagall would break up the big banks right away.

- If I thought reinstating Glass-Steagall would solve the problem, I'd be for it. Glass-Stegall worked for its time, but now we need a 21st century solution. As to the biggest banks, I'll say it again. My plan limits the size and power of the biggest banks. It imposes a risk fee. It stops banks from gambling with taxpayers' deposits.
- But we have to look beyond the big banks. To the shadow banking sector.
 Insurance companies. Other big financial institutions. And finally hold executives accountable when they break the law. Because no one should be too big to jail.

Reply – 911 Comment from last debate

• As I said in the last debate, as Senator from NY after 9/11, I did help rebuild at Ground Zero where we were attacked. But if you look at my record as Senator, you will see that on issue after issue, I stood up to Wall Street. [Pivot to above proof points].

Reply – Obama proof point

• President Obama took more money from Wall Street than any candidate had in history in 2008. That didn't stop him from signing into law the most sweeping set of Wall Street reforms since the 30's.

- So I am wondering, are Governor O'Malley and Senator Sanders saying that President Obama was in the pocket of Wall Street? I sure hope not.
- I'm proud of what he and Democrats like Elizabeth Warren are doing every day to fight against Republicans who are trying to repeal Dodd-Frank.
- As President, I will veto any legislation that rolls back protections in Dodd-Frank or defangs the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. And I'll go further to tackle risk wherever it lies in our financial sector and hold executives accountable for wrongdoing. Because no one is too big to jail. And what happened in 2008 can never happen again.

Sanders: I've been consistent on Wall Street my entire career. And Secretary Clinton has not. She is only pretending to be tough on Wall Street now.

- If you actually look at the record, only one of us voted for a major bill to deregulate Wall Street, and that was Senator Sanders. He voted for a bill in 2000 that took away regulatory authority from the SEC and CFTC over swaps and derivatives.
- Senator Sanders has even acknowledged that this bill was one of the reasons Lehman Brothers was able to become so leveraged and dangerous.
 - o PUSHBACK if he says "I had to vote for that bill" and your husband signed it: You may wish you were running against my husband, but you're running against me, and I didn't vote for or sign anything!

Reply – O'Malley hypocrisy

• Governor O'Malley has been meeting with Wall Street executives during this campaign to raise money. He raised hundreds of thousands of dollars from Wall Street when he was head of the Democratic Governors Association. And as Governor, he appointed a former investment banker to head his state's Commission for Financial Regulation. And that was in 2010, *after* the crash. So I guess by his logic, he wouldn't be a good choice to stand up to Wall Street!

OPPONENT POSITIONS:

- **Sanders**: reinstate Glass-Steagall (voted against repeal in 1999); break up the banks; an FTT of 50 cents for every 100 dollars in stock trades and a smaller fee for bond trades (he says = \$3 trillion over a decade, but a Tax Policy Center analysis of a similar proposal said =\$500 billion a decade).
- O'Malley: reinstate Glass-Steagall; impose higher capital requirements on banks; an FTT on high-frequency trading; create an "economic crimes" division at the DOJ; appoint independent regulators ("Bob Rubin and Larry Summers will not be serving in an O'Malley Administration"); impose a 3-year wait before regulators can go to Wall Street; make the head of the NY Fed a presidential appointee; impose a "points" system on banks that commit infractions, similar to drivers at the DMV.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS:

- Costs of crisis: 9 million Americans lost their jobs, 5 million lost homes. Nearly \$13 trillion of families' wealth was destroyed.
- <u>Individual accountability:</u> Our nation's biggest banks have paid over \$100 billion for misconduct related to the crisis. And not a single top executive at any of those places went to jail.
- Senator Sanders' vulnerability: voted FOR the Commodities Futures

 Modernization Act of 2000 (CFMA) in the House, which exempted the SEC and CFTC from regulating swaps and derivatives. (It passed the House passed 377-4). In 2008, he recognized it contributed to the financial crisis, because it created a class of unregulated derivatives. In 2009, a Sanders spokesman said the omnibus would have shut down the government and that "individual members don't always have the choice to pick and choose between different parts of a bill."
- But Senator Sanders voted for the Commodity Futures Modernization Act twice first as a standalone proposal in October of 2000 and second as part of the omnibus package in December of 2000. It's been reported that the December version of the CFMA (negotiated into the omnibus by Senator Graham) was meaningfully different from the October version. But our research and consultations with Gary Gensler (who was at Treasury in 2000)

have confirmed that the key deregulatory provisions were already included in the October version, which Senator Sanders voted on as a standalone. Most importantly, the October version already:

- O Included the "Enron Loophole"—allowing for certain derivatives exchanges to remain unregulated as long as they facilitated transactions solely between professionals. Note that it's been reported that Senator Graham created the "Enron Loophole in the December version of the bill; however, the provision he inserted was essentially duplicative of a provision that was already included in the October version.
- Excluded over-the-counter "swaps" from CFTC jurisdiction cementing in place the deregulatory status quo for the over-thecounter financial derivatives market, including credit default swaps (the explosion of which led to the collapse of AIG). The lack of regulation of over-the-counter derivatives was a major pre-crisis regulatory failure, and imposing regulation on over-the-counter derivatives market was a key achievement of Dodd-Frank.
- o The October version of the CFMA went through the House Banking and Financial Services Committee of which Senator Sanders was then a member which held a hearing, produced a mark-up, and issued a committee report on the bill. The October version of the bill passed the House by a vote of 377-4, with Peter Defazio (D-OR), Gene Taylor (D-MI), Nick Smith (R-MI), and Ron Paul (R-TX) voting against. The December omnibus passed the House, with 60 votes against (including nine Democrats).
- O It's hard to know why Senator Sanders supported the CFMA in 2000, but our sense (after consulting with Gary Gensler and Barney Frank) is that the bill at the time was both technical and non-controversial. With the White House, Treasury, the Fed, the SEC, the CFTC (after Brooksley Borne departed), and congressional leadership all in support of the bill, there may have been little reason for congressional Democrats with little understanding of the esoteric substance to vote against.

• Gov. O'Malley's vulnerability: In 2010, appointed Mark Kaufman, a former Deutsche Bank investment banker (1995-2002) as state's commissioner on financial regulation. He had also been a managing director of investment banking at CIBC World Banking.

• YOUR history on going after Wall Street:

- You called out the "fly by night brokers who were peddling loans to unqualified buyers." [Nov. 2007]
- O You went to NYC in Dec. 2007 and told Wall Street they had to "shoulder responsibility for the crisis"—and called for a 90-day moratorium on subprime foreclosures. [Dec. 2007].
- You said the Bush Administration was doing too little to crack down on the unscrupulous lending. [Dec. 2007]
- You called for closing the carried interest loophole [July 2007] and limiting executive compensation.

• Wall Street/Campaign Finance figures:

- o Total HFA thus far: \$77 million
- o Total HFA from "securities and investment": \$2 million (< 3%)
- o Total Obama from "securities and investment" in 08: \$17.3 million
- o Total Sanders from "securities and investment": \$47,000
- o Total HFA from broader "finance/real estate/insurance": \$5.5 million
- o Total Obama from broader "finance etc." in 08: \$44 million
- o Total Sanders from broader "finance etc.": \$302,000
- In 2016, securities & investment have donated almost 2 to 1 to Republicans, though YOU are the top recipient.
- From 1999-2016, YOU received \$12.8 million from securities & investment, \$2.4 million from commercial banks, or 3.7% of the \$406 million YOU raised.

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS:

Would you impose a financial transactions tax on trades of bonds or stocks?

• I'm going to impose a tax on high-frequency trading. The sort of short-term, speculative trades that help hedge fund managers reap in millions, but do nothing for the mainstream economy. And that make our financial system less secure for everyone else. Because we need a Wall Street that works for Main Street again. Long-term investments. Consumer protections.

Will you make a pledge that your Secretary of Treasury won't be a former Wall Street executive?

• I will pledge that my Secretary of the Treasury will put investors and consumers ahead of the big banks. That is my test. There are examples of people who have worked on Wall Street and still put the interests of investors and consumers first. Like Gary Gensler, who is one of my advisors and a progressive champion. I will not appoint anyone from Wall Street or anywhere else who will go easy on Wall Street. I believe in accountability. That's my test.

21.Taxes: What do you think should be the top tax rate that the richest tax payers pay?

- We've got billionaires who are paying lower tax rates than teachers. Large corporations that pay no taxes at all. So the bottom line is this: the wealthiest Americans are paying too little in taxes. And the middle class is paying too much. I'm going to fix that.
- So first, I'm going to close loopholes for Wall Street money managers—who get to pay lower tax rates than their secretaries today. No more.
- Second, impose a rule that makes every millionaire pay at least a 30% tax rate. That's the "Buffet Rule." To deal with the fact that the wealthy use deductions and tricks to avoid paying taxes that aren't available to working families.
- Third, end tax breaks that big corporations use to avoid paying their fair share. Like the tax subsidies for the oil companies and the breaks for companies that shelter their money overseas.
- Fourth, give middle class families a break. I want to extend the tax credit that helps families afford college. Create a new credit for people who are caring for an aging parent. Help defray high out-of-pocket drug costs.
- Our tax system is broken -- and the Republicans are proposing to make it
 worse. Ben Carson and Ted Cruz want "flat taxes" that would give
 hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax breaks to millionaires and
 billionaires. It's the same old trickle down nonsense they've tried before
 and we know that doesn't work.

OPPONENT POSITIONS:

- Sanders: would (1) raise rates "significantly higher than they are today" for the top 1% -- [suggested as high as 70%]; (2) lift the Social Security cap on income above \$250,000 (NOT indexed for inflation); (3) revenue positive corporate tax reform; (4) an FTT that he says would raise \$3 trillion over 10 years; (5) raise estate tax rate to 45% (and higher for the wealthiest estates) and lower the exemption threshold to \$7 million per couple from \$11 million today; (6) Buffet rule and (7) close loopholes for the wealthy and corporations, like the carried interest loophole, tax breaks for companies that move jobs overseas, and tax breaks for oil and gas companies; (8) impose a carbon tax.
- O'Malley: would raise taxes on "investment earnings" to pay for his debtfree college plan—which appears to mean closing the carried interest loophole, other loopholes for corporations, and increasing the capital gains rate to ordinary income rates for wealthy Americans. <u>In Maryland</u>, he signed higher taxes on corporate income and on individuals making more than \$100,000 per year, and a millionaire surtax.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS:

- <u>Unfair tax system:</u> Almost half of the wealthiest 400 taxpayers people making \$140 million per year, or more pay less than 15% of their income in taxes. That is outrageous.
- Sanders has supported middle-class tax cuts in the past (e.g., in the Recovery Act, the EITC and CTC, etc.), but has not introduced plans to cut taxes for working families in this campaign. YOU have called for a \$5,000 tax credit for out-of-pocket health costs, a caregivers tax credit of 20% on up to \$6,000 in expenses (up to \$1,200 a year in reduced taxes), and extending the American Opportunity Tax Credit for college.
- Sanders vulnerability is his health care plan and the taxes it would raise on the middle class. His healthcare plan costs roughly \$15 trillion. Every bill he has proposed in Congress has included middle class taxes to pay for it—a 2.2% income tax, and a 6.7% payroll tax.

• Sanders' vulnerability: In 1970s, supported a 100 percent income tax rate for those making more than \$1 million. In 1974, Sanders said, "Nobody should earn more than \$1 million."

YOUR TAX PROPOSALS

Tax Policies YOU have Proposed							
Tax Raiser	Amount raised / saved (\$	<u>Notes</u>					
	billion over 10 years)						
Limit high-income tax expenditures/deductions to 28%	\$350 (announced)	Imposing 28% limit on incomes >\$250,000 with no protections for charitable raises \$525 billion Devoted to College					
Financial risk fee	\$100 (revenue not public)	Compact Not yet used as offset					
Buffett Rule	\$70	Not yet used as offset					
Close oil and gas loopholes	\$60	Devoted to clean energy					
Carried interest	\$15	Not yet used as offset					
Raise shorter-duration capital gains rates	\$20-\$40 (revenue not public)	Devoted to expanding NMTC / small business relief					
Total, tax raisers	<u>\$625</u>						
Not yet announced: Return the Estate Tax to 2009 levels = \$200 billion over 10 years. Other: Comprehensive Immigration Reform: \$200 billion over 10 years (CBO score)							

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS:

Will you set any deficit reduction target?

• The plans I've proposed in this campaign won't add to the long-term government debt. And as President, I am committed to fiscal responsibility.

Senator Sanders has proposed increasing the estate tax to 65% (from 40% today) and lowering the exemption to \$7 million for couples (from \$11 million today) – would make any changes to the estate tax?

• I support the estate tax as part of a fair tax code -- it's a "Downton Abbey" tax on the most fortunate estates. Republican proposals to get rid of it or pare it back are just another give-away to the wealthiest Americans. My

preference would be to at least return to the 2009 levels, as President Obama has proposed. That would impose the estate tax on less than 5 of every 1,000 estates.

Note: the 2009 parameters are an exemption at \$7 million per couple and a top rate of 45%. Returning to these parameters will raise \$200 bn/over 10 years. In 2013, only 20 small businesses and farm estates paid ANY estate tax, and their average estate tax burden was just 4.9 percent.

Would you support a budget deal that balanced spending cuts with high-income tax raisers? Would you have supported a version of the Boehner – Obama Grand Bargain?

• I don't believe we need a dollar in spending cuts for every dollar we raise in making the wealthiest Americans and corporations pay more. I do believe we should go through our budget line by line, and cut unnecessary spending and waste. And look for smart savings wherever we can. Like giving Medicare the power to negotiate drug prices. But would I support a deal that has steep cuts to our entitlement programs like Medicare or Social Security? No. I don't believe we should balance the budget on the backs of the middle class.

What is the total cost of your promises in this campaign, and how will you pay for them? Be specific.

- First, many of the proposals I put forward don't cost significantly new money. Legislation to ban discrimination against LGBT Americans across public life. Letting Medicare negotiate with prescription drug companies to bring down costs for medicines. That would save billions. Other proposals I've put forward do cost new money—but will pay big dividends by creating jobs and boosting our long-term competitiveness. Like universal pre-k for 4-year olds. Investing in clean energy. Making college affordable for every American.
- And two things. First, I've said my proposals will not add to the long-term government debt. Second, I've identified many specific ways I will raise revenue. Closing the carried interest loophole. A new millionaires-pay-at-

least-30% rule. Limiting the tax deductions for wealthy Americans. Ending tax breaks for big corporations that help them stash money overseas and avoid fair taxes. Ending subsidies for big oil.

What program would you cut in the federal budget?

• I'm going to cut subsidies for oil and gas companies. Get rid of loopholes that help corporations avoid paying their fair share of taxes. I've proposed demanding bigger drug rebates in Medicare, by letting it negotiate with prescription drug companies over prices. I would eliminate ineffective grants programs in the Department of Education, and refocus those funds on serving the students most in need, with evidence-based interventions. I'd streamline training programs so they are better focused on helping workers find jobs. And I'd go through the budget closely, and make sure we eliminate or consolidate programs that are wasteful or duplicative.

<u>22.Health care/Obamacare</u>: Democrats largely say Obamacare has been a success, but want to "fix what is wrong with it." Has it worked? What is wrong with it -- if anything --what would you change?

- 18 million Americans now depend on the Affordable Care Act. Women can no longer be charged more just because of our gender. Insurance companies can no longer discriminate against people with pre-existing conditions.
- So we need to defend this progress and build on it:
 - First, I want to get prescription drug costs under control. My plan lets Medicare negotiate with drug companies over prices. It allows people to buy generic versions of drugs from other countries – like Canada.
 - Second, I want to bring down families' costs. I'll offer a new \$5,000 tax credit for families with high out-of-pocket costs.
- The Republicans all want to repeal the Affordable Care Act they've already voted to do it 55 times. Well, I don't want to let anyone rip it up and start all over again.
- That's why I'm very concerned about Senator Sanders' approach. His plan would end Obamacare, end SCHIP, end Medicare, end the private health insurance you have today. And then he'd roll everything together and turn it all over to the states to Republican Governors like Paul LePage in Maine and Terry Branstad in Iowa. I just don't think any of that makes sense.
- And I have to say, I never thought replacing Obamacare would be something we'd be arguing about at the *Democratic* debate.
- Let's not start all over again. Let's build on the progress we've made. Fix what's still broken. And deliver quality, affordable health care to every American.

If pressed: are YOU now against single-payer altogether? Even in states that want to experiment with single-payer – like a ballot proposal in Colorado?

- I've been fighting for universal healthcare my whole life, and I have the scars to show for it. There is a reason that even before the Affordable Care Act passed, over 90% of children in this country had health care because I fought for SCHIP when I was First Lady.
- I do think single-payer is a model that can work in many countries. But it's not the system we have here. I think what Americans want right now is to build upon and improve on what we've put in place the Affordable Care Act. That is my focus.
- [If asked about specific states, like Colorado]: It's up to the people of Colorado to make a judgment on this proposal. Vermont tried this approach and had to abandon it. But I believe states are the laboratories of democracy and have every right to try different approaches to meeting the needs of people. I am going to do everything I can to make sure the Affordable Care Act is defended and that it continues to work better.

Sanders: I haven't proposed a specific plan yet in this campaign — I'm still working on the details— but I can tell you this: the middle class will do better under single-payer. For example, under the bill I proposed in the Senate, a family making \$50,000 would pay \$1,100 more in taxes, but save \$5,000 in premiums.

- Senator Sanders isn't being straight with the American people. Since 1995, he has proposed a health care bill in Congress 9 different times. Every time, it included a 2.2% income tax, and at least a 6.7% payroll tax on the middle class—which any economist will tell you gets paid by workers, not employers. That means a 9% tax on middle-class families.
- Now Senator Sanders will say: everyone will do better overall. First, there are millions of people who will actually do worse. People benefitting from the Affordable Care Act today and who will pay new taxes, but for no new

benefits. Second, everyone else is being asked to take a giant gamble with their health care – because they are being asked to turn it over to the states. To Republican governors like Paul LePage or Terry Branstad. To the 19 states that wouldn't expand Medicaid even for *free*. And he'd expect them to chip in 14% of the cost.

• At the end of the day, the most important thing to me is this: we have fought for and won something as a party. The Affordable Care Act. Let's make it better. Let's not start a whole new debate.

Reply – if he says he WON'T turn healthcare over to the states:

- All I can tell you about is the plan Senator Sanders introduced 9 different times in Congress—and touted on the campaign trail this past summer. And here is what it does: ends Medicare, Tricare, SCHIP, and private insurance rolls everything together and turns it over to the states. If he's changed his plan now, then I think he owes it to everyone to explain exactly what he's going to do. Because when you're talking about a \$15 trillion dollar gamble with people's health care, it's not enough to talk in general terms you need to get specific.
- And I keep coming back to the same proposition: the Democrats have fought hard for the Affordable Care Act, and have achieved it. We should defend it and build on it, not scrap it and start all over.

OPPONENT POSITIONS:

Sanders

Sanders repeatedly proposed a similar Medicare-for-all bill in Congress:

Year	Income Tax	Surtax on high incomes	Payroll tax	Corporate Tax	Other
<u>1991</u>	no bill text				
<u>1993</u>	Increases in regular income tax rates and 7.5% premium tax	10%	7.9%	4% increase	Modified other deductions
<u>1995</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
<u>1997</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
<u>1999</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
<u>2001</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
<u>2003</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
<u>2005</u>	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	Tobacco tax
2009	2.2% on all individuals	-	8.7%	-	-
<u>2011</u>	2.2% on individual incomes under \$200,000, with higher rates on higher incomes	5.4%	6.7%	-	Financial transaction tax
<u>2013</u>	2.2% on individual incomes under \$200,000, with higher rates on higher incomes	5.4%	6.7%	-	Financial transaction tax

- Sanders has yet to release a specific plan on this campaign, and his staff has told the media that his Senate bill is not necessarily his current proposal. That said, after the last debate, they circulated a table based off his Senate bill, which showed a family making \$50,000 would pay \$1,100 more in taxes under his plan, but would say up to \$5,000 in premiums.
- Sanders has introduced a detailed plan to reduce prescription drug costs, including allowing Medicare to bargain; allowing Americans to import drugs from Canada; closing the Medicare Part D loophole ahead of schedule; outlawing "pay for delay" deals, and increasing price transparency.
- <u>Favorite stats:</u> At least half of all Americans take a prescription drug, but last year nearly 1 in 5 did not fill a prescription because of cost.

O'Malley

- Was a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act, but has not laid out a health care plan in this campaign.
- Does support expanded treatment for substance abuse, and will likely cite that as mayor, he expanded access to drug treatment in Baltimore, driving a 60 percent reduction in overdose deaths from heroin over 10 years.
- When O'Malley was governor, Maryland had the worst state rollout of the Affordable Care Act's state-based exchanges, leading to a federal inspector general to launch a review into what went wrong. Eventually, the state imported Connecticut's software to run its exchange.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

Fast facts:

- Deductibles rose 7 times faster than wages in the past 5 years. Average deductible this year is \$1,318 for single coverage.
- 175 million people have employer-based insurance. Sanders would end all of their plans on Day 1.
- A few weeks ago, the CEO of Turing Pharmaceuticals jacked up the price of a drug for AIDS patients by \$5000 from \$13 dollars to over \$700 per pill.
- Drug costs is an issue that affects every American family-- 90 percent of seniors and half of all Americans take a prescription drug every month.
- The largest drug companies are together earning \$80-90 billion per year in profits

Groups Who Will Fare Worse under Sanders' Medicare-for-All Bill:

- **People under age 26 with income:** Under Sanders' plan, people under age 26 who today can stay on their parents' plan—and so don't have to pay for health insurance—would have to pay a new <u>9% tax on any income</u>, for no new benefit.
- Families in the ACA exchanges: A family of 4 in New Hampshire making \$40,000 today and in an ACA exchange plan, would pay \$3,500 in new taxes. Currently, that family pays about \$1,908 in premiums (in a silver

- plan) and \$1,217 in cost sharing expenses. Altogether, they would pay an additional \$376 in taxes, compared to current expenses.
- **Families in Medicaid:** A family in Medicaid in New Hampshire making \$30,000 would pay \$2,626 in new taxes. Today, their payments for premiums and cost-sharing capped at 5% of income—which yields \$1,500 for a family making \$30,000. Altogether, they would pay an <u>additional</u> \$1,126 in taxes, compared to expenses today.
- Some families with employer-based plans, who don't get passed-through income: A family making \$85,000 who gets insurance through their employer today pays about \$5,000 for insurance (employee-share of premium) and \$2,000 for cost-sharing expenses. The employer pays the rest of the premium share, which averages \$12,000 for a family. Under Senator Sanders' plan, that family would pay \$7,400 in new taxes. Altogether, that means another \$400-500 in taxes, compared to expenses today, unless their employers pass on the employer-side premium share in extra wages (and there is no obligation to do so).

COLORADO CARE BALLOT PROPOSAL

Next November, Coloradans will vote on a ballot initiative to create Colorado Care through the ACA waiver program. Colorado Care would be a single-payer health care system that its backers estimate will require \$25 billion per year in taxes, raised through a 10 percent payroll tax (6.67 percent employer side, 3.33 percent employee). Unlike Sanders' proposal, Coloradans on Medicare and Tricare would continue their current coverage, as would veterans in the VA system. Everyone else, including Medicaid patients, would receive insurance through Colorado Care.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Do you support the medical device tax?

• I do support fees that are part of the Affordable Care Act – and help pay for it – on health insurers and other suppliers, like drug and device manufacturers. But I think the primary way we need to pay for the Affordable Care Act is reforming our delivery system for healthcare in this country. So that we contain costs. That's why I think we need to repeal Cadillac tax. It shifts too much to middle-class families

23.Trade: Would you seek to renegotiate the TPP to strengthen the provisions you don't like?

- I've consistently said that I would support a high-standard trade agreement with Asia-Pacific nations that meets my three tests. Does it create more good-paying American jobs? Will it help raise wages? Will it strengthen national security?
- I would obviously explore whether it would be possible to achieve that kind of agreement, even as I pursue the investments to strengthen our competitiveness at home.
- What I know is that this deal, the one before us, does not meet my tests.
- I just don't think this deal clears the high bar it needs to. I can't look people in the eye and tell them this deal is going to raise their wages. And so I can't support it.
- More broadly, trade really works for us when we make investments at home in our economy and our people. And the Republicans have blocked just about everything President Obama has wanted to do to invest in the American people. Building infrastructure. Job training. Clean energy. Raising the minimum wage. So those are going to be my priorities.

Sanders/O'Malley: In 2012, Secretary Clinton said TPP "set the gold standard in trade agreements to free, transparent, fair trade."

• I said that three years ago, while the agreement was in the process of being negotiated. And after three years of negotiations, I reviewed public information about the final deal. And I concluded, unfortunately, that it did not meet my standards. I could not look the American people in the eye and tell them, this trade agreement will improve their wages.

- Governor O'Malley has said we can't turn our backs on trade—and I agree with that. I'd go one step further and say you can't run for President if you're running away from the global economy. Senator Sanders has a different view than we do—he has <u>never</u> been for a trade deal. With 95% of America's potential customers overseas, I think we need to fight for a level playing field, not give up on selling to those customers.
- What I believe makes sense is to set out strong, clear tests for any agreement, and then judge each one on the merits. That is what I did here.
- Senator Sanders may have been happy to pre-judge this agreement years before the actual details were finally negotiated. I was not.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

- Sanders: opposes TPP; voted against Fast Track in the context of TPP; voted against NAFTA, Colombia, Panama, South Korea; and voted with conservatives to kill the Ex-Im Bank.
- **O'Malley**: opposed TPP; opposed Fast Track in the context of TPP; supported the revised 2011 South Korea FTA; supports the Ex-Im Bank.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

- YOUR QUOTE RE: "GOLD STANDARD" in Australia, 2012: "So it's fair to say that our economies are entwined, and we need to keep upping our game both bilaterally and with partners across the region through agreements like the Trans-Pacific Partnership or TPP. Australia is a critical partner. This TPP sets the gold standard in trade agreements to open free, transparent, fair trade, the kind of environment that has the rule of law and a level playing field. And when negotiated, this agreement will cover 40 percent of the world's total trade and build in strong protections for workers and the environment."
- Your record re: trade agreements: You voted for FTAs with Singapore, Chile, Australia, Morocco, and Oman (in 2003-2004, 2007). You said you supported permanent normal trade relations with China (in 2000), and voted for such with Vietnam (2001). You voiced support for deals with Jordan and Peru. You voted against CAFTA (Central American Free Trade Agreement) (in 2005). When running for president in 2007 and 2008, you spoke against agreements with Colombia, Panama, and South Korea, but were later supportive of them when they passed under President Obama in 2011 (citing improvements made to the deals).
- More background on PNTR with China in 2000: In 2000, President Clinton requested that Congress vote to permanently normalize trade relations with China, and Congress ultimately did. This was on the eve of China's entry to the WTO –which occurred in 2001. You told reporters in April and May

2000 that YOU supported PNTR as well as China's entry to the WTO, but Rep. Sanders voted against PNTR in May 2000 (it passed the House 237-197, with 72 Dems in favor and 138 Dems opposed, and later passed the Senate 83-15). At the time, the U.S. had a trade deficit with China of about \$70 bn. Arguments in favor of PNTR were (1) normalization would give U.S. companies the same advantages that would accrue to firms in Europe, Japan, and other WTO member states when China entered the WTO, from being able to make new investments in China and access its markets; (2) the U.S. at the time had a trade deficit with China in part due to the market restrictions it placed on U.S. goods, and PNTR was expected to lead to more U.S. exports to China, especially for farm exports; (3) failure of the U.S. to grant PNTR would undermine the position of political reformers in China, who overcame domestic opposition to membership in the WTO by arguing that it was a means of gaining permanent normal trade relations with the U.S., their largest export market; (4) failure to grant PNTR would undermine the position of U.S. negotiators in the final stage of China's entry to the WTO. NOTE that PNTR was supported by both major presidential candidates, Al Gore and Bush.

- Your record on fast track: You called on the business community to make a stronger case for giving President Clinton fast track authority in 1998. You voted <u>against</u> fast track authority for President Bush, twice, in 2002. In 2007, you said you "don't want to give fast track authority" to President Bush.
- Your position on trade in 2007-2008: You called for a trade timeout, so we could enforce the trade agreements currently on the books. You said NAFTA was in principle a good idea (creating a better market between Canada, the U.S., and Mexico), but that it was inherited from the Bush Administration, did not include a tough enough enforcement mechanism, and did not deliver on what we hoped it would. You said you'd fix NAFTA by strengthening its labor and environmental provisions and changing it investment provisions that give foreign companies the ability to challenge laws in special tribunals.

24.Rural: I would like you each to specify—what is your agenda for rural America?

- I know rural America. I spent over a decade living in Arkansas. I was elected to the Senate twice from New York believe it or not, a major farm state and I listened to farmers and rural New Yorkers and we came up with some creative new approaches.
 - O I launched a Farm-to-Fork initiative. To connect farms in upstate New York with restaurants and distributors downstate. Why should New York City restaurants not be serving wines and produce from New York State?
 - I also launched a trading cooperative in the Adirondacks that brought together eBAY, New York colleges, and small businesses. This was a rural part of the state with sparse population and just not enough customers. So this helped those businesses get online and find customers around the world.
- And I've seen with my own eyes the *changing face* of rural America, including right here in the North Country of New Hampshire. We need to invest in education, innovation, and technology. We need to make sure rural American is in the future business.
- Let's make rural America the powerhouse for clean energy. We should double our investment in loan guarantee programs to help rural communities build plants and convert agricultural waste into products. And strengthen the Renewable Fuel Standard.
- We also need to spur investment in the rural economy beyond agriculture because 46 million Americans in rural America don't actually farm. I want to expand high-speed Internet to all households by 2020. Expand tax credits like the New Markets Tax Credit—to link entrepreneurs to capital. That program is already helping towns across New Hampshire create jobs and increase investment for example, the redevelopment of the Claremont Mills; the new community health center in Plymouth; and retrofitting old boilers to generate cleaner energy in Berlin.

Sanders: I'm from Vermont, a state that's entirely rural. I know what it takes to help rural America.

• Senator Sanders says he is from a rural state and knows what rural communities need. Well I think one place Senator Sanders misses the mark is his opposition to programs like the Export-Import Bank and the New Markets Tax Credit. That's a place where he agrees with the Republicans in Congress who let these important programs lapse.

OPPONENTS' POSITIONS:

Sanders' weaknesses

- Ex-Im: Sanders was the only member of the Democratic Caucus in the Senate to vote against reauthorizing the Ex-Im Bank in July 2015.
- Ethanol and the RFS In a September interview on Iowa TV, Sanders voiced support for corn ethanol and for the Renewable Fuel Standard, praising Iowa's leadership on clean energy. He did note that he thinks feedstocks other than corn deserve increased attention for biofuels development. This was a recent evolution. In May, he said, "I know this is important to Iowa. I don't have a definitive answer. I've got to learn more." In March, he claimed ethanol drives up food prices. And before that, he was consistently against ethanol. He voted against a "blenders tax credit" in 2011 that incentivized refiners to blend ethanol with gasoline and he voted against ethanol subsidies in 2005.

KEY FACTS:

- The agricultural economy accounts for \$800 billion in economic activity each year, and supports 1 in 11 jobs.
- Nearly 1/3 of women in rural America live in counties without an obstetrician or gynecologist.
- About 1/6 of Americans live in rural areas, but less than 1/10 of physicians practice there.
- Many rural communities are facing population decline the period from 2010 to 2014 was the first period of overall population decline in rural America.
- 6.2 million Americans live in rural areas and in poverty.
- 85% of the persistent poverty counties are in rural areas.

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS:

How can people trust that you will continue to support the Renewable Fuel Standards if you staunchly opposed the mandate early in your Senate career—referring to it as a "tax" and voting against ethanol 17 times? And you only started to support it when you were about to run for President in 2007?

- Well as you said, I did vote to expand the Renewable Fuel Standard in 2007.
 The threat of global climate change has become more apparent and more
 urgent with each passing year. I don't think anyone on this stage disagrees
 that today, we absolutely need to develop lower carbon energy sources to
 meet our energy challenges.
- So I support expanding the Renewable Fuel Standard. We need to get the RFS back on track to achieve the targets passed by Congress. The Obama Administration took a step in that direction last month when they raised the obligations in their final rule, relative to the proposal earlier this year. But there's still more we can and must do.
- I want to make sure we're not just using biofuels in cars and trucks, but in ships and planes, too—including those owned by the US military. Build out the fueling infrastructure across the country that will enable more consumers to benefit from biofuels. And invest in innovation so the United States continues to be a leader, especially in cellulosic and advanced biofuels.

25. Women/Families: You've talked a lot about paid leave and vacation. What do you say to the small business owner who says that she just can't afford those policies?

- More than half of mothers work outside of their homes. 40 percent of women are the primary breadwinners in their families. But our policies haven't kept pace with the times. We are the only advanced country in the world without paid leave—to take care of a newborn baby, or a sick family member. That hurts our families, and it hurts our economy.
- So workers should have 12 weeks of paid family leave to take care of a new baby or a sick relative, and up to 7 sick days a year to take care of themselves and their kids.
- The first President Bush vetoed *unpaid* family leave twice. A bill to guarantee that people wouldn't get fired if they took time off to care for a newborn or family member. When my husband became President, it was the first bill he signed into law. And I will go further—because America is the only developed country without paid leave.
- I've said I want to be the Small Business President, and my dad was a small businessman, so I appreciate the questions small business owners might have about leave or sick policies. But the paid leave guarantee won't cost small businesses a cent. And for sick days –look at Connecticut. It passed a law in 2012 requiring them, and unemployment dropped.
- So let's catch up to the rest of the world on this one. I just fundamentally believe that when families are strong, America is strong.

Sanders: I am disappointed Secretary Clinton has broken with the Democrats on the Hill and does not support the FAMILY Act.

• I think it's just wrong that America is the only advanced country in the world that doesn't have paid leave. I have consistently said I support 12

weeks of paid family leave. I applaud Senator Gillibrand for pushing this in the Senate. But I have a different way to pay for it. I think we can pay for this through asking the wealthiest Americans and corporations to pay their fair share of taxes.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

- Sanders: supports the FAMILY Act, which means 12 weeks of paid family and medical leave, financed through a payroll tax; supports 7 sick days a year; supports 2 weeks of guaranteed paid vacation.
- **O'Malley:** 12 weeks of paid family leave (for newborn or loved one); "no family should have to pay more than 10% of their income on childcare every year"; <u>Maryland:</u> expanded family leave.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

- Childcare costs rose 25% in last decade.
- Childcare costs up for a 4-year old up to \$12,280/year in some states. More than college.
- Women are primary or co-equal breadwinners in 60% of households. They are primary breadwinners in 40 percent of households.
- Movement of women into the workforce over the past 40 years → \$3.5 trillion in growth.
- U.S. is only developed country without paid leave of any kind.
- One quarter of all women in U.S. return to work less than 10 days after birth.
- 45 million workers (39% of private workforce) = have NO sick days.
- The FMLA has been used more than 200 million times by men and women who need it.

<u>26.Immigration</u>: How could you get Congress to pass Immigration Reform when President Obama has been unable to do so?

- America is a nation of immigrants ...built by immigrants ...strengthened by immigrants ...enriched by immigrants. The parents ...grandparents ...great grandparents of almost everybody here came from somewhere else. Have we <u>forgotten</u> that?
- We need comprehensive immigration reform with a real path to citizenship, and we need it now. Our system is tearing families apart, keeping workers in the shadows, and creating a second class in this country. It is time to live up to our heritage.
- This used to be a bipartisan issue. We enacted broad-based reform under President Ronald Reagan. It was a priority for George W. Bush. They call immigrants rapists and drug dealers. Talk about deporting 11 million people. Even say they want to end birthright citizenship.
- So I'm not giving up on comprehensive reform. But if Congress stands in the way, I will not only defend President Obama's executive actions I will go further. I'll create a streamlined process so that anyone with a sympathetic case for relief from deportation can come forwards. To keep more families together.

If pressed on: In recent remarks, YOU spoke about the importance of strong borders and referred to YOUR voting record on border funding. Do YOU think border enforcement should be a priority?

- Like President Obama, Ted Kennedy, like every Democrat who has seriously worked to reform our broken immigration system, I believe that strong border security has to be part of the solution.
- But our borders are more secure than ever, and I don't think we need more border security to move forward on comprehensive immigration reform. My

number 1 priority is comprehensive reform and a path to citizenship for the 11 million undocumented immigrants living here today in the shadows. Defending President Obama's executive actions, and looking to expand them further. We are a nation of immigrants. I believe I immigration has always, and will always make us stronger.

 What Donald Trump and the other Republican candidates have been proposing about immigrants is hateful and it is wrong. Deporting 11 million people. Calling immigrants from Mexico rapists. Ending birthright citizenship for kids who were born here.

If pressed further: so you DON'T support new spending for border enforcement?

• The Obama Administration has invested a lot in border security and immigration enforcement. The Border Patrol's budget is up 900%, from 1993 to 2014. The evidence shows it is working: apprehensions of people trying to cross the border is at the lowest level in 40 years. Our priority now should be comprehensive immigration reform and a pathway to citizenship.

Sanders: I will take action in my first 100 days to protect up to 9 million people from deportation — by extending the President's actions to every individual who would have been eligible for relief under the Senate's 2013 bill. I will put an end to local police officers enforcing the immigration laws. I will protect immigration workers who protect labor abuses and violations.

- I completely agree with Senator Sanders that we need to defend the President's executive actions for DREAMers and for parents of citizen children. As we speak, the President is defending those actions from attack by Republican governors in the Supreme Court.
- And I agree that we should go further to extend relief to more people. Our goal should be to keep families together. Protect those people who study and work here, contribute to their communities and our economy, and who are American in every sense of the word.

• That is why last May- shortly after I declared my candidacy – I went to Nevada, met with DREAMers and spoke with them at a Roundtable, and announced that I would build on Obama's executive actions. Through creating an executive process to allow anyone with a sympathetic case apply for relief from deportation. I was the first candidate to do that.

O'Malley: Secretary Clinton called hardworking people "illegal immigrants" and bragged about her support for building a wall. She sounds like the Republicans.

- I've talked about undocumented immigrants hundreds of times and have been a strong advocate for comprehensive immigration reform for years—everyone on this stage knows that. It's true that a few weeks ago, I made a poor choice of words—but it's just wrong try to twist my position or try to gain politically from that.
- In fact, the reality is exactly the opposite of what Governor O'Malley suggests: I was the first person on this stage to call out Donald Trump for calling immigrants rapists, to call out the Republicans for their hateful language, and for the fact that every Republican remained silent when Mr. Trump made his ugly comments.
- I have consistently stood up for undocumented immigrants.

O'Malley: Last summer, I called on the Obama Administration to stop the fast-track deportation of children from the southern border. Secretary Clinton was calling for them to be sent back home.

• When I spoke out about the crisis on our border, I thought it was important to send a message, discouraging families in Central America from sending their kids on this journey. But of course, when young people arrive at our doorstep in this fragile condition, we need to treat them compassion. Give them a chance to tell their story. And admit those with valid claims to

remain here under our asylum law – if they face a threat to safety at home. Case closed.

- And we need to end family detention for women and children. We need to shut down private prisons and immigration detention centers.
- And we need to lead the world in welcoming more refugees from Syria.

O'Malley: I am the only candidate saying we should expand subsidies in the ACA exchanges to DACA and DAPA recipients.

• I've said every person in this country needs access to the healthcare system. So I support states' efforts to open their health insurance programs to all children, like California is doing. I would change the federal rule to allow any family to purchase health insurance through the Affordable Care Act exchanges, no matter its immigration status.

12/12/2015 IMMIGRATION

O'Malley: Secretary Clinton said just last week that if someone has been convicted of "any crime," they should be deported. Even j-walkers?

- Of course that's not my position. What I meant in that interview is what I've said consistently: people who have been convicted of serious or violent crimes, and who threaten our public safety or national security, do not deserve to stay. They should continue to be the focus of our immigration enforcement efforts.
- But the vast majority of undocumented persons in this country are hard-working, law-abiding members of our community. They are our neighbors, family members, and friends. They contribute to our communities and our economy every day. We should give them a path to citizenship.
- And people who maybe have had a small blemish on their record but have proven over the years that they are contributing members of our society deserve to come forward and pursue a path to citizenship. We need to show more understanding, and help their families stay together.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

<u>Sanders</u> (released a comprehensive immigration plan in November, copying O'Malley's plan in several respects). Of note:

- Would expand eligibility for relief from deportation to up to 9 million reaching all immigrants who would have been given legal protections by the 2013 Senate-passed immigration bill.
- End federal programs that enlist local law enforcement in the enforcement of federal immigration policy.
- Establish a whistleblower visa for immigrants who report labor violations.
- Expand humanitarian parole to return "unjustly deported" immigrants.
- Expand parole-in-place policies, currently available only to current and aspiring service members and their families, to include undocumented relatives of U.S. citizens and lawful permanent residents.
- End racial profiling in law enforcement, improve cooperation between immigrants and law enforcement, expand access to counsel, better fund immigration courts.
- End for-profit and family detention and promote alternatives.
- "Turn back the militarization of the southern border" and conduct a review of the border patrol checkpoints that are up to 100 miles within the US border.
- Calls for strengthening and expanding support for refugees, without specifying a goal
- Includes pursuing "balanced trade agreements" to reduce pressures promoting migration
- Allow undocumented immigrants to purchase insurance on the ACA exchanges with their own money
- Past votes: Sanders voted for CIR in 2013, but did NOT vote for it in 2007.

O'Malley

- Wants to expand President Obama's executive actions to "the greatest possible number of new Americans" including parents of DACA recipients, individuals who have long-term residence in the country, and all young people who entered the United States before age 21.
- Supports allowing deferred action beneficiaries (DACA/DAPA) to access subsidies on the ACA health exchanges.
- In Maryland: passed a "DREAM" Act, letting DREAMers qualify for instate tuition; made drivers' licenses available to undocumented immigrants

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

Sanders' Vulnerability:

- In 2007, Sanders voted against the McCain-Kennedy CIR bill: His main reason was the guest worker provision—which he described as a way for corporations to "import cheaper workers." [NOTE: YOU raised concerns about guest worker programs. In 2006, YOU wrote the H-2A legal guest worker program was "antiquated, unworkable, and woefully inadequate." In 2007, YOU voted for a Dorgan amendment to the immigration bill that ended the guest worker program after 5 years.]
- <u>In 2013, Sanders voted for the bipartisan Senate CIR bill, but still raised concerns on temporary worker programs</u>. He said the J-1 Summer Visa and H2-B visa would take away jobs from young people.
- In the summer of 2015, Sanders continued to talk about immigration reform as a pet-child of corporate America. He told the U.S. Hispanic Chamber of Commerce that, "There is a reason why Wall Street and all of corporate America likes immigration reform. And it is not that they are staying up nights worrying about undocumented workers in this country. What I think they are interested in is seeing a process by which we can bring low-wage labor of all levels into this country to depress wages in America, and I strongly disagree with that"

O'Malley

• Although O'Malley said Obama should accept children from Central America, he rejected them coming to Maryland. O'Malley said that the Obama administration's policy not to accept Central American children refugees would send the children "to certain death." But at the same time, O'Malley objected to having some of those children located at a former military center in Carroll County, Maryland. "I suggested to [the White House] that the location still under consideration in Westminster might not be the most inviting environment for the kids," O'Malley said. O'Malley said he was working to find more foster parent arrangements for the children. Later, the location was vandalized with graffiti that read "no illegals here."

Key Facts:

- It would cost \$300 bn to forcibly remove the 11.2 million undocumented and we'd lose 6% of our labor force.
- Obama's DACA/DAPA = will benefit around 5.5 million people.
- Comprehensive immigration reform would increase U.S. GDP by \$832 billion over 10 years.
- While undocumented immigrants pay \$12 billion in payroll taxes each year, leaving millions of workers in the shadows means we forfeit approximately \$20 billion each year.
- <u>Border security</u>: We now spend \$18 billion on border security and immigration enforcement the Border Patrol's budget increased 900% from 1993 to 2014. Apprehensions of border crossers is at lowest level in 40 years.

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS

Will you commit to end family detention for parents and minor children, who arrive at U.S. borders and are fleeing dangerous situations in their home countries?

- The United States should not be in the business of detaining children and mothers. It is bad for their health and well-being. It is expensive. Detention should be for criminals who pose a threat to the community or are a flight risk. We have to have a sensible process for when people come into the country, but I will end the policy of family detention.
- Right now, two of the centers being used to detain families who arrive at our border are privately run. And they aren't even licensed to make sure they are safe for children. We have to end those, too.
- I also believe that children and families who arrive at our borders in these desperate situations should be treated with compassion. They should tell their story with the help of an attorney. And those with legitimate claims under our asylum laws, who face a threat to their safety back home, should be admitted.

- And America should lead the world in accepting more refugees from Syria, and bring other countries together to do their part.
- But we also have to work with our partners around the world to strengthen conditions abroad. To build economic opportunity, peace, and safety around the world. And to prevent families from sending their children on these dangerous journeys in the first place.

Do you support eliminating private prisons and private immigrant detention centers?

- Yes, I would end private prisons and detention centers.
- Protecting public safety is a core responsibility of the federal government, as is enforcing our immigration laws. We should stop contracting these critical government functions out to private corporations.
- The benefits of contracting out are questionable at best --and outweighed by significant downsides. Even the appearance of connecting the detention of individuals to corporate profit is at odds with American values of fairness and justice.
- This is only one of many ways we need to rebalance our criminal justice and immigration systems.
- We need to end mass incarceration. And we need to reform our immigration system, including making enforcement and detention more humane, more targeted, and more effective. We should not be in the business of putting children and families in detention centers, and we have effective alternatives to detention for immigrants who pose no flight or safety risk.

Would you let undocumented persons participate in the ACA exchanges, or be covered in Medicaid or SCHIP? How about DACA/DAPA beneficiaries?

 First, I think every kid in our country needs and deserves access to our health care system. I've been fighting for this for decades. I helped create the Children's Health Insurance Program in the 1990s, which today covers 8 million kids.

- In our country, we don't punish children for the choices their parents make. And it's bad for our public health if kids are running around sick.
- So yes, I believe these kids absolutely need access to our health care system. Now the way we'll get to a permanent solution is comprehensive immigration reform. But I want to work with states to make sure these kids are getting the healthcare they need. California is doing this now—and I want to support those efforts in the states.
- I also think we should let families buy into the ACA exchanges. There are millions of families with children here who should be able to pay for healthcare if they want it, instead of getting their healthcare in the emergency room. It just makes sense.

If YOU are pressed about whether YOU would give undocumented immigrants access to federal subsidies as well as access to the exchanges, pivot to CIR:

• That is exactly the kind of significant fiscal and policy issue we need to work out through comprehensive immigration reform.

In 2008, you said undocumented persons should not even be able to get a driver's license. Now you say you support a path to citizenship. What has changed?

- The good news is we have gotten to a place today where our goal has moved far beyond driver's licenses. Now, we are talking about citizenship, and as President, I will fight for that. I voted for comprehensive reform in 2007, and I co-sponsored the DREAM Act in 2003.
- As to the specific issue of licenses –states have seen over the past few years that refusing to issue licenses on the basis of immigration status ignores reality, increases the risk of uninsured drivers on the streets, and complicates their ability to focus law enforcement on criminals. So they have started providing licenses to undocumented immigrants. I think that makes sense.

We know about your immigration plans. What would you do for the Southern border?

 Of course we need to have a secure border. I voted in favor of border security repeatedly in the Senate. But while this should be a priority, it should be part of comprehensive immigration reform – and a path to citizenship.

What would you do about the immigration detention bed quota?

• I don't think we need to have arbitrary quotas when it comes to our immigration detention system. The Secretary of Homeland Security should have the discretion to determine the needs of the department. We don't have a quota like this in any other law enforcement context.

Will you continue to allow cities to be sanctuary cities?

• Yes. I have long supported sanctuary cities because I think they can enhance public safety. When local police enforce immigration laws, victims and witnesses may be afraid to report crimes. And it can undermine community policing efforts, by creating mistrust of law enforcement. Now of course we need a system where people who are a serious threat to the public don't fall through the cracks. That's why we need comprehensive reform.

Will you allow DACA beneficiaries be part of your College Compact?

• My college plan is a federal-state compact. It partners with states to make college affordable for every American. So that no one has to borrow money for tuition at a public college in their state. Now, some states have decided to allow DREAMers to qualify for in-state tuition—and in those places, yes, DREAMers would benefit from my College Compact. I applaud these states and call on others to follow. But I think the way we solve this once and for all is through comprehensive immigration reform.

Both Senator Sanders and Governor O'Malley have criticized the stance you took on the influx of children from Central America at our Southern border

last year. They say they called for these children to be admitted to the United States, and you called for them to be sent back. Were you wrong?

- That's just a misrepresentation of what I was saying. I was focused on all those kids making the dangerous journey all the way across Mexico, beset by traffickers and smugglers, many of them never making it.
- I wanted to find a way to help those kids avoid having to make that journey in the first place to improve the conditions so they could be safe where they lived. But for the kids who did come, of course I supported giving asylum to the ones who qualified for it.
- Look, we need to end family detention for women and children who arrive at our border in desperate situations. We need to admit those people with legitimate claims under our asylum laws.
- And I still think it's critical that we work with Mexico, and our regional partners, to build stability and peace abroad. So that these children never have to make these trips where they risk exploitation and death.

If O'Malley comes hot, at the end of your answer, you can say: And I'm really disappointed Governor O'Malley has raised this. Because when this crisis happened, he rejected a request by the Obama administration to use a facility in his state for these kids.

12/13/2015 EDUCATION

27. K-12: Do you support the common core? Do you think it is being implemented with too much testing?

- I have a fundamental belief that every child in this country should have the chance to live up to his or her God-given potential.
- I welcomed President Obama's recent move to reduce burdensome and unnecessary testing throughout our school system and the passage of the Every Student Succeeds Act, which gives states much more flexibility in how they test students. But there's still more work to do.
- Common Core was a nonpartisan way for states and schools to agree on standards that students throughout our country should meet—no matter what kind of school district they were in, or their family's income. To ensure we wouldn't have two tiers of education. Because every child should have the chance to live up to his or her God-given potential.
- But when states started implementing these standards, some just piled tests upon tests. They didn't allow enough time or resources for educators to update the curriculum, or receive new training. And so in state after state, we've seen one-half, one-third of the kids pass the exams. It's not working.
- So we need fewer, fairer, better tests. We need to listen to educators—and parents—about how to integrate tests into the curriculum.
- Bottom line. We should be training the next generation of leaders, not the next generation of test takers.

- 28. Education/TFA/Charters: YOU have recently been critical of two key pillars of the education reform movement—Teach for America, and charter schools. Have YOU changed YOUR position on these issues to secure endorsements from the major teachers unions?
 - I have been a strong supporter of public charter schools for decades. And I
 believe that Teach for America plays a critical role in sparking the love of
 teaching and creating a corps of young people across our country who stay
 dedicated to public service.
 - What I am against is continuing the education wars that are currently being waged. All of us education reformers and union members alike can agree that we should provide every child in America a world class education.

More on Teachers:

- No in-school factor is more important to a child's education than a great teacher. We can all agree on that too. But many communities in America today are facing a teacher shortage. And I believe that this is in no small part due to the fact that teachers are being scapegoated for all of society's problems.
- For the sake of our children, we need to mend this divide and work together to lift all of our teachers up. We need to listen to teachers about what works and what doesn't. That is why I will put a plan forward to improve the recruiting and retention of America's teachers. Certainly, Teach for America and traditional teacher education programs should be part of the solution and should not be pitted against one another.

More on Charters

• I have long been – and still am—a strong support of charter schools. I think quality charts can provide parents with real choices for their children. That is why I'm glad the Every Student Succeeds Act that the President recently signed into law provides resources to expand high-quality public charter schools that are committed to equity and inclusion.

- At the same time, I also want to be sure that public charter schools, like traditional public schools, serve all students and do not discriminate against students with disabilities or students with behavioral challenges.
- The public school system is one of the pillars of our democracy and a pathway to opportunity. As president, I will work to ensure that pathway lives up to the potential of every child.

29. K-12: Name an area or issue on which you oppose the position of the teacher's unions.

- No matter how schools change, there's still nothing more important to a child's education than a great teacher. We need to stop scapegoating teachers and start supporting their work.
- We also need to hold them to high standards. I've told my friends in the teacher's unions that they need to lead in figuring out how to deal with teachers who just can't cut it. One year with a low-quality teacher costs a kid \$50,000 in lifetime earnings. We can't afford to look the other way.
- But we also need to do more to recruit the best and brightest to become teachers. For example, I think every teacher should have in-class training before they start—something like a medical residency. And teachers in Colorado, Connecticut, and Pittsburgh are working to develop innovative approaches to teacher evaluation. We need more of that leadership.
- Finally, we need to listen to teachers about what works and what doesn't. Work with them to design better and smarter tests, and develop curriculums that focus on the whole child. So that we produce the next generation of leaders, not the next generation of test-takers.

<u>30.Higher Ed</u>: What are the differences between your college plans and Senator Sanders' plan?

- [Ask the audience: How many of you have student debt? If you're sitting at home, you know what I'm talking about.]
- Here are the facts. College tuition is up 40 percent in the last ten years. 40 million Americans are facing over a trillion dollars in college debt.
- Here's what my plan does. First, my plan lets anyone with student loans to refinance to today's low rates. It makes no sense that a corporation can refinance its debt but you can't refinance your student loan.
- So I'll let anyone do that—and that will help millions of students save thousands of dollars. And I will make sure that the federal government never profits from student loans.
- Second, my plan ensures that anyone can go to a public college without having to borrow a cent for tuition. No loans for tuition.
- Where Bernie and I disagree is that I don't believe we should spend \$700 billion to send Donald Trump's kids to college for free.
- To make this happen, we need change how we fund higher education—and higher education needs to deliver more for less. All of us have to do our part. That's why my plan is a compact: If students work hard and families contribute what they can afford, then states and schools need to step up too.
- As a student in Nevada told me, the hardest part about going to college shouldn't be paying for it.

Sanders: HRC's plan to means-test college is like means-testing Social Security. Her play is too complicated, and it doesn't ask enough of the rich. It asks too much of the middle class.

• [If he mentions Social Security]: Comparing this to Social Security makes no sense. People pay into Social Security their whole lives. It comes out of their own paycheck. Of course everyone—including the wealthy—should be part of that system.

• But yes, my college plan is a compact. Everyone has to step up and do their part. Families who can afford to, will continue to make a realistic contribution. Students may need work part-time, up to 10 hours a week. States will be held accountable for funding public higher education, not slash budgets. College and universities will be on the hook for providing a better education, not higher and higher bills.

Sanders: Most of the students who go to public colleges and universities aren't wealthy. HRC's attack on my plan is just misleading.

- My plan is targeted to help those who need the help: the middle class and those striving to get into the middle class.
- That's why my plan starts with making sure you can go to college without taking out loans for tuition. It makes community college free. And it lets all 40 million Americans with student loans refinance to today's low rates.
- But my plan does more, too. Targeted help to those who need it most.
- I want to keep building the African American middle class and the Latino middle class by supporting HBCUs and Hispanic-serving institutions with a special fund. HBCUs like Xavier and Howard send way more black students to medical school than the biggest state schools. We need to keep that going.
- I want to make sure the 1 in 4 students who are already parents themselves have the support they need to finish their degrees by funding campus child care centers.
- The President doesn't get a blank check, as nice as that would be. So we need to prioritize. And my priority will always be the middle class and working families.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

- Sanders: introduced the "College for All Act," which would grant everyone free tuition at public colleges, at a federal cost of \$750 billion, which he would fund through an FTT; the plan would require states to invest more in colleges and would require colleges not to spend money on certain non-instruction line-items. His plan would also let anyone refinance their student loan if prevailing interest rate is lower.
- **O'Malley:** introduced a plan for "debt-free" college including room-and-board, "called on" states to immediately freeze their tuition rates, restore investments in higher education, and then tie tuition to no more than 10% of state median income; and said he will pay for his college plan through taxing "wealthier people." He would also allow students with debt to refinance today, and to automatically be enrolled in income-based repayment plans.

 <u>Maryland record:</u> froze college tuition for 4 years in a row.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

YOUR plan:

- <u>Dedicated \$25 bn fund to private nonprofits, like HBCUS</u>: HBCUs graduate the majority of African American teachers in our country, and 1 in 5 African Americans who earn science and engineering BAs.
- Grants to campus childcare centers: Increase funding for this from \$15 to \$250 million. Because 1 in 4 college students is already a parent.
- Work study: Students who participate in federal work-study are more likely to graduate and get a job after college (according to a new study from Columbia's Teacher's College)

Key Facts:

- A college degree boosts life-time earnings by \$500,000 (half a million).
- 40 million people hold \$1.2 trillion in student debt
- People with college debt are paying on average \$400 a month in debt payments, which is more than what the family spends at the supermarket.

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS

Senator Sanders would let people refinance their student loan any time the rate is higher than the prevailing interest rate – but you only allow 1-time refinancing. Why?

• The \$1.2 trillion in outstanding student debt today is a result of a broken system, and I'd let students refinance to fix that. Going forward, I want to build a new system where people don't build up so much debt in the first place. Anyone will be able to enroll in an income-based repayment plan for their loans after they graduate, so they never have to pay more than they can afford.

You have said you'd limit tax expenditures to pay for your College Compact – won't that hurt charitable deductions? Jeb Bush exempts charitable contributions from his change to the tax expenditures.

• I'm looking at special protections for charitable contributions. I'm talking about limiting tax deductions taken by the wealthiest Americans for a wide range of expenditures—deductions these people don't need, and that cost us hundreds of billions of dollars.

You voted to prevent private student loans from being discharged in bankruptcy. How is that student-friendly? Do you regret that vote? Will you reverse it?

• As I said in 2008, I regret that vote. My plan insists that private lenders offer income-based modification options to people having trouble paying off their loans. And I'll make sure lenders can't hide behind the bankruptcy code if they don't.

12/17/2015 SOCIAL SECURITY

31.Retirement Security: How would you fix Social Security? Why should the highest earners be exempt from Social Security taxation on most of their earnings? Your opponents have proposed an across-the-board increase in benefits, but you have not. Even though this year alone, seniors won't get any cost-of-living adjustment at all.

- Social Security lifts more than 14 million seniors out of poverty today, and helps tens of millions more.
- That's why the first thing I'm going to do is fight against any Republican efforts to privatize it. And you know this is a real threat when they are calling Social Security a "Ponzi scheme."
- Second, I think we need to expand Social Security for the groups that need the help the most. Social Security was designed back in the 1930s, and there's some real gender discrimination built into the system.
- I'm going to help survivors often older women—who lose up to half of their benefit when their spouse passes away. The poverty rate for women over 65 is 70 percent higher than it is for men. It's time we fix that.
- And I want to expand benefits for the women <u>and</u> men who take time off from their careers to do the vitally important work of raising a child or caring for an aging parent. Right now, the years they take off don't count toward their Social Security benefit, which means they get shortchanged.
- Finally, we need to preserve Social Security for decades to come. There is no way to do this without asking the highest-income Americans to pay more. There are a number of options for how to do that.
- So please join me in sending a message to the Republicans that we are not going to let them undermine the guarantee of Social Security we're going to make that guarantee even stronger!

12/17/2015 SOCIAL SECURITY

Contrast point with Sanders:

• Senator Sanders and I have a difference in priorities when it comes to Social Security. He wants to expand benefits for people like me and Donald Trump. I want to fix an injustice in our system that he just doesn't address. The Social Security system was built in the 1930s, and there is a lot of gender discrimination built into it. Like the fact that women who take years of their lives to raise a child – those years don't count towards Social Security benefits. Even though caregiving certainly benefits their family, and benefits all of us. Senator Sanders hasn't proposed any plan to put caregivers on an equal footing with everyone else in the Social Security system. No plan to specifically protect widows who lose up to 50% of their Social Security benefit when their spouse dies.

If pushed on raising the social security cap:

• I will fight to protect Social Security for all Americans, for all time. That means extending the life of the Social Security Trust Fund. I agree with Senator Sanders that this will require taxing some income above the current Social Security cap, and taxing income not currently taken into account by the Social Security system. There are a range of ways to do this. We need to come together and find a way for the wealthiest to pay their fair share, and that's how we will ensure solvency.

If pressed by moderator, or O'Malley, on whether YOU would "rule out" benefit cuts:

• I am against benefit cuts. I'm against Republican plans to privatize Social Security, and throw seniors on the mercy of the stock market. My Social Security plan isn't about cutting benefits, it's about expanding them. For women who are short-changed by the current system. For people who've taken time away from their careers to do the vital work of raising a child or caring for a sick relative. Social Security isn't just a program, it's a promise, and it's a promise I intend to keep.

12/17/2015 SOCIAL SECURITY

If REALLY pushed: So, will you pledge "I will never cut Social Security benefits?"

• I've opposed benefit cuts my entire career. And I do oppose the proposal to shift to chained-CPI. I agree with President Obama on many things, but I think he got that one wrong. I don't have a plan to cut benefits, I have a plan to expand them.

If pressed: Do you support Senator Warren's bill to give Social Security beneficiaries, who aren't receiving a cost-of-living adjustment this year, a 3.9% increase? Another \$581 in benefits next year?

• I know some seniors are struggling without a cost of living adjustment this year. And I really do hope that Senator Sanders and his colleagues can get some relief for seniors this year. But the job of the next President will be to find a find a permanent solution to keep Social Security solvent and fix the inequities in the Social Security system.

[PIVOT TO GENERAL SOCIAL SECURITY ANSWER]

OPPONENT POSITIONS

• **Sanders:** across-the-board benefit increase by \$65/month; ensure solvency for another 50 years by lifting the cap on income above \$250,000, and not indexing that level.

• **O'Malley:** supports "boosting monthly benefits in a progressive manner" for all beneficiaries (does not specify); supports extending solvency by "lifting the cap on the payroll tax for workers earning more than \$250,000"; would also provide 5 years of "caregiver credits" to extend the 35-year wage base for those who spend extended time providing full time care for others.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

- Social Security reduced poverty rate for seniors from 80% before it was enacted, to 10% today.
- Social Security Trust Fund is solvent through 2034.
- In 2014, 59 million people received Social Security benefits.

Warren et. al bill: Last week, Senator Warren and 18 other Democratic Senators, including Sanders, Schumer, Murray, and Gillibrand, introduced legislation to give Seniors an ~\$581 check next year—which would represent a 3.9% increase for the average Social Security beneficiary (the same percent increase as top CEOs saw last year). This one-time check would cost about \$40 billion, according to Warren's office, and would be paid for by denying the deductibility of all compensation in excess of \$1 million at public corporations—eliminating the exception for performance pay. This limitation would apply to all employees, and not just to the top 5 executives as under current law. (Note we have considered eliminating the exception for performance pay, but believe this version is too broad since it sweeps in all employees).

35-year wage base, and caregivers: Social Security benefits are based on "average indexed monthly earnings," which is based on the top 35 earning years, adjusted for wage growth. Caregivers, who tend to be women (women make up 66% of unpaid caregivers, according to NOW), often have lower or zero earnings in the years they choose to provide care, lowering their average indexed monthly earnings, and thus, their eventual Social Security benefits.

Women: their own benefit versus spousal benefit: Married persons (and eligible divorced spouses) receive the larger of their own retired worker benefit or 50 percent of their (former) spouse's retired worker benefit. When a spouse dies, a retiree who had been receiving benefits based on her own earnings record sees no increase in benefits, even as her spouse's benefits end—meaning that total Social Security benefits for that family can fall by as much as one-half (though living costs often won't fall that much). For a retiree who has been receiving benefits based on the spouse's earnings record, total benefits for the family fall by one-third when her spouse dies.

- 32.Campaign Finance: If the campaign finance system is broken, and you dislike that, why do you have a SuperPAC? And if you say that is because you don't want to disarm against Republicans, why does it exist for your primary campaign?
 - The Supreme Court's decision in *Citizens United* undermines the very core of our democracy. Billionaires are trying to buy elections. The voices of the American people are being drowned out.
 - I'm going to fight with all my might to fix our broken campaign finance system but I'm not going to fight with one hand tied behind my back.
 - That's why I support a constitutional amendment to fix this. And I will appoint Justices who would roll back *Citizens United* and protect the people's right to be heard—not corporations' right to buy elections.
 - But there are more immediate things I would do, too. We have to end this dark money in politics by requiring more public disclosure. In the 2014 elections, <u>one-third</u> of independent spending was by groups that weren't required to disclose their donors. That's just wrong.
 - I'm proud to have a broad and diverse group of people supporting my campaign. More than 60% of my donors are women; that is an all-time record. And 90% of them are small donors.
 - But I also think unilateral disarmament would be foolish when the Koch brothers have said they will spend \$1 billion to win the 2016 campaign for the Republicans. These folks are out there running against Democrats every day at every level. Two hedge fund billionaires founded a SuperPAC that's airing ads against me right now in Iowa. They are flooding the airwaves with false accusations. We need to fight back. And then we need to take our democracy back.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

- **Sanders:** litmus test for Supreme Court nominees will be overturning *Citizens United*; has also PROPOSED a constitutional amendment in the Senate; supports public funding of federal elections; rejects having a super PAC.
- **O'Malley:** litmus test for Supreme Court nominees will be overturning *Citizens United*, OR constitutional amendment; supports a public financing system for congressional elections that would give Americans a \$25 refundable tax credit; wants to tighten coordination rules between Super PACs and candidates.

33.SuperPAC: Will you tell any supportive SuperPACs not to attack fellow Democrats?

- I've told any group that supports me that this election should be about the issues that affect people's lives. There's enough insults flying around on the other side. We don't need that over here.
- I want the American people to really know—and understand—what I am going to do for them. To get their incomes rising. To help them afford college. To save for retirement. To help them deal with a family member struggling with drug addiction. The big fights, and the quiet fights.
- Now, I don't think any of us should shy away from laying out our meaningful differences on issues. We should debate them openly and fairly. But that's what this election should be about. Issues.

If pressed on Correct the Record's Attack on Sanders' Connection to Jeremy Corbin; i.e., do you disavow that attack, which suggested Sen. Sanders is allied with Chavez?

• I don't know exactly what you're talking about. I don't know the context of that. What I can tell you unequivocally is that this should be focused on issues, not attacks.

12/13/2015 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

<u>34.Criminal Justice</u>: Do you think the policies that you and your husband supported in the 1990s are to blame for the mass incarceration problem? If so, why did you support them?

- It's time to face the hard truth about race and justice in America. The recent dash-cam video of the shooting of Laquan McDonald in Chicago is yet another example. African American men are still far more likely than white men to be stopped by police, charged with crimes, and sentenced to long prison terms. African American children face the same discrimination.
- I have heard the impact when I've met with leaders of the Black Lives Matter movement. I've met with mothers who have lost their children—at the hands of police, of civilians. I sat with them and heard their stories. About the tragic deaths of Hadiya Pendleton, Eric Garner, Tamir Rice, and others.
- We have got to come together and change our system. After the recent Chicago video was released, I called for a full review by the Justice Department into the practices of the Chicago police department. I think we need better officer training on de-escalation. To put an end to racial profiling. And to end the era of mass incarceration—by cutting back on mandatory minimums, ending for-profit prisons, and ending the crackcocaine disparity.
- But we also need to fight for common-sense gun reform and comprehensive background checks. To keep guns out of the wrong hands, including the mentally unstable, domestic abusers, and, of course, criminals.

If pressed on the 1994 crime bill in particular:

• As to the 1994 crime bill—I think it's a mixed story. City and community leaders were pushing for something to be done after a roaring decade of crime. The bill included things we can all be proud of, like the Violence Against Women Act and a ban on assault weapons. But it also increased federal sentences across the board, and spurred states to do the same. So now

12/13/2015 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

we have men in jail for the rest of their lives for stealing socks. That's just wrong. And we have thousands of African-American and Latino men behind bars, instead of at the kitchen table with their kids. That's not how we're going to build stronger communities.

Sanders/O'Malley: Secretary Clinton might say she is for criminal justice reform. But she won't even address one of the gravest problems in the criminal justice system. The death penalty. We should repeal it.

- I think the death penalty should be an option for juries to impose in the most heinous cases. Like the Oklahoma City bombing. Like the terrorists who attacked us on 9/11. My opponents and I just disagree on this issue.
- Of course, I also believe that the death penalty must be administered fairly and there are serious problems in how it has been administered. African-Americans are far more likely than whites to face the death penalty. There are 3,000 people on death row in America 271 in Texas alone. So while I do understand why juries have chosen to impose the death penalty in the most heinous of cases, I also believe that we need to address the inequities in the system.
- [Pushback: Remember, I was the Senator from New York on September 11. I met with the families of the victims and saw first-hand every day for a long time the damage the terrorists did. Khalid Sheik Mohammed, the mastermind behind that terrible day, is awaiting trial right now. And I was First Lady when the Oklahoma City bomber killed 168 people, including 19 children. I met their parents. I saw what was done. Because of acts of terror like these, I may think about the death penalty differently than my opponents.].

If pressed on "sigh of relief": Why would you breathe a sigh of relief if the Supreme Court struck down something you said you'd maintain?

• If the Supreme Court would address the problems in the states in how the death penalty is implemented and applied, I think that would be a good thing. Problems like the racial inequities in so many states' criminal justice

12/13/2015 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

systems, like how African-Americans are still stricken from juries. Problems with access to counsel – because every defendant has the right to a competent lawyer.

If pressed on: Do you believe there is a "Ferguson effect" occurring, where police officers are afraid to enforce the law – as FBI Director James Comey has warned about?

- My concern is that trust has eroded so deeply between police and some of
 the communities they protect. And I think we need to rebuild that trust –
 trust on both sides, the community and the police. We need to respect law
 our brave enforcement officers who put their lives on the line every day to
 keep communities safe. But we also need more accountability which I've
 said I support body cameras for every police department. Perhaps with
 greater transparency will come greater trust.
- I agree with President Obama that we haven't seen hard evidence of this sort of national trend. There has been anecdotal suggestions. But I think we are ill-equipped to have this whole conversation because as a nation, we aren't collecting the data we should on crime, policing activity, and accountability. We need a much better effort on this.

12/12/2015 CRIMINAL JUSTICE

If pressed: A majority of Chicagoans now think that Rahm should resign as mayor. Do YOU?

• I am deeply troubled by the shooting of Laquan McDonald by a Chicago police officer and the actions that followed. I made clear from the start that I support a full review by the Justice Department —one that goes beyond this terrible case, into the larger practices in the Chicago police department. The Attorney General has said she is going forward with that investigation, which is good.

• As to Rahm, he has said he is committed to complete and total reform and I would give him the chance to prove it. Everyone should hold him to that standard.

OPPONENT POSITIONS

- Sanders: eliminate mandatory minimums that result in sentencing disparities between blacks and whites; invest in community policing; federally fund and require body cameras for police; new rules on use of force, and de-escalation training; legalize medical marijuana and; ban forprofit prisons; abolish the death penalty.
- O'Malley: eliminate mandatory minimums for low-level drug offenses; reclassify marijuana from a Schedule I to a II controlled substance; encourage states to appoint independent prosecutors to investigate police misconduct; establish a national use of force guideline, and encourage states to do the same; body cameras; require enforcement agencies to report data on all police-involved shootings; end the death penalty; ban solitary confinement for juveniles; abolish the death penalty. Also, robust reentry program, including education for prisoners while in prison.

PUSHBACK/KEY POINTS

- There are 2 million Americans behind bars today—about 4 times more than in 1980. We spend \$80 billion a year to keep folks in jail.
- There are 1.5 million missing black men from everyday life—largely because they are in prison, or died early.
- One in every 28 children has a parent in prison.
- One third of all black men face the prospect of prison during their lifetimes. (Compared to 1: 17 white men).
- Black drivers are three times more likely to be searched during a traffic stop than white drivers in 2008.
- Mass incarceration and drugs: About 50% of the federal prison population, and 16% of the state prison population, is there for drugs. The majority of these individuals are there for nonviolent offenses, but they are not necessarily low-level (most are not). BUT IN RAW NUMBERS, drug offenses HAVE been a significant driver of mass incarceration over the last 2 decades. We had approx. 40k people in prison for drugs in the 1980s. In 2014, it was 500,000 people locked up for drugs.
- Federal death penalty: since 1988, 75 federal defendants have been sentenced to death, and only THREE have been executed (Timothy McVeigh, the Oklahoma City bomber, Juan Garza, a drug dealer, and Louis Jones, who kidnapped and murdered a white female soldier). There are 62 federal defendants on death row currently.

• How the 1994 crime bill effected state sentences: The bill created 2 grant programs of roughly \$10 billion total. The money was used to construct, expand, or renovate correctional facilities. To qualify, states had to either implement "truth in sentencing" guidelines showing that violent offenders were serving 85% of their sentences, or had to otherwise increase the percentage of violent offenders sentenced to prison, the average time violent offenders served, or make sure repeat serious drug offenders served 85% of their sentence. States responded by adding prison beds and incarcerating more people. About 50% of the growth in state prison inmates between 1990 and 1997 were violent offenders, and 19% of the growth were drug offenders.

TRICKY MODERATOR QUESTIONS

Do you think Darren Wilson - the police officer that shot Michael Brown - should have been indicted?

• I am glad the Department of Justice opened an investigation. We should be taking a close look at these kinds of cases to make sure justice is served.

You said you'd restore the right to vote for ex-felons – would you limit that to people on probation or done serving their time, or include people in prison?

• I would focus on people who have served time and paid their debts to society, because they should be able to move on. Fully participate and reintegrate into society. And one of the ways to do that is to participate in our democracy—and that means restoring the right to vote.

Note: Only 2 states actually allow people in prison to vote.

Will you sign onto a moratorium on executions while we get to the bottom of the disparity in imposition of the death penalty? (Both Sanders and O'Malley oppose the death penalty)

• I am deeply concerned by racial disparities in the application of the death penalty. And I have supported efforts to make it more fair and just. I support the governors who have imposed moratoriums

35.Marijuana: Governor O'Malley says he supports rescheduling marijuana from Schedule I of the Controlled Substances Act to Schedule II. Senator Sanders said he would deschedule it all together. What is YOUR position?

- I strongly believe we need more research into the medicinal uses of marijuana. So yes, I support rescheduling it at the federal level. So that we open the door for greater research.
- I also think the states should be the laboratories of democracy on this. Four states now allow recreational use of marijuana. 17 states have decriminalized possession of small amounts of marijuana. And about half the states allow medical use. I would continue the Obama Administration's enforcement guidelines in this area, to allow states to experiment—and let this all play out.

If pressed: what about marijuana banking restrictions – should we let marijuana businesses access banking services?

- I do think these businesses if they are operating in according with state law, and with federal guidelines should be able to access banking services. I know that the Obama Administration has taken steps in this direction, and I think those steps are smart.
- Not having access to banking services can force legal and licensed businesses to deal in cash, making their stores a target for theft. Cash-only operations also are more difficult to audit. I will continue to evaluate the steps the Administration had taken, to determine if we should go further.

KEY FACTS

Fast Facts on marijuana and incarceration

- Marijuana accounts for half of all drug arrests.
- In 2014, there were 700,000 arrests for marijuana-related offenses. And of those, 90% were for possession.
- Of the 500,000 people incarcerated for drug offenses today, thousands are there for marijuana crimes (one estimate is 40,000).

SUMMARY: While YOU should avoid saying marijuana accounts for a signification portion of the U.S. correctional population, or a significant portion of those behind bars for drug offenses, it IS correct that there are hundreds of thousands of arrests for marijuana crimes, and that there are thousands of people serving (some) time for marijuana crimes – many of whom would likely be better off in their communities.

Background on marijuana legalization:

- Over two-thirds of Americans now live in a jurisdiction that permits the use of marijuana in some form.
- Four states have legalized marijuana for recreational use: Alaska, Oregon, Colorado, and Washington.
- An additional 17 states have de-criminalized small amounts of marijuana: California, Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Nebraska, Nevada, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oregon, Rhode Island, and Vermont.
- A total of 23 states have legalized Medical marijuana.
- Activists in nearly every state are attempting to put marijuana on the ballot in 2016. Experts predict that ballot measures will take place in Nevada (confirmed), as well as California, Hawaii, Maine, Massachusetts, Missouri, and New York.
- Note that on November 3rd, Ohio voted against legalizing recreational and medical marijuana via an amendment to the state's constitution.

<u>Background on continuing the Obama Administration's enforcement priorities.</u> Like the Obama Administration's current approach to the criminal enforcement of federal marijuana laws, YOU would not intervene in states that are reforming their own marijuana laws, as long as those states adhere to certain federal priorities. These priorities include not selling to minors, preventing interstate transport of marijuana, and keeping organized crime out of the indust

36.Gun Violence Prevention: What would you do to address the problem of gun violence in America?

- 33,000 Americans are killed by guns each year. Many thousands more are injured. That trend means in the 35 days since we last met on a debate stage, more than 3,000 people were killed by guns. It means nearly 250 children and teenagers were killed by guns.
- We are better than this. It is time to act. I have a clear, common sense approach. Comprehensive background checks. Prevent suspected terrorists from buying guns. Close the Charleston loophole that allowed the Charleston shooter to buy his gun and kill nine people in a church.
- Senator Sanders has a different record. He voted 5 times against the Brady Bill, which created the background check system. He voted FOR that Charleston loophole.
- And he voted FOR the immunity law for gun manufacturers. He wants to hold every corporation responsible for something—except those that make or sell guns. He said in both of our debates that he'd revisit that issue. America is waiting. He's introduced or co-sponsored 21 bills since then,—but he's been silent on the immunity issue.
- I will not be intimidated by the gun lobby. I will fight for the right of every parent to send their kids to school, or to a movie theater, or to a Bible study, without having to fear that someone will pull out a gun they shouldn't have-and start shooting.

If asked: How do YOU respond to the Republicans' argument that more gun control measures will NOT prevent the next terrorist attack—that Democrats are too focused on using gun control to fight terrorism—and if anything, we need more guns rather than less, so civilians can self-protect?

- The central job of the President of the United States is to keep families safe. That's why it seems like a no-brainer to me: If you're too dangerous to fly on a plane, you're too dangerous to buy a gun.
- Of course protecting our people from terrorist attacks both at home and abroad, like the tragic shooting in San Bernardino, demands a comprehensive counterterrorism strategy. And I have a plan. To defeat ISIS and other terrorist groups on the ground, shut them down on the internet, prevent them from spreading their ugly and hateful ideology, and disable them from coming here and launching attacks.
- But keeping Americans safe also means protecting our people from the indiscriminate and indefensible gun violence that is claiming more than 90 lives a day in this country. We need to be smart and sensible in preventing gun violence. To at last establish universal background checks, hold manufacturers and retailers liable for their products, and keep guns out of the wrong hands.
- We should be pursuing both objectives to keep our people safe.

If pressed: But what about arguments that the no-fly list or terrorism watch list are overly-broad, and don't allow for due process?

• I think it is pretty simple: suspected terrorists who are too dangerous to get on a plane are too dangerous to have guns. And the legislation the Democrats proposed in Congress to fix this loophole, and that the Republicans recently blocked – legislation that was first proposed by the George W. Bush Administration – is not overly broad. It would have allowed the Attorney General and the FBI to stop a suspected terrorist from buying a gun on a case-by-case basis. It would allow anyone who thinks they are mistakenly denied a gun to challenge the denial—first with the Justice Department and then in court. So the idea this would impact lawabiding gun owners is just wrong and it is intended to serve as a distraction.

[NOTE: We recommend YOU use the phrases "prevent suspected terrorists from buying guns," or "people deemed too dangerous to fly are too dangerous to buy guns," rather than referring specifically to the "terrorism watch list." Sen.

Feinstein's bill, which the Republicans blocked, wouldn't have used the no-fly list or terrorism watch list as the basis for its policy, but instead would have allowed the AG to deny a sale by a federally licensed dealer on a case by case basis.].

Sanders: You're misrepresenting my record. I only have 2 bad votes. I supported closing the gun-show loophole, which was a courageous vote in my state. And after San Bernardino, I voted again to close the gun-show loophole. I voted to deny guns to people on the terrorist watch list.

- I don't know how Senator Sanders is doing his math. He voted against the Brady Bill 5 times. He voted to protect gun manufacturers and dealers from liability—and then voted to make it harder to revoke the licenses of dealers who break the law. He voted to let people bring guns on Amtrak trains. He voted to let people bring guns into national parks.
- And even though he voted against the Brady Bill, he voted for a loophole that says if a background check isn't completed within 3 days, a dealer can sell the gun anyway. That's the loophole the shooter in Charleston used, to get his gun. So that's a lot of votes many more than two.
- And here is my problem: Senator Sanders still won't say any of those votes were a mistake, like his vote against the Brady Bill. He still won't tell us what he'd do about the immunity law. On the Charleston loophole, there is a bill right now pending in the Senate to close it, with 14 Democratic cosponsors. Senator Sanders isn't one of them.
- There is nothing courageous about bowing to the gun lobby and, in the face of thousands of shootings every month in this country, refusing to own up to your record.

Sanders: I can forge a consensus, with dialog on both sides.

• There *is* a consensus in this country. 92% of Americans support background checks. 85% of *gun owners* support them. We have a consensus. What we

need is someone who is willing to stand up to the gun lobby. Just look at the other side – Ted Cruz's Super PAC is bragging that he blocked the Senate from finally passing comprehensive background checks, after 20 innocent children were killed at Sandy Hook elementary. So we need someone who is going to finally stand up to this, stand up to the gun lobby, and take leadership.

• [PIVOT TO: He won't admit he made a mistake...]

Sanders: And I take offense at you saying I was sexist to talk about shouting and gun control. You know better than that. My point wasn't directed at you -I've been saying that for years. You should apologize to me for calling me sexist.

- I take Senator Sanders at his word. But the real issue isn't how loud I've made my voice to demand we take action on guns because nothing's going to stop me from doing that it's why hasn't Senator Sanders raised his voice?
- One thing I admire about Senator Sanders is how outspoken he is about issues he is passionate about. I just wish he would raise his voice the same way about the scourge, the crisis, the epidemic that is gun violence in America.
- This is no time for standing on the sidelines or having quiet conversations. All of us all of us must speak clearly and loudly, together: we are not going to let the NRA have its way in Washington any longer!

Sanders: Like on so many issues, Secretary Clinton is flip-flopping here. In 2008, criticized Obama on guns and talked about learning to shoot guns as a child.

• My father did teach me to shoot as a child. And he taught me about the proud American tradition of hunters and sportsmen, who treat their guns with respect and who practice strict gun safety. I lived for two decades in Arkansas. I represented rural New York as a Senator. I understand that gun ownership, hunting and shooting is an important to many Americans.

There's nothing inconsistent about respecting America's tradition of gun ownership and wanting stronger gun violence prevention laws on the books. The majority of gun owners support comprehensive background checks. They support measures to keep guns out of the hands of criminals and the mentally ill. Many of them don't feel the NRA is speaking for them when they are lobbying in Washington and in the states. And I hope those hunters and sportsmen will stand with me in this fight.

O'Malley: In 2008, Secretary Clinton said we should have no "federal blanket" gun laws. Now she's changed her tune. I've been consistent.

- I think Governor O'Malley is making a mistake when he resorts to this kind of misleading political attack. I have not been shy about speaking out against the gun lobby and in favor of strong federal gun measures. The fact is: I have always supported the Brady Bill. The assault weapons ban. And I voted against giving gun makers and dealers immunity from liability. And Governor O'Malley knows that.
- I would expect more from Governor O'Malley than to take my words out of context when he knows full well that in 2008, I was talking about allowing some cities and states -- like New York -- to go further than the federal government. Something I am sure he supports and I support. Tonight we should talk about the differences that do exist among us, but not invent differences where there aren't any.

If pressed: Do YOU support a national gun registry – an idea YOU did supported at one point in the past?

• I do not. I don't think a national gun registry is the right answer to our problems. I want to focus on the policies we know will work best. [Pivot to plan: So first, we need comprehensive background checks – and if Congress refuses to act, I would use my executive authority to close the gun show and Internet sales loopholes. Second, we should make sure suspected terrorists

cannot buy guns. Third, we need to close the loophole that allows people to get a gun if a background check is not completed within three days, which the shooter in Charleston used.]

If pressed: what do YOU say about proposals, such as by Ted Cruz and Mike Huckabee, to pare back gun free zones, so that more civilians can have arms to protect themselves against terrorists?

• Gun free zones are for the most part a state and local policy decision – but I would say this. Does anyone really think it's a good idea to allow people to carry guns into football games? Or into schools or bars? My priority is to pursue gun safety measures that will work – and that will keep us safer. [Pivot to plan: So first, we need comprehensive background checks ...]

ADDITIONAL BACKGROUND:

<u>Suspected terrorist gun purchases:</u> Between 2004 and 2014, suspected terrorists attempted to purchase guns from American dealers at least 2,233 times. And in 2,043 of those cases — 91 percent of the time — they succeeded. Not a single gun buyer on the terror watch list was turned away because they were a suspected terrorist. Instead, reasons for their rejections included felony conviction, under indictment, adjudicated mental health, misdemeanor crime or domestic violence conviction, fugitive from justice and controlled substance abuse

Ownership and carrying licensure: There is no federal law that requires gun owners to be licensed—either for gun ownership or for carrying. In the 13 states that require licenses for gun ownership, licensing laws fall into two broad categories. Ten states mandate that prospective firearm purchasers obtain a permit or license prior to the purchase of at least some firearms. These laws are known as "permit to purchase" licensing schemes. Illinois and Massachusetts, on the other hand, require a "license to own" a firearm, and New York requires a license to own a handgun. Unlike a permit to purchase, a license to own a firearm must remain valid for as long as the person owns the firearm. In many of these states, an individual must undergo a criminal background check to obtain a license.

	Type	Type of license	Safety training/exam	Duration
California	All firearms	Permit to purchase	Yes	5 years
Connecticut	All firearms	Permit to purchase	Yes	5 years
Hawaii	All firearms	Permit to purchase	Yes (handguns)	10 days
			No (long guns)	1 year
Iowa	Handguns	Permit to purchase	No	1 year
Illinois	All firearms	License to own	No	10 years
Maryland	Handguns	Permit to purchase	Yes	10 years
Massachusetts	All firearms	License to own	Yes	6 years
		Permit to purchase	Yes	10 days
Michigan	Handguns	Permit to purchase	No	30 days
Nebraska	Handguns	Permit to purchase	No	3 years
New Jersey	All firearms	Permit to purchase	No	No limit (long guns)
				90 days (handguns)
New York	Handguns	License to own	No	5 years
North Carolina	Handguns	Permit to purchase	No	5 years
Rhode Island	Handguns	Permit to purchase	Yes	Unspecified

Every state allows the carrying of concealed weapons in some form. Forty-four states generally require a state-issued permit in order to carry concealed weapons in public (a "carrying of concealed weapons permit" or "CCW permit"). The

remaining six (Alaska, Arizona, Kansas, Maine, Vermont, and Wyoming) generally allow individuals to carry concealed weapons in public without a permit. Of the 44 states that generally require a CCW permit in order to carry concealed weapons in public, nine states have "may issue" laws, which grant the issuing authority wide discretion to deny a CCW permit to an applicant if, for example, the authority believes the applicant lacks good character or lacks a good reason for carrying a weapon in public. The other 35 states have "shall issue" laws, which require the issuing authority to grant most CCW permit requests. "Shall issue" laws can be further subdivided between 18 states that provide no discretion to the issuing authority, and 17 states which provide the issuing authority a limited amount of discretion. While every state has its own unique CCW permitting system, the strongest laws require CCW applicants to demonstrate good cause as to why the applicant needs a permit.

Three states (California, Florida, and Illinois) and the District of Columbia prohibit the carrying of any firearm openly in public. Another two states (New York and South Carolina) prohibit the open carrying of a handgun, but not a long gun, and another three states (Massachusetts, Minnesota, and New Jersey) prohibit the open carrying of a long gun, but not a handgun. In the remaining states, the open carrying of firearms is generally allowed, although some states require the person to first obtain a permit or license.

Assault weapons bans: The 1994 crime bill made it unlawful for a person to manufacture, transfer, or possess a semiautomatic assault weapon. The law expired in 2004. The law defined the phrase "semiautomatic assault weapon" to include 19 named firearms and copies of those firearms, as well as certain semi-automatic rifles, pistols and shotguns with at least two specified characteristics from a list of features. The federal ban also prohibited the transfer and possession of any new large capacity ammunition magazine. The act suffered from a notable limitation: The two-feature test and the inclusion of some features that were purely cosmetic in nature created a loophole that allowed manufacturers to circumvent the law by making minor modifications to the weapons they already produced.

Currently, seven states and the District of Columbia have laws banning assault weapons: CA, CT, HI, MD, MA, NJ and NY. In addition, MN and VA prohibit children from possessing assault weapons. Many localities across the country also have bans, including in Highland Park, Illinois, where the Supreme Court recently declined to grant cert on a case challenging the regulation. Some state and local

assault weapon bans prohibit specific weapons by listing them by name. Some bans list features that, when present, make a gun an assault weapon.

• California has one of the most comprehensive approaches to defining assault weapons, banning roughly 75 assault weapon types, models and series by name and providing a one-feature generic test for rifles and pistols. The law generally prohibits rifles with detachable magazines from being sold. However, an exception known as the "bullet button loophole" deems a magazine "fixed" even if it can be easily removed by pressing the tip of a loose bullet into a recessed button, allowing for a high-capacity magazine to be inserted in its place. A bill to close this loophole was vetoed by Governor Brown in 2007.

12/13/2015 CLIMATE CHANGE

37. Energy & Climate Change: What will you do to combat climate change? Why is your plan better than your opponents'?

- Last week, we saw what American leadership can do. The entire world came together in Paris to take on a defining challenge of our time.
- The next ten years are going to be critical—because if we don't take ambitious steps now, it's going to be impossible to meet any goals for 2030, 2050, or beyond.
- I have an ambitious plan to combat climate change using every tool we have, starting on day one.
 - o I'll set big new clean energy goals: Half a <u>billion</u> solar panels installed by the end of my first term. Enough renewable energy to power every home in America within 10 years.
 - I'll slash carbon pollution in every sector of the economy. Energy.
 Transportation. Housing. Industry. Infrastructure.
 - I will reach out to the leaders of Mexico and Canada to forge a new North American Climate Compact to cut carbon pollution.
- And I know that there are some places where we need to <u>keep fossil fuels in the ground</u> or under the water. That's why as President I will say NO to drilling in the Arctic.
- As for the Republicans, who say they're not scientists, who stick their head in the sand, who use taxpayer dollars to give a platform to climate deniers: I'm putting them on notice. I'm not a scientist, either, but I'm going to lead this fight and make America the clean energy superpower of the 21st century—because our future depends on it.

12/13/2015 CLIMATE CHANGE

Moderator: You've touted your involvement in the Copenhagen talks, but those were widely regarded as a disaster, since they failed to achieve a binding international agreement. What do you say in response?

- To be frank, without Copenhagen, we would not have achieved the strong international agreement that was finalized just last week in Paris.
- Copenhagen brought the Chinese and the Indians to the table for the first time. They agreed to be part of the solution. And we're seeing results. So I'm proud of the role I played.
- But combating climate change is bigger than any one agreement. I applaud the incredible progress President Obama made in Paris. But we have more work to do. That's why I'm going to keep pushing every day of my Presidency to build on that progress. That's why I will start working right away to forge a new North American Climate Compact with our allies in Canada and Mexico to slash carbon pollution across the continent. It's why I will set ambitious new goals for clean energy.
- And it's why I will never give in to the defeatists who say climate change is too big and too difficult a problem to solve. We're Americans! Solving big problems is what we're about.

IF Sanders criticizes the Paris climate deal:

• For the first time in our history, 195 countries came together to combat climate change. The United States led the charge. And you can't take yes for an answer! This is a big deal and I am incredibly proud of President Obama for getting it done.

Moderator: Governor O'Malley and Senator Sanders have said climate change is the single biggest national security threat facing our country. Do you agree?

• I said in our first debate that I think our biggest national security challenge is the threat of terrorist groups acquiring nuclear weapons—because of the

12/13/2015 CLIMATE CHANGE

scale of devastation they could cause. But the fact is, a President has to do more than one thing at a time. We clearly face an ongoing threat from terrorist attacks. And I agree that climate change is a serious threat to our economy, our public health, and our national security.

- The Pentagon calls climate change a "threat multiplier" that could push existing conflicts over the edge. It's already contributing to conflicts and food insecurity in the Middle East and the Horn of Africa. The U.S. is an Arctic nation and climate change is already reshaping Alaska and the Arctic, and we need to do more to prevent potential conflicts in that region.
- As President, I will be focused on keeping Americans safe at home, defeating ISIS abroad, and pushing forward to build on the progress we've made in combating climate change and make sure America is getting the good-paying jobs that will come from becoming the clean energy superpower of the 21st century.

Sanders: I'm leading this fight. We need a carbon tax. I want to stop fossil fuel leasing on public lands. We need to keep fossil fuels in the ground.

- I will slash taxpayer subsidies for fossil fuels and invest that money in clean energy. Right now taxpayers are paying twice—once when we give away huge tax breaks to fossil fuels, and then we pay a second time with worse storms, more flooding, and hotter wildfire seasons from climate change.
- But we are not going to solve the climate challenge unless we have a comprehensive strategy to build a clean energy economy for the 21st century. I have that plan.
- That's why I have called for a Clean Energy Challenge that will slash carbon pollution and make the US the clean energy superpower we can and should be. I've released my plan to have half a billion solar panels installed in this country by the end of my first term and to produce enough renewable electricity to power every home in America within ten years of taking office.

12/17/2015 CLIMATE CHANGE

 And I'm not stopping there. I will be outlining my plans to make our cars, trucks, buildings and industry cleaner and more efficient, which will save households and businesses billions of dollars on their energy bills and make U.S. manufacturing more competitive. We need to use every tool we have. There is no Planet B.

If pressed on creating a carbon tax:

- That's not part of my plan. I will slash taxpayer subsidies for fossil fuels and invest that money in clean energy. Right now taxpayers are paying twice—once when we give away huge tax breaks to fossil fuels, and then we pay a second time with worse storms, more flooding, and hotter wildfire seasons.
- And I believe we need to accelerate clean energy innovation. The fact of the
 matter is, New England already has the highest electric costs in the country.
 Here in New Hampshire, you know how expensive it is to heat your homes
 with fuel oil in the winters. We should be cutting families' energy costs and
 investing in building a clean energy future.
- My plan gets started on day one with ambitious new goals. Half a billion solar panels by the end of my first term. Enough renewable electricity to power every home in America within 10 years. A Clean Energy Challenge to partner with states, cities, and rural communities. A new North American Climate Compact with Canada and Mexico to cut carbon pollution continent-wide.

If pressed hard by O'Malley:

• I take a back seat to no one when it comes to climate leadership. And I'd remind Governor O'Malley that he was the one who approved fracking in Western Maryland despite significant community concern.

If asked: Do you support the deal that lifted the oil export ban this week?

• First of all, the bill passed this week protected the gains we've made under the President's Climate Action Plan, and that's critically important for the fight against climate change. But I would have liked to see real concessions from the oil and gas industry—like ending their \$60 billion in special tax breaks—and more significant investments in building a clean energy future.

YOUR OPPONENTS SAY:

SANDERS: In early December, Sanders released a comprehensive climate plan, which includes a carbon tax, a goal of cutting emissions 40 percent below 1990 levels by 2030, a ban on any new fossil fuel production in federal lands or waters (including the Gulf of Mexico), and a call for a "national environmental and climate justice plan" recognizing the disproportionate impact of climate change on low-income and minority communities.

He also wants to deny license extensions to existing nuclear power plants, which currently produce 20 percent of US electricity, likely making it harder and more costly to meet emissions goals. He explicitly says he will ban fossil fuel lobbyists from working in the White House, and claims his plan will create 10 million clean energy jobs—which excludes the jobs lost in fossil and is many times higher than even the most ambitious think tank estimates, which put net job creation of the clean energy transition at 1 million jobs in 2030 and 2 million in 2050.

We suggest YOU focus on Republican obstructionism in addition to anything you want to say about Exxon and oil companies generally, as Sanders rarely takes the fight to the Republicans.

OMALLEY: O'Malley has set a target of the United States being 100% renewable energy by 2050 – not just in our power sector, but in transportation. He opposes the Keystone pipeline, Arctic drilling, opening up any new areas for offshore oil development, and wants to raise royalties for fossil fuel production on public lands.

In 2014, O'Malley said he was ready to allow fracking in Western Maryland, provided environmental safeguards.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

- Three-quarters of Americans accept the scientific consensus on climate change, including 59% of Republicans, according to UT-Austin.
- So far this year, more than 9 million acres have burned in wildfires. That's equal to Maryland + Rhode Island.
- Water levels in New York harbor are a foot higher than a century ago. In Norfolk, Virginia, home of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet, they are over a foot higher than in 1930.
- Rising sea levels are causing flooding. By 2050, U.S. coastal cities will have 30 days of localized flooding per year.

- By 2050, \$106 billion in property could be below sea level in the U.S.
- Since the creation of the EPA, pollution has been cut 70%. While economy tripled in size.
- The solar industry created jobs at 20 times the rate of rest of economy last year.
- The US produces 3 times as much electricity from wind, and 30 times as much from solar, compared to 2008.
- Every 4 minutes, another home or business goes solar.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Would you take Yucca Mountain off the table – shut it down?

If people of NV don't want it, it shouldn't happen. I still have concerns today, as I had as a Senator, about Yucca Mountain. And I think no community should have a waste repository facility forced on them. I support the Obama Administration's decision to follow a consent-based siting policy for nuclear waste repositories, which respects local communities' wishes. I think it will help us find a way to continue to use zero-carbon nuclear power safely

- 38. LGBT: Secretary Clinton has said it was proper to jail Kim Davis for refusing to issue wedding licenses to same sex couples. How about private people should they be able to deny services to LGBT customers on the basis of their religious beliefs?
- We can all be proud that today, across America the country, you can marry
 the person that you love. But as it's been widely said, there are still places
 where you can get married on Saturday, post the pictures on Facebook on
 Sunday, and fired from your job on Monday. So we have got to get rid of
 LGBT discrimination in every aspect of our laws, once and for all.
- That's why we need a law that bans discrimination against LGBT Americans across all parts of public life: employment, housing, schools, jury service.
- And we can respect religious liberty this by maintaining the exemptions that let churches and religious nonprofits express a preference for hiring people of their own faith. These have been part of our civil rights laws for decades.
- But can a county clerk refuse to issue marriage licenses to same-sex couples? No. Marriage equality is the law of the land, and state officers must follow the law. Should a wedding photographer or florist be able to refuse to serve a same-sex couple? No. We don't let people refuse to serve Catholics or African Americans because it's against their religion.
- I will not rest until we achieve full equality and full protections for LGBT Americans.

Sanders: I've been a staunch supporter of marriage equality for decades. I didn't wait until 2013 to speak out the way you did. President Clinton signed Don't Ask Don't Tell, he signed the Defense of Marriage Act—two laws that set us back.

• I am surprised to hear Senator Sanders criticize my position on marriage equality. Because as recently as 2009, we had the same position.

- When he voted against the Defense of Marriage Act, he called that a "states' rights" vote not a vote for marriage equality. And in 2006, when he was asked if he supported same-sex marriage he said, "not right now" and supported civil unions instead. Now, I don't fault Senator Sanders for coming to a different position, like I did, and President Obama, and Vice President Biden, and so many Americans have. But you just can't attack someone else for doing the same thing you did.
- The question is who can lead the <u>next</u> fight, for full equality and protection from discrimination. Because now LGBT Americans can get married on Saturday. Post the pictures on Sunday. And then get fired on Monday and evicted on Tuesday.
- On my first day as Senator, I co-sponsored the Employment Non-Discrimination Act to protect LGBT Americans. As President, I will lead the fight to pass the Equality Act and ensure that LGBT Americans have full protections and full equality in the eyes of the law once and for all.

Sanders: But you said President Clinton signed the Defense of Marriage Act because there was a threat of a Constitutional amendment, and that conversation wasn't happening in 1996. And Don't Ask, Don't Tell you said was the lesser of two evils. You can't have it both ways.

- That is my recollection from 20 years ago and I readily admit it might reflect private conversations rather than public ones.
- I've been very candid about this. Because of the activism of the LGBT community, because of my own friends, because of my daughter, my views changed. And the more we talk about the way things were 20 years ago, the happier I am about just how much has changed.
- The greater mystery to me is why Senator Sanders has been out on the campaign trail criticizing me for having had the same position he had in 2006.

- Especially when it comes to a civil rights issue like this, it is not productive to look backward and launch campaign-style attacks. We need to focus on the next fight for equality. There's still so much work to do. We can't stand for an America where LGBT people can get married on Saturday but then fired from their job on Monday just because of who they are and who they love.
- There is no justifying the Defense of Marriage Act or Don't Ask, Don't Tell, and today there is no one more committed to LGBT equality than me.

YOUR OPPONENTS SAY:

SANDERS: Supports the Equality Act.

OMALLEY: Supports the Equality Act. Signed marriage equality into law in 2012.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

Although Sanders voted against DOMA in 1996, that vote was about federalism and states' rights. His anti-DOMA statements from the time were that each state should get to decide. At the time, Sanders' wife and then-chief of staff, Jane, said the congressman opposed the proposal because he believed it improperly interfered with states' authority by violating the full faith and credit clause of the Constitution. 'We're not legislating values. We have to follow the Constitution,' Jane Sanders said. 'And anything that weakens the Constitution should be (addressed) by a constitutional amendment, not by a law passed by Congress.' 'You're opening up a Pandora's box here,' she added. 'You're saying that any state can refuse to... recognize the laws of another state if they don't like them.'

Sanders SUPPORTED Vermont's civil union law as late as 2006. In 2006, when asked whether Vermont should pass marriage equality (they already had a civil union law on the books), Sanders said, "I support the civil union law...I'm comfortable with that right now." And while he noted that Vermont "led the way," on civil unions, he called it "a very divisive debate." Asked whether Vermont should legalize full marriage rights for same-sex couples, he said: "Not right now, not after what we went through."

In 1990, when asked if he would support a bill to protect LGBT people from job discrimination, Sanders said, "probably not."

<u>In 2006, O'Malley said marriage was between a man and a woman but supported</u> civil unions.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Do you support transgender rights or open service for transgender in the military?

 Yes, everyone able and willing to serve, should. When I was Sec of State, we made it possible for transgender Americans to have true gender reflected on passports.

Should there be any restrictions on LGBT Americans donating blood?

• The FDA has made progress but it still imposes a 1-year ban for gay or bisexual men, requiring no sexual activity for the past year if they want to donate. We should change that rule, like Italy just did. Restrictions on donating blood should depend on each individual, not a group designation.

In Houston, the campaign to defeat the cities Equal Rights Ordinance ran ads about men using women's bathrooms. Is this a new frontier of anti-LGBT rhetoric?

- The HERO ordinance was about protecting all Americans rights under the law to not be discriminated against, including LGBT Americans. In too many places, it's perfectly legal to fire someone because of who they are or who they love. To deny them housing. Or evict them. That's just wrong. But we all know that the far right excels at manufacturing a problem where there isn't one. Houston didn't include anything about bathroom access in the ordinance, but they attacked it anyway.
- We saw this same exact tactic back in the days when we were fighting for the ERA. It's politics at its worst. And all I can say is, I think all people should be treated with dignity and respect. I think Americans agree with me on that. And that's what we're fighting for with the federal Equality Act, and it's what I'll fight for as president.

Should a transgender individual be free to choose the public bathroom of their choice?

o I think all people should be treated with dignity and respect. Trans-gender people face real discrimination and harassment in this country. [I want people to go and live and function where their identity leads them.]

<u>39. Abortion</u>: Do you support federal legislation that imposes any restriction on abortion at any stage in pregnancy – either at 20 weeks, or at some point after 20 weeks?

- As we stand here today, across America, women's right to choose is under assault. And women's health. The Supreme Court is currently reviewing a case out of Texas—where the Republican legislature passed laws that could shut down up to 75% of women's health providers in the state. I am tired of Republicans shaming and blaming women, instead of respecting our right to make our own healthcare decisions.
- The Republicans running for President all want to defund Planned
 Parenthood. Some of them even want employers to decide whether women
 can get access to birth control. Politics and politicians have no place in these
 decisions. They should be left to a woman, her family, and her faith, in
 consultation with her doctor.
- I oppose the bill that the Republicans in Congress passed, to ban abortions after 20 weeks. It's a direct assault on women's rights under *Roe v. Wade*. It has no exceptions to protect women's health. It is not based on sound science. And it is wrong.
- The fact is that abortions at this stage of pregnancy are extremely rare. Where they do happen, it is often because of devastating medical situations or complex circumstances where women's and doctor's hands just shouldn't be tied.

If pressed:

• Now, as to whether I would support any federal restriction at any point—the question on the table—I have said yes. I would support a regulation that applied late in the term of a pregnancy, provided that exceptions are made for medically necessary abortions to protect a woman's life or health. That's what the Constitution demands, and that's what respect for women demands.

YOUR OPPONENTS SAY:

SANDERS: 100% lifetime rating from Planned Parenthood. Would expand PP funding and use a woman's right to choose as a litmus test for SCOTUS nominees.

OMALLEY: Pro-choice, but does not have specific proposals. As Governor signed a law that ensures women on Medicaid have access to contraception, free pregnancy counseling, and cancer screenings.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

Neither O'Malley or Sanders have commented on the Republicans' 20 week abortion ban proposals.

While YOU unequivocally supported Planned Parenthood during the video scandal this summer, Sanders criticized the videos but said: "Obviously, I think Cecile Richards apologized for the tone of that video. I think her apology was exactly right. I think that the staffer, the tone was terribly wrong."

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Have you taken Carly Fiorina's challenge to watch the Planned Parenthood videos?

I have not watched them in full but I've seen portions. What she described as occurring in those videos did not actually occur. And the videos themselves are doctored. This is part of an attack on women's rights...

Would you push for repeal of the Hyde Amendment?

Yes, I've opposed it my whole career. I believe that all women, including low-income women, should have access to the full range of reproductive health services.

<u>40. Abortion</u>: Do you continue to support using fetal tissue—from abortions—for research?

- Of course I do—because some of our most important, life-saving discoveries were made as a result of fetal tissue research.
- We've been doing this kind of research for a long time. It's had bipartisan support because it has saved lives and led to cures. Fetal tissue research was used to develop the polio vaccine, and the chicken pox vaccine. Today it is being used to develop cures or therapies for diabetes, breast cancer, vision loss, and Parkinson's disease.
- Federal law prohibits the sale of these tissues for profit—which I absolutely support. So what we are talking about is research pure and simple. Research that may lead to life-saving medical advances.
- When Republicans distort this research to try to score political points, I can't think of anything more out of touch and out of date with what it takes to save lives and make Americans healthier.
- You know, in 1988, President Reagan appointed a panel to look at the whole question of fetal tissue research. That panel included members who strongly opposed abortion rights. And after its study, it recommended overwhelmingly that this research go forward, as long as it was conducted with appropriate ethical safeguards. Those safeguards have now been the law for over 20 years and have served us well.

- 41. Veterans: One of Senator Sanders' key achievements in the Senate was the veterans health care bill in 2014. Do you think our veterans are getting the healthcare they need? Should we privatize the Veterans Administration?
- Taking care of our veterans and their families is part of our solemn duty.
- This is personal for me. My dad during World War II was an officer at Great Lakes Naval Station outside Chicago. I remember him telling me what it felt like to watch the sailors he trained head off for war. Knowing so many wouldn't come back.
- We are shortchanging our veterans and that has to stop. I'll highlight three
 priorities. First, healthcare. No vet should have to wait in line for weeks to
 see a doctor. I will ensure our women veterans get the quality health care
 they need in a timely way.
- We need to modernize and reform the VA system, not privatize it. That's what the Republicans want to do. I <u>do</u> think choice should be part of the solution, but vets need to be at the center of any reform. And I will <u>not</u> stand for any so-called reform that would throw the brave men and women who served us out onto the open market. But the way the Choice Act has been implemented shows we need a more strategic approach.
- Second, college and jobs. After 9/11, we passed a new GI bill, which I cosponsored in the Senate. But we need to invest in and empower our vets creating the best educational opportunities and eliminating hurdles to them transferring their skills to the workforce.
- Third, I will fight to end the veteran suicide epidemic and continue building on the progress the Obama Administration and cities and states have been making toward ending veteran homelessness.
- These men and women served us in uniform. There is no greater service. We owe them the same respect and honor they have given us.

How could YOU say that the problems in the VA are not as widespread as people have suggested? Aren't YOU out of touch?

- Of course I believe that the problems at the VA are unacceptable, and I have said so. The Inspector General found systemic deficiencies – and so I strongly believe the system needs to be fixed.
- But I will not stand by as some Republicans try to exploit this issue to drive their ideological agenda to dismantle the Veterans Health Administration and throw our veterans out into the private health care market without the coordination of care they need and deserve. That is the definition of turning our backs on our vets and would prevent untold numbers of veterans from getting the specialized care they need.
- [I was sad to see Senator McCain joining the political attacks on my comments, because he and I worked together closely together to get better care for seriously wounded Iraq and Afghanistan veterans when I was in the Senate, and I count him as a friend.]
- I know Senator Sanders has voiced the same concerns in the past—that there are dishonest brokers who want to use the VA scandal to gut the system. That would just heap failure on top of failure.
- But I think he'd agree with have more work to do. I have a comprehensive plan to ensure veterans receive the timely and high-quality health care they have earned through the VA system. I will end the VA claims backlog and ensure our women veterans get equal access to the care they need. I believe we can end the veteran suicide epidemic and continue making strong progress to end veteran homelessness. And I will empower veterans by better connecting them to the jobs and educational opportunities that take advantage of their unique skills.

YOUR OPPONENTS SAY:

SANDERS: Will tout his role as the chief sponsor and shepherd of the VA reform bill when he was Chairman of the Veterans Affairs committee. Has released a five-point plan:

- 1. Fully fund and expand the VA so that every veteran gets the care that he or she has earned and deserves.
- 2. Substantially improve the processing of Veterans' claims for compensation.
- 3. Expand the VA's Caregivers Program.
- 4. Expand mental health service for Veterans.
- 5. Make comprehensive dental care available to all veterans at the VA.

OMALLEY: Advocates repealing income tax on retired veterans' benefits. Advocates expanding the Peace Corps as a means to help achieve full employment for returning veterans. Supports allowing veterans to use a portion of GI benefits toward a term of national service.

YOUR record:

(1) successfully expanded the FMLA with Sen. Chris Dodd, to allow family members to take up to 6 months of unpaid leave to care for wounded warriors; (2) introduced the Heroes at Home Act, which had a provision directing the VA to create a caregivers' training program for traumatic brain injuries. Sen. Durbin took the model and got a provision into the 2009 bill creating the "VA Caregivers Program," for families caring for injured Iraq and Afghan veterans.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Bernie Sanders passed a major bill on veterans – what do you think of it?

I was outraged by the recent scandals at the VA and as President will demand accountability and performance from its leadership. Wait times for many veterans seeking doctors' appointments remain unacceptably long as do processing times for disability claims and appeals. I am committed to reforming the Veterans Health Administration to deliver timely and quality care and ensuring it continues to lead the nation in research for areas like mental health and prosthetics. I will work to end the epidemic of veterans suicide. And I will guard against those that falsely believe privatization is a panacea.

- 42.Iraq: You have admitted your vote for the Iraq war was a mistake. How can Americans trust you, as President, to decide matters of war and peace when you got the last such decision wrong?
- I've said my vote on the Iraq War was a mistake. But the question that people will be asking themselves when they're choosing a Commander in Chief is, who is going to keep us safe?—especially in light of the new and complex threats facing us today.
- The American people have seen me in action. I've been in the Situation Room at crucial moments. The Bin Laden raid. Crafting our Iran strategy. How to confront Russia and manage our relationship with China.
- I was also proud to be America's chief diplomat, and I believe passionately in diplomacy and development as core pillars of American power.
 Negotiating a ceasefire with Gaza. Building a coalition to impose unprecedented sanctions on Iran.
- Force must be a last resort. A clear national interest must be at stake. We should seek to build coalitions to share the burden. And our troops need the best equipment, and a strategy to succeed.
- The attacks in Paris and San Bernardino showed that the United States is facing real threats and real enemies. I will keep hitting this threat at its source in Iraq and Syria and across the arc of instability in the Middle East in partnership with our allies. And we need to work with the Muslim American community and law enforcement to counteract self-radicalization here at home. Deny ISIS virtual territory on the Internet. Cut off their financing. And through it all, stay true to our values. That's the kind of Commander in Chief I will be.
- Republican contrast: The GOP has not learned the lesson of the Iraq war. Their approach of using our military as a first resort, and looking to large-scale deployment of U.S. ground troops as the solution to some of our most vexing problems. We've been down that road. We know where it leads.

YOUR OPPONENTS SAY:

SANDERS: Opposed the invasion of Iraq. <u>NOTE:</u> YOU and Sanders cosponsored legislation to revoke the 2002 authorization and require a new authorization to continue military efforts in Iraq.

OMALLEY: Opposed the invasion of Iraq.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

Number of U.S. troops in Iraq today: approx. 3,500 for the training mission. U.S. suffered its first casualty of the anti-ISIS operation on October with the death of Master Sergeant Joshua Wheeler in a special operations mission to free hostages held by ISIS in Northern Iraq.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Why did you only visit Iraq once or twice as Secretary?

I engaged on a regular basis for Iraq's leaders. And of course Vice President Biden played the lead role in that relationship.

I met with Prime Minister Maliki multiple times, and with my counterpart, Foreign Minister Zebari. I chaired a joint coordinating committee, to implement the US-Iraq strategic framework—our shared interests. I regularly briefed President Obama on developments. My State Department led the transition to a civilian mission in Iraq. And I rallied the world to build a new global counter-terrorism agenda, to invest in our partners.

43. ISIS: First answer – no matter what the question

• The first job of the President is to keep the American people safe. And what happened in San Bernardino reminds us that the threat of ISIS and other radical jihadist terrorists is not just a faraway threat – it's a threat here at home.

- So we have to protect our country and lead the world to confront it. ISIS can't be contained. It must be defeated.
- I have a three-part plan to defeat ISIS.
 - First, smash ISIS' stronghold in the Middle East, by pummeling them from the air and supporting our regional partners on the ground, like the Kurds. This will involve U.S. advisors and special forces, but not combat forces.
 - Second, destroy the global network of terrorism, by cutting off their funding, fighters, and propaganda.
 - o Third, <u>defend our homeland and our partners against external and homegrown threats</u>. Stop would-be terrorists from coming here, disrupt online recruiting, support our first responders, and work with, not against, the Muslim-American community.
- The Republicans want simplistic solutions shut our borders; label an entire religion as the enemy; deploy large numbers of troops to battle ISIS.
- But this is the kind of problem that requires strength <u>and</u> smarts. This is complex and dangerous world and we need a Commander in Chief who is up to the job of keeping the American people and this country safe.

Specific question on domestic radicalization

• We have to understand that the threat against us is evolving. Just look at Fort Hood, the Boston bombing, and now San Bernardino. We need a strategy that keeps us ahead of the curve.

• A strategy that counters each step in the process that can lead to an attack here in America, from recruitment to execution:

- First, shut down the online propaganda machine.
- Second, stop potential recruits from going overseas, and stop potential terrorists from coming here.
- Third, discover and disrupt plots before they explode.
- Fourth, stand with the law enforcement officers at every level who risk their lives to keep us safe.
- Finally, empower Muslim-American communities on the front-lines of the fight against radicalization.

Answer to the charge that this all happened on your watch

- During my time in the administration, I saw the roots of extremism forming, and I advocated for policies that would best position the U.S. to confront the threat.
- So while **ISIS** did not begin its march until more than a year after I left the administration, I was advocating for policies that would deter a terrorist group like this.
- I advocated early on for arming the moderate Syrian opposition, because I recognized that if we did not support them, radical jihadists would emerge in their stead.
- I told President Bush that I opposed Prime Minister Maliki all the way back in 2007, because I saw that the alienation of the Sunnis was feeding Sunni radicalization, and it's why I advocated for keeping a small contingent of American troops in Iraq -- which Maliki wouldn't allow because he insisted on sticking to the agreement President Bush negotiated.
- I gave a speech in Doha on the eve of the Arab spring telling Arab leaders that their countries would sink into the sand if they didn't reform.

• I also warned against pushing Mubarak out because of what could ensue.

• So I'm proud of my record. <u>But the American people are asking a different question – what are we going to do now to keep them safe</u> [pivot to affirmative message]

Follow up on judgment:

- The biggest counterterrorism judgment I had to make as Secretary of State was whether to recommend to the President that we go after Osama bin Laden. I think I made the right call.
- The American people have seen my judgment in the Situation Room and on the diplomatic frontline lines.
- And the question the American people are asking as they look for a Commander in Chief is, what are we going to do about these threats now? And I'm the only one up here with a plan....

Answer to charge that this happened because of the Iraq war

- <u>First</u>, the United States and our allies were dealing with terrorism for decades before the Iraq war. Lebanon in the 1980s. Kenya and Tanzania in the 1990s. Of course 9/11.
- Second, I said I made a mistake in voting to give Bush authority on Iraq, but let's be clear: what's happening now in the region is being driven by a whole lot of things that go way beyond Iraq. We've seen:
 - o A wave of revolutions that had been brewing for decades;
 - The spread of a vicious jihadist ideology that has fueled terrorist groups from Afghanistan and Pakistan all the way to Nigeria;
 - The spread of new technologies that have allowed these terrorist networks to grow
- So we can't look to just one source, or one cause we have to see the full scope of the threat before us.

• And that leads us to the real question facing us tonight, which isn't what happened in the past but what are we going to do starting on January 20, 2017. [pivot forward]

If pressed: ISIS emerged from AQI, which emerged from the Iraq war

- There is no question that President Bush made grave errors that marginalized the Sunnis in Iraq. Like disbanding the army, which pushed them into the arms of AQI and then ISIS.
- But the real issue is what we do now.

Question trying to draw a distinction between you and Obama

- I was glad that he spoke to the nation. I'm glad he's taken additional steps to take the fight to ISIS.
- I have laid out my own plan. I believe we need to begin a new phase and intensify and broaden our efforts to smash the would-be caliphate and deny ISIS control of territory in Iraq and Syria.
- As I've said our goal is not to contain ISIS, but to defeat ISIS.
- And there are some new pieces we should add to this effort:
 - A no fly zone, to create a space where Syrians can stay rather than become refugees, to put more pressure on ISIS' remaining border strongholds, and to create leverage in the diplomatic process.
 - Greater engagement with the Sunni tribes and a willingness to arm the Kurds and Sunnis directly if Baghdad won't do its part.
 - A comprehensive strategy to counter Iran, one that gets our Sunni partners on the same page as us -- and gets them to put more into the fight against ISIS.
- I do agree with President Obama that we shouldn't be sending tens of thousands of combat troops back into the Middle East.

Pushback on Sanders

Brushing back Sanders' "Muslim nations have to take the lead" argument:

• I'm glad that Senator Sanders is talking about getting more Muslim countries into the coalition to fight ISIS. That's good. The question is, how are you going to do it?

- I've built coalitions. I've gotten Arab governments to put their own military assets into a fight in the Middle East. I've gotten countries to go against their economic interest to sanction Iran. I even got Russia and China on board.
- You can't just assert that countries should do more. You have to <u>persuade</u> them. You've got to have the relationships. You've got to know how to use leverage and pressure.
- And you've got to have a <u>plan</u>. I've laid out a three-part plan for defeating ISIS. It's a plan that has specific steps for getting these other countries to step up and do their part. I can do it again, because I've done it before.

Rejoinder if Sanders raises regime change in Libya, or generally:

- I'm surprised that Senator Sanders would criticize me for regime change in Libya. He co-sponsored a resolution that called for an end to the Qadhafi regime, and called for the Security Council to authorize all necessary means to protect Libyan civilians.
- That's exactly what happened! So I can't tell if he is criticizing me or his own vote back in 2011.
- And by the way, Senator Sanders also voted for regime change in Iraq, in the 1990s. He is on record supporting regime change in Syria. So I'm truly not sure where this is coming from, other than someone told him it would be good politics to attack me for it.
- Look, we have serious challenges, and we need a plan to deal with them. That's what the American people want to hear from us.

Additional options – not to use all at once Sanders

• Senator Sanders has been all over the map about Syria. It's really not clear what he would do. He's been for and against arming and training the moderate opposition, for and against sending American special forces. We need clarity and constancy on this.

• Senator Sanders has said the solution is to put more <u>Iranian</u> troops in Syria. That is <u>not</u> the right solution. The last thing we need are more Iranian troops on the Golan Heights, within striking distance of Israel. Syria is on fire right now, and Senator Sanders is proposing that we invite one of the arsonists to come pour more gas on the fire.

O'Malley

• Governor O'Malley has said that we have to fight ISIS and terrorist networks the way we fight drug gangs. With all due respect to the governor, those are very different kinds of fights, and they demand very different kinds of responses.

Specific questions

Do we need more troops on the ground in Iraq or Syria?

- Our role should be to lead and coordinate the coalition. I believe that our regional partners should take the lead in this fight on the ground, not us.
- I've laid out the missions I believe our forces should be undertaking on the ground: advise and assist and enable local and regional forces.
- And I've made clear that the U.S. contribution is connected to the contributions of our partners as they step up more, we should step up more.
- So I can't put a precise figure on the number of troops I could support. It depends on what our commanders say they need to fulfill the missions and on how much skin others put in the game.

12/17/2015 ISIS

• But I can tell you this. It won't be tens of thousands of ground troops, which would only be a further magnet for extremists.

- So let's immediately deploy the Special Operations Forces that the President has decided to send to Syria, and then review whether we need to send more, which I would be open to.
- Let's give our forces in Iraq more flexibility to carry out their missions.
- Let's work with our partners to intensify our coalition air campaign against ISIS, coupled with an intelligence surge that helps provide better targets.
- And let's get more local and regional forces in the fight, along with European partners.

Did we pull out of Iraq precipitously?

• It was George W. Bush and Prime Minister Maliki who set the end date for our presence in Iraq. President Obama tried to negotiate a follow-on presence – an effort which I supported – but Prime Minister Maliki did not want to provide the necessary protections and he chose not to change the terms of the agreement he had reached with President Bush.

Are we winning?

- We won't have won until ISIS is defeated. So let's redouble our efforts. Let's lead the world. Let's prevail in this fight.
- [pivot to affirmative plan]

Are we at war?

• We've been fighting terrorists under an authorization to use military force since 9/11. And while I agree that it covers operations against ISIS, I believe that Congress should update the AUMF. That would send a clear message to our allies and our adversaries, and show support for our troops on the ground in the region.

12/17/2015 ISIS

• But here's the reality. We have never declared war against a non-state actor. And trust me: ISIS <u>wants</u> us to declare war. They <u>want</u> us to elevate them in that way. To give them legitimacy. They <u>want</u> us to send hundreds of thousands of troops and get sucked in to a long war that provides plentiful battlefield targets. They <u>want</u> us to provoke a clash of civilizations. ISIS would have a recruiting tool more powerful than any other if we were to declare war. We'd be playing right into their hands.

• That's why I'd like to see Congress update the AUMF. And it's worth noting that they have and should use the AUMF to withhold support for the large-scale combat deployment of U.S. troops, to preclude fears that we will see a repeat of the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq.

SANDERS: Supported U.S. air strikes in Syria as part of a coalition, and training moderate forces: In May 2015, when asked about a U.S. airstrike that took out top ISIS leaders, Sanders responded, "I have supported those efforts on the part of the president." In September 2014, Sanders said, "I think it is appropriate for the United States to train moderate forces in Syria and I think it is appropriate for the President, along with an international coalition, to be involved in airstrikes." NOTE: Sanders opposed the AUMF to fight ISIS.

OMALLEY: Gave a speech in which he advocates confronting ISIS without U.S. boots on the ground. Specifically names supporting coalition partners and countering ISIS communications as planks of his strategy.

12/12/2015 SYRIA

44. Syria: Are YOU suggesting that we allow Assad to remain in power so we can better focus on ISIS?

- No. We need to move simultaneously on two tracks: intensifying diplomacy to produce a political solution that paves the way for a new government with new leadership, and getting more Syrian opposition forces to take on ISIS. Neither effort can wait.
- To get to a political transition, we need more leverage at the bargaining table.
- That's one of the reasons I've called for a no fly zone and for greater support for the Syrian opposition.
- To get local and regional forces to take on ISIS at the same time that the Syrian opposition is taking the fight to Asad, we need to step up our support for them. That's why I have backed immediately deploying the Special Operations force President Obama has already authorized and be prepared to deploy more, as more Syrians get into the fight. And it's why I've said we should retool and ramp up our efforts to support and equip viable Syrian opposition units.
- None of this will be easy. But we need to move decisively on both tracks at once.

Follow up: After the Turkish shoot-down of the Russian fighter, do YOU still think a No Fly Zone is a good idea?

- This has become a widening regional war in the heart of the Middle East. If we don't lead decisively, this crisis will worsen.
- Combined with increased support to Syrian opposition units, and increased support from our Arab and European partners, we should work with the coalition and the neighbors to impose no fly zones in Syria.
- We've employed no fly zones successfully in the past in the Middle East. We know how to do this.
- Here's how it would work:

12/12/2015 SYRIA

 Protected by coalition forces from above, opposition forces on the ground, with material support from the coalition, could create safe areas where Syrians could remain in the country rather than fleeing toward Europe.

- This combined approach would help enable the opposition to retake the remaining stretch of the Turkish border with Syria from ISIS, choking off its supply lines.
- It would also give us new leverage in the diplomatic process that Secretary Kerry is pursuing.
- If we bring the world together around this, the Russians will respect it. I am confident of that.
 - Putin is still looking for a way to manage Russian involvement in this conflict, including at the negotiating table
 - Keep in mind that we have already deconflicted our air operations with Russian planes in Syria and would continue to do so with a no fly zone
 - We are much more likely to gain greater stability when we are strong and when we lead with self-confidence.

If pressed: doesn't the incident with Turkey show that this is a dangerous idea?

• This incident showed the importance of communication and deconfliction measures – which we have successfully employed with the Russians in Syria, where we are both flying.

SANDERS: Does not support a no-fly zone. <u>Supported U.S. air strikes in Syria as</u> part of a coalition, and training moderate forces:

In October 2015, Sanders was asked in an interview about President Obama's plan to send military trainers to Syria and was initially supportive. "So what I think to answer your question is the United States - what the President is trying to do is send a small number of people, essentially, essentially, with some exceptions, which they don't talk about publicly, to train - and this is not easy, it is very difficult - those forces who are prepared to effectively fight ISIS. Not so easy. And also Assad... I do not want to go to funerals, what Obama is trying to do, under very complicated and difficult circumstances, is to give support to those groups and countries that are effectively fighting ISIS, making sure the weapons don't end up in ISIS's hands, and trying to prevent Americans from getting into combat, I agree with that overall view."

However, later the same day, his campaign walked back these statements, saying via a spokesman that "Sen. Sanders expressed concern about the United States being drawn into the quagmire of the Syrian civil war which could lead to perpetual warfare in that region. The senator believes that the crisis in Syria will be solved diplomatically, not militarily."

In May 2015, when asked about a U.S. airstrike that took out top ISIS leaders, Sanders responded, "I have supported those efforts on the part of the president."

Has shifted positions over time on whether to arm the Syrian opposition; in 2012 he supported arming them "in a careful way" but voted against doing so in 2014, arguing that it would play in to ISIS narrative of a West versus East conflict, and drag the United States in to a quagmire. But in September 2014, Sanders said, "I think it is appropriate for the United States to train moderate forces in Syria and I think it is appropriate for the President, along with an international coalition, to be involved in airstrikes."

NOTE: Sanders opposed the AUMF to fight ISIS.

OMALLEY: Questioned the President's request for authorization for military strikes in Syria following the August 2013 chemical weapons attack.

12/13/2015 ISLAM

45. Islam: Should we call this Islamic terrorism?

• Look, I think the Republican candidates are approaching this all wrong. If we're going to beat ISIS, we have to be strong and smart. We have to understand who are enemy is, and how they think.

- Islam is not our adversary. The vast majority of Muslims are on our side. Muslim Americans are our neighbors, co-workers, and friends.
- Now, of course there are those who twist Islam to justify mass murder. But we can't buy into the same narrative that these barbaric, radical jihadists use to recruit new followers. Declaring war on Islam or demonizing the Muslim-American community is not only counter to our values it plays right into the terrorists' hands.
- That's what the Republicans are doing. Now Donald Trump is calling for a "complete and total shutdown" of Muslims entering the United States.
- He's not an outlier. Ben Carson says that a Muslim shouldn't be President. Jeb Bush and Ted Cruz have suggested that we impose a religious test for Syrian refugees that only Christians would pass. Chris Christie says not even 3-year-old Syrian orphans should be let in to America.
- I want to say tonight to Muslim Americans: What you're hearing from the Republicans is absolutely, unequivocally wrong. This is your country. And I'm proud to be your fellow American.
- Radical jihadists underestimate us. We won't turn on each other or turn on our principles. We will keep our country safe and strong, free and tolerant. And we will defeat those who threaten us.

IF moderators ask, following O'Malley comments, whether YOU would call Trump's positions "fascism" or Trump a "fascist"?

• I'll leave the name calling to Donald. But I will say that what is he is doing is not only wrong, it's dangerous.

12/13/2015 ISLAM

• And it's not just him. It's all of the Republican candidates. They are playing right into the hands of radical jihadists when they say the prejudiced, hateful things they have been saying.

- What I can tell you is that in dark times, America is strongest when we are united. When we do not scapegoat our neighbors, but instead choose to stand closer together. When we do not give in to fear.
- We won't turn on each other or turn on our principles. We will keep our country safe and strong, free and tolerant. And we will defeat those who threaten us.

12/13/2015 TERRORISM

46. Terrorism: Are we safer now than we were 7 years ago when Obama took office? Or: Name one place we are safer than we were.

- None of us should be satisfied as long as we're being attacked by terrorists. But we have made real progress against many of the threats we face.
- Iran is no longer racing toward a nuclear weapon.
- We've locked down a lot of loose nuclear materials that might otherwise have fallen into the hands of terrorists.
- Notwithstanding our problems with Russia, we're reducing our nuclear stockpiles to the lowest level in 50 years.
- Our alliances in both Europe and Asia are stronger than they were when President Obama took office. So are our partnerships in Latin America.
- We've just concluded an historic international climate agreement.
- And of course, Osama bin Laden is dead and we don't have hundreds of thousands of troops in Iraq and Afghanistan.
- But again, none of us can be satisfied. The threat of terrorism is constantly evolving, and we have to be strong and vigilant.

Sec State record home base:

- Restored our alliances in Europe and Asia.
- Built the international coalition that put the toughest sanctions in history on Iran—ultimately bringing Iran to the negotiating table, and paving the way for a nuclear deal.
- Helped secure and ratify nuclear agreement with Russia, that reduced our nuclear stockpiles to the lowest level in 50 years.
- Got China, the world's worst polluter, to the table, which made the Paris agreement on climate change that was just finished last week—possible.
- Stood up for women and girls around the world against sexual trafficking, child marriage, and for the right to get an education; for LGBT rights; for internet freedom, and against religious persecution.

12/17/2015 REFUGEES

<u>47. Refugees:</u> How would you approach allowing Syrian refugees to enter the United States?

- [If Maggie Hassan is referenced in the question: I don't have any argument with Governor Hassan on the fact that we need to have the most careful vetting that we possibly can.]
- Our highest priority must always be protecting the American people. So we need to be vigilant in screening and vetting any refugees from Syria. Right now, it can take 18 months or more for a person to get through that process. So we can get the refugee screening process right. And we should fix the problems we know exist in our visa system—starting with visa waivers.
- But what we shouldn't do is slam the door on refugees, declare war on Islam, or demonize the Muslim-American community, as the Republicans are doing. It's not only wrong, it's dangerous. It plays right into the terrorists' hands.
- Donald Trump is calling for a "complete and total shutdown" of Muslims entering the United States. He's not an outlier. Ben Carson says that a Muslim shouldn't be President. Jeb Bush and Ted Cruz have suggested that we impose a religious test for Syrian refugees that only Christians would pass. Chris Christie says not even 3-year-old Syrian orphans should be let in to America.
- To defeat the terrorists, we have to be strong <u>and</u> smart. That's the kind of Commander in Chief I'll be.

How many should we take?

• I've set a goal and I want to be ambitious about this. But I would consult with our security professionals about what's practical.

12/17/2015 REFUGEES

YOU talked about tightening the visa and visa waiver system, to prevent suspected terrorists from coming here. Why didn't you address this as Secretary of State?

- First of all, under a law passed after 9/11 and agreements reached among the agencies, when folks apply for visas, the Department of Homeland Security takes the lead in setting the regulations and procedures for security screening.
- But of course the U.S. government should do everything it can to improve the process. And I did a number of things as Secretary of State to contribute to tighter security.
- We established the largest biometric screening program in the world using facial recognition. We worked closely with DHS to expand their Visa Security Program that puts DHS personnel in our embassies overseas, adding an extra layer of visa review. And I expanded authority for my consular officers more generally to revoke visas if they thought there could be a problem with security.
- Going forward, I think the Administration should review the visa process to make sure all of our intelligence, law enforcement, and counter-terrorism systems are synced up and that security is built into every step of the process.

• .

- 48. Iran: If Israel took military action against Iran, for fear of the consequences of Iranian moves after signing the nuclear deal with the US, what would you do if you believed that Iran was still in compliance with the agreement?
- I don't think you make foreign policy on the fly based on hypothetical questions. That wouldn't be smart or responsible because the facts and circumstances matter.
- But I believe the Iran deal is the most effective way we have to prevent Iran from obtaining a nuclear weapon. We have to enforce it to the fullest, and make it part of a broader strategy to push back against Iran's support for terrorism.
- As part of enforcing this deal, I will work to meet Israel's defense needs in a
 dangerous neighborhood. That is why I fully support the sale to Israel of the
 most sophisticated fighter aircraft ever developed and why I will work
 overtime to ensure that Israel has the missile defenses it needs. As Secretary
 of State, I promoted the Iron Dome missile defense system, which helped
 save lives in the Gaza war.
- Israelis must know, and all of Israel's potential adversaries must know that if you challenge Israel's security, you challenge America's security. Plain and simple. I have stood for this all of my public life and will continue to do so as president.
- *GOP contrast:* One thing is clear ripping up this deal on day one, as most of the Republican presidential candidates would do would be the worst thing we could do for Israel's and our security. It would have a seriously destabilizing effect on the region and leave Iran's nuclear program free of restraints after it already received economic relief from the comprehensive sanctions we've had in place. That kind of cavalier approach to security is not what we need.

SANDERS: Supports the Iran deal. Backed the sanctions regime YOU put together.

OMALLEY: Supports the Iran deal. Backed the sanctions regime YOU put together. As Governor of Maryland, signed a law divesting the state from business dealings with Iran.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

Sanders has not said whether he would go to war to stop Iran from going nuclear, preferring to underscore that he would "exhaust every effort" to do so peacefully. In the Senate, Sanders voted AGAINST the development of an "effective defense" against Iranian ballistic missiles, as well as AGAINST a policy to "combat, contain, and roll back" violent Iranian activities in Iraq. YOU voted in favor of both measures. He did vote for economic sanctions and congressional voting power over a final deal. Like YOU, he criticized Senate Republicans for sending a letter directly to Iranian clerics.

- 49. Libya: Did you play a major role in creating the mess in Libya that is now unfolding and where ISIS may be establishing a new foothold? Do you have any regrets or second thoughts about our actions there?
- No. We have to remember that in 2011 we faced a murderous dictator,
 Qadhafi, with American blood on his hands, who was murdering civilians.
 And our allies European and Arab alike were calling on us to help them act.
- But the more important question to be asking is what we should be doing today. ISIS is setting up an outpost in Libya. How do we eliminate it?
- I think we need to do three things:
 - First, we need to get the warring factions to reach a ceasefire so they can take on ISIS themselves without fearing attacks from other Libyans. Even if that means we don't get all the way to a national unity government, and the ceasefire is only temporary, this is a critical priority.
 - Second, we need to keep stepping up our coalition efforts to counter ISIS in Libya, building on a recent strike on an ISIS leader. We can do more from the air, as well as get our European allies to do their part. And our Arab partners have a crucial role to play in getting the Libyan factions to turn their fight to ISIS and to support them in that fight.
 - Third, we should support Italy's efforts to build a stabilization force that would support implementation of an agreement among the Libyan factions, help rebuild the country, and ensure we deny space for radical jihadists.

If pressed: But shouldn't YOU had done more to support Libya after the war?

- We knew Libya's transition after 42 years of Qadhafi's brutal rule would be challenging, and we planned accordingly. We worked closely with the Libyan people and with our allies in Europe and partners in the region to prepare for the challenges to come. But it was clear that this would be hard. For decades, Qadhafi had hollowed out institutions, squashed civil society, and kept his people divided.
- We worked closely with the interim government as they attempted to work through the mess that Qadhafi had left behind. We had multiple lines of effort across a range of issues – security, political, economic, and so on.
 Some of these programs were successful – such as our support for Libya's first-ever democratic election and for the destruction of its chemicalweapons stockpile, a not-inconsequential achievement.
- When Libya held its first parliamentary elections in July 2012 and the transitional government handed over power to a new General National Congress in August, it was an important moment for Libya and we immediately started working with its leaders.
- At the end of the day, Libya did not want foreign forces of any kind on the ground. And without that kind of basic security, it was difficult for our efforts to move forward. Now we need to focus on how we get back to the work of rebuilding the country and putting it on the right track.
- But I would ask people: would you really have abandoned the Libyan people, and our allies, facing what they did in 2011? I advocated for intervention, which I'd note had broad bipartisan support, including from Senator Sanders. I still believe it was the right choice

SANDERS: Has criticized the intervention in Libya because we didn't have a plan for the day after and because there was insufficient time for the public and Congress to weigh in on the action before it was launched. But Sanders cosponsored a resolution at the time – which passed the Senate by unanimous consent – that condemned the "gross and systematic violations of human rights in Libya," demanding that Libyan leader Moammar Gadhafi leave office, and calling on the United Nations Security Council to impose a no-fly zone over Libya."

OMALLEY: Has implicitly criticized YOU for the attack in Benghazi. Said in his foreign policy speech that there are 4 lessons: we need to know in advance who is likely to take power when a dictator is toppled before intervening; we need more human intelligence, not just social media; we must recruit and retain a new generation of diplomats; and we must give diplomats sufficient tools to engage in hostile environments. He has praised Chris Stevens in this regard.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

<u>UNSCR 1973</u> was adopted by the <u>UN Security Council in March 2011 in a 10-0 vote</u> (Russia, China, Brazil, Germany, and India abstained). It provided the legal basis for military intervention in the Libyan civil war. It: demanded establishment of a ceasefire and an end to violence; imposed a no-fly zone; authorized member states, acting nationally or through regional organizations, to "take all necessary measures" to protect civilians and civilian-populated areas; strengthened the arms embargo; imposed a ban on all Libyan-designated flights; imposed an asset freeze on assets owned by the Libyan authorities, and reaffirmed that such assets should be used for the benefit of the Libyan people; designated additional individuals and entities for a travel ban and assets freeze; and established a panel of experts to monitor and promote sanctions implementation.

12/12/2015 REGIME CHANGE

50. Regime Change: Senator Sanders and Governor O'Malley have both said you are to quick to support regime change. What is your approach to regime change?

- I do believe there are circumstances in which leaders have taken actions that cause them to lose all legitimacy and therefore their countries and peoples are better off without them.
- But whenever possible we should support orderly transitions and avoid the kind of rapid change which can be profoundly destabilizing and take years if not decades to rebuild societies.
- That's why I expressed caution about supporting the precipitous overthrow of Mubarak telling the President in the Situation Room that "it may work out fine in 25 years, but I think the period between now and then will be quite rocky for the Egyptian people, for the region, and for us."
- But of course there are exceptional circumstances, such as when a large-scale massacre is on the horizon, that more expeditious action is required, and I do believe that the United States and the Libyan people are better off for having removed Qadhafi from power.
- If attacked by Sanders: And I know Senator Sanders has been critical of me on this, but in fact his record on this issue is very consistent with my own he voted in 1998 for the bill that made regime change in Iraq official U.S. policy; he supported the Congressional resolution that called for Qadhafi to resign and for the UN to impose a no fly zone; and supported arming the Syrian opposition and believes Assad needs to go.

Sanders: Senator Sanders has been critical of your record on regime change, arguing that you are too quick to support it, pointing largely to your vote for the Iraq War. But while Sanders has generally been more reluctant to use U.S. military force as a tool to effect regime change, he has voted numerous times in support of the policy of regime change. He supported the 2011 resolution (which passed the Senate by unanimous consent) that called on Qaddhafi to resign and permit a peaceful transition to democracy and called on the UN Security Council to take "such further action as may be necessary," including a possible no fly zone. He voted in 1998 for the Iraq Liberation Act to authorize U.S. arming of the Iraqi opposition, which expressed the sense of Congress, later codified in law in a bill Sanders supported, that "it should be the policy of the United States to support efforts to remove the regime headed by Saddam Hussein from power in Iraq..." though made clear that he had concerns about employing U.S. military force toward that end without the consent of Congress or the UN. He voted in 2012 to support arming the moderate Syrian opposition "in a careful way," has agreed with President Obama's overall approach to countering ISIS, and affirmed his view that "we all want to get rid of Assad."

O'Malley: Governor O'Malley has parroted Senator Sanders' criticisms of YOUR support for regime change.

51. Russia: How should the United States deal with Russia – and with Putin?

- Vladimir Putin has made his intentions clear. He is going to threaten and bully his neighbors, prop up dictators, and repress his own people. We need to be clear-eyed about that. And we need to be firm and consistent in pushing back, including in Syria and Ukraine.
- Let's not forget that Russia still has thousands of troops on the border with Ukraine. There has even been an uptick in violence the last couple of weeks as the world has been focused on Syria.
- Look, I've dealt with Putin. I called him out for trying to rebuild the Soviet Union long before he invaded Ukraine. I spoke out against his election rigging, to the point where he actually blamed me for the protests on the streets of Moscow.
- But I also know how to get things out of Russia when we need them.
 Sanctions on Iran and North Korea. Access across Russia to Afghanistan so we could supply our troops in combat. A nuclear arms treaty that gave us eyes on the Russian nuclear missile program.
- So I think there is a part for Russia to play in combating ISIS and in bringing about a political transition in Syria if Putin recognizes that Assad is part of the problem, not part of the solution. But unless and until Putin changes course, we must remain clear-eyed about Russia's actions and intentions.
- This is how you deal with Russia and Putin a combination of strength and smarts to push back against Russian bullying while encouraging them to play a more constructive role.

Follow up: Do you agree with Senator Sanders that we should have a "NATO 2.0" that would include Russia and the Arab League to fight terrorism?

- I agree that the fight against ISIS and radical jihadism needs to be a multilateral effort. In my speech, I called for NATO and our Arab partners to all step up to defeat ISIS and counter the international networks that facilitate terrorism. I also called on Russia to become part of the solution.
- And the Global Counterterrorism Forum that I created as Secretary of State, which now includes more than 30 countries, is an important platform for such an effort. I've called for it to be a clearinghouse for directing assistance to countries that need it and for mobilizing common action against threats.
- But I disagree with the idea that we should expand NATO or set up a new "NATO 2.0." Let's remember that NATO is at its core a defense alliance -- one that formed the basis for the deep ties between the U.S. and our European partners in the shadows of WWII.
- And it has demonstrated in the decades since the strength of these bonds, which are not only built on a common sense of threats but on common values. How Russia would fit in such a framework - after invading multiple countries and oppressing its people - is not clear to me.

Follow Up: What else would YOU do in Ukraine?

- Maintaining the sanctions, and getting our European partners to commit to doing so, is an immediate priority.
- Equally important is to give Ukraine a real chance to succeed. And that means we should spare no effort to support those in Ukraine who are working to improve their economy and democracy, and especially to root out corruption.
- And we should make clear to Putin that if he escalates militarily, we will be prepared to provide greater material assistance to the Ukrainian armed forces.

SANDERS: Will focus on multilateralism and cooperating with Russia and Iran on challenges like Iran. Recently proposed creating a NATO 2.0 that would include Russia and the Arab League. Voted against normalization of trade relations in Russia. Voted for the New START treaty.

OMALLEY: Has not publicly commented on Russia. Will advocate nonviolent intervention.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

<u>Successes of Russia Reset:</u> sanctions on North Korea and Iran; abstained (and so did not oppose) the UNSC Resolution in March 2011 which set the legal basis for the military intervention in the Libyan civil war, imposing a no-fly zone over Libya and authorizing the international community to use "all necessary measures" to protect Libyan civilians; Russia's entry into the WTO; northern supply route to equip our troops in Afghanistan; joint work with U.S. to destroy Syria's chemical weapons stockpile; and expanded counter-terrorism initiatives. Russia has proposed creative solutions at times – i.e., in the Iranian negotiations, the proposal that Iran sent its uranium stockpile to Russia.

Russia's steps in the wrong direction:

- *Backtracking from nuclear non-proliferation*: In 2012, Russia withdrew from the Cooperative Threat Reduction Program, violated the INF Treaty, and said it will not attend the 2016 Nuclear Security Summit.
- Working to incite anti-Western sentiment among Russian minorities in Baltic states: Putin wants to prevent the Western integration of countries along its periphery. He thus spreads false narratives throughout Russia's neighboring states, to win hearts and minds of Russian minorities and fuel anti-Americanism and anti-EU sentiment.
- *Increasing incidents of Russian and Western militaries:* Violations of national airspace, narrowly-avoided mid-aid collisions, close encounters at sea.
- Anti-democracy activities within Russia: Lack of press freedom; continued human rights abuses; murder or imprisonment of activists working for an open Russia; and new laws regulating NGOs to silence opponents.

- <u>52. China</u>: What would you do to change US policy toward China on hot button issues like cybersecurity, military moves in the South China Sea, trade, and currency manipulation?
- There is no more consequential or complicated relationship that we have than our relationship with China. And we need a commander in chief who has the strength, savvy, and experience to handle it.
- As Secretary of State, I worked to expand the areas where we could cooperate with China. For example, in Copenhagen, President Obama and I convinced them for the first time to agree to cut their carbon pollution. And just two weeks ago, we announced new cooperation with China on cutting more emissions, all building on the work we did.
- But when China did things that weren't in our interest, I met them with a firm response. I rallied the region against their territorial seizures in the South China Sea. I raised the alarm on their cyber espionage. I pushed back on their unfair trade practices. As President, I will pay close attention to the possibility of currency manipulation—because when China messes with its currency, American workers pay the price.
- So I know what it takes to manage this relationship. I've done it. We can't take a risk on a president who doesn't know how to get it right.

SANDERS: Has repeatedly attacked China for currency manipulation and the effects of its trade policies on American workers. Has supported the idea of a "currency manipulation fee" on China and other countries. Supports diplomatic engagement, particularly on South China Sea conflict and combating climate change. Opposed permanent normal trade relations with China. <u>NOTE:</u> YOU supported normalization in 2000, before you were in the Senate.

OMALLEY: Supports diplomatic engagement on South China Sea and combating climate change. In 2011, O'Malley led a trade delegation to China – to recruit investment to Maryland. That year, his trade missions to China, South Korea, Vietnam and India netted \$145 million in trade and investment deals for Maryland and the accompanying companies.

TRICKY MODERATOR QA:

Would you label China a currency manipulator?

I would follow the evidence. China has certainly been a manipulator in the past and if they manipulate going forward we will call them out. We cannot take our eye off ball with China when it comes to trade –or cyber-crimes, or human rights, or so many other issues where it often refuses to play by the rules. As Secretary, I was very tough on China, I called it out for its unfair trading practices. And our exports went up 50% when I was Secretary. Its currency improved considerably. So I know how to deal with them.

What about the IMF making the RMB a reserve currency?

As I said, we need to be vigilant about any manipulation by China of its currency. And given its past track record, I have concerns about this move without evidence that China has changed its tune. So as China is brought in to international frameworks like this, part of the goal is to bind it in the rules – and we should therefore hold China to them very closely.

Do you support the Obama Administration's recent cyber deal with China?

It's a good step, but when it comes to China and cyber, as the President himself said, actions speak louder than words.

53. Af/Pak: Do you still support armed US troops on the ground in Afghanistan? If so, how many for how long?

- Our war in Afghanistan has come to an end. Americans should not be in combat there. But I support President Obama's decision to maintain a limited troop presence in Afghanistan like we have had in many other countries where we are not at war to continue training the Afghan security forces and to support counterterrorism, and an Afghan-led peace process. The recent events in the North of Afghanistan, where the Taliban took over a city, show that we cannot just talk away.
- The Taliban's resurgence in Kunduz, and al Qaeda's attempts to prove it is still relevant, show that we cannot just walk away. The President's approach allows us to ensure that Afghanistan is never again a haven for terrorists to plan and launch attacks on our homeland without putting American troops in a combat role.
- The Afghans themselves will be leading the fight for their country's future, while we help them enhance their security, strengthen their democracy, and continue to improve their education system and economy.
- Afghanistan has made real progress. Girls are going to school. The country had its first peaceful, democratic transition of power with last year's election. President Ghani has stood up and said he will prosecute those who prey on young boys. Our troops should no longer be in combat there but we should not turn our backs on Afghanistan.
- But even as we focus on those who will remain deployed serving this critical mission, we cannot forget our veterans and soldiers who have served there over the past 14 years.
- I believe in making sure that people who sacrifice for us are given all the care and the benefits and support that they need. And I believe strongly that taking care of our veterans is part of our solemn duty as Americans.
- And so we need to ensure that they have access to the opportunities and tools they need to succeed when they return home.

SANDERS: Expressed serious concerns about the troop surge, questioning why American taxpayers and troops had to bear the burden of what should be an international effort.

OMALLEY: Supported the troop surge and withdrawal.

TOUGH MODERATOR QUESTIONS

If elected President, would YOU keep American troops in Afghanistan?

- I would take careful stock of the situation in 2017, consult with my national security team, and I would pursue a course of action that would preserve counterterrorism capabilities and keep Afghanistan stable. I would not allow for the emergence of another dangerous breeding ground for terrorists and extremists.
- If that means a small on-going non-combat presence like we have had in many other countries where we are not at war to support counterterrorism efforts, our ability to collect intelligence, and an Afghan-led peace process, then that's something we should consider if the circumstances warrant.

Doesn't the President's decision to leave more troops in Afghanistan show that his earlier decision to draw down was naive?

- I believe it is right for the conditions on the ground to determine the size and timeline of our troop presence.
- And the President has consistently underscored that while America's combat mission in Afghanistan may be over, our commitment to Afghanistan and its people endures.
- He is right that we cannot allow Afghanistan to be used as safe haven for terrorists to attack our nation again.
- And one important factor that has changed is that in President Ghani and CEO Abdullah we have true partners with whom we can continue to build on the progress we have made to date.

- <u>54. Civil Liberties</u>: Today, many political leaders are expressing doubts about the privacy intrusions that are part of government programs after 9/11. Can you point to any concerns or objections you raised publicly before Mr. Snowden released the information he provided to the press?
- We have to protect liberty, and we have to protect security. They go hand in hand.
- We have to find the right balance. I think the law Congress passed recently, the USA Freedom Act, did strike that balance which is why I supported it. I think the Bush Administration's warrantless wiretapping went way too far—which is why I spoke out against it repeatedly.
- The USA Freedom Act which is now in effect goes a long way to rein in the most intrusive and frankly unnecessary practices that the Bush Administration put in place. For instance, it means the government won't collect and sit on millions of files with people's private information. But if the government has a legitimate national security reason to get access, it can go to the courts.
- This bipartisan law will make us safer and better protect Americans' privacy. I don't think there's any good reason to have opposed it. And I am open to other reforms.
- These issues also require hard choices. I know how to make them, in consultation with privacy and security experts and above all the American people.

Sanders: Hillary voted for the Patriot Act. I voted against it. Since then, I have repeatedly voted against the law's reauthorization. Back in 2001, I said the law gave the government too much power to spy on innocent Americans, and I've been proven right. Today, I am even more convinced that the law gave the government

far too much power. The NSA is out of control and operating in an unconstitutional manner.

- We have to protect liberty, and we have to protect security. They go hand in hand.
- We have to find the right balance. We have learned more over the years about ways in which Patriot Act provisions were abused and things got out of balance. When I was in the Senate, I spoke out repeatedly against the Bush Administration's warrantless wiretapping. [And I voted against laws in 2006 and in 2008 when I didn't think they had adequate safeguards for privacy.]
- The law Congress passed recently, the USA Freedom Act, got us back into balance which is why I supported it.
- The USA Freedom Act goes a long way to rein in the most intrusive and frankly unnecessary practices that the Bush Administration put in place. For instance, it means the government won't collect and sit on millions of files with people's private information. But if the government has a legitimate national security reason to get access, it can go to the courts.
- Given the threat we face from ISIS and other terrorist organizations, I think we need to retain some capability to track terrorist communications into the US with all the appropriate protections.

SANDERS: Voted against the Patriot Act in 2001, while YOU supported it. Voted against the USA Freedom Act, while YOU supported it. Has advocated leniency for Edward Snowden.

OMALLEY: Supported the Patriot Act in 2001. Supports the USA Freedom Act.

PUSHBACK/KEY FACTS:

<u>President's Commission:</u> In 2013, President Obama appointed a Review Group on Intelligence and Communications Technologies to undertake an assessment of the government's signals intelligence programs. The commission released 46 advisory recommendations—several of which were implemented by the President or enacted by Congress.

Section 215 of the Patriot Act: Previously, the government relied on Section 215 of the Patriot Act as the legal authority for bulk collection of telephone metadata. But Section 215 authority expired in June, prompting reforms. Under the newly enacted USA Freedom Act, the NSA will no longer be able to collect and hold telephone metadata. Phone companies will retain the data, and the NSA can only gain access by filing individual requests with the FISA Court. President Obama also implemented a reform limiting the scope of NSA queries. When requesting metadata, the NSA can now only pursue phone calls that are two steps removed from a number associated with a terrorist organization—instead of three.

Section 702 of the FISA Amendments Act: Section 702 allows the government to intercept the communications of foreign targets overseas. The government relies on Section 702 for PRISM and "upstream" mass surveillance. PRISM allows the NSA to receive data directly from U.S. companies, and involves the collection of emails, texts, and chats. Upstream involves the collection of communications as they pass through fiber-optic cables. The President asked the Attorney General to initiate reforms that place restrictions on the government's ability to retain and search communications between Americans and foreign citizens incidentally collected under Section 702. But no substantive actions have been taken at this time.

<u>The Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Court:</u> The USA Freedom Act included two FISA Court reforms. First, the law appointed a panel of public advocates who will argue for the protection of civil liberties when the Court hears a novel issue

of law. Second, the law directs the government to declassify significant FISA Court opinions. President Obama has already declassified over 40 opinions, and has pledged to conduct an annual review.

<u>National Security Letters</u>: When investigating threats, the FBI relies on the use of National Security Letters, which require companies to provide certain types of information to the government without disclosing the orders to the subject of the investigation. To be more transparent in how the government uses this authority, the President directed the Attorney General to ensure that this non-disclosure is not indefinite, terminating within a fixed time.

YOUR record on intelligence:

- In 2001, you voted for the Patriot Act after fighting for enhanced privacy protections.
- In 2006, you initially voted against reauthorization of the Patriot Act because the bill allowed almost unfettered access to business records and roving wiretaps. You voted for reauthorization once you helped to secure key civil liberty provisions.
- In 2006 and 2007, you repeatedly spoke out against warrantless wiretapping during the Bush administration.
- In 2008, you voted against the FISA bill that limited the FISA Court's ability to review government targeting and minimization procedures.
- In 2008, you spoke out against a provision in the FISA bill that granted immunity to telecom companies that may have engaged in illegal surveillance.

YOUR voting history re: Patriot Act:

- In 2001, you voted for the Patriot Act after fighting for enhanced privacy protections.
- In 2005 and 2006, you initially voted against reauthorization of the Patriot Act—voting against cloture. In your statement, you said that the bill allowed almost unfettered access to business records and roving wiretaps. You then voted *for* reauthorization once you helped to secure key civil liberty provisions: the right to challenge gag rules, rights related to National Security letters, and rights for libraries. After the bill still didn't go far enough in terms of protection, YOU expressed serious concerns but ultimately voted for the bill because we could not let other important and

- bipartisan provisions in the legislation critical to the safety of our citizens lapse.
- In 2006 and 2007, you repeatedly spoke out against warrantless wiretapping during the Bush administration.
- In 2008, you voted against the FISA Amendments Act, which limited the FISA Court's ability to review government targeting and minimization procedures. Then-Senator Obama voted FOR it.
- In 2008, you spoke out against a provision in the FISA bill that granted immunity to telecom companies that may have engaged in illegal surveillance.

TOUGH MODERATOR QA

You said that Edward Snowden could have received whistleblower protection. He disputes that. Do you stand by your position:

- Absolutely. He could have any of these things:
 - He could have raised his concerns with his supervisors, the General Counsel of the NSA, and ultimately the Director of NSA;
 - He could have filed a complaint with any number of Inspectors General who could have investigated his claims;
 - He could have raised the issue with the Department of Justice IG, as DOJ's Office of Intelligence Policy Review was responsible for briefing the Court on its legal interpretations;
 - Finally, he could have availed himself of the 1998 law that allows NSA employees and contractors to raise matters of "urgent concern" involving classified operations to the Congressional Intelligence Committees.
- Snowden did none of those things. Instead, he loaded hundreds of thousands of highly classified documents onto several laptops and fled the country, going first to China and then to Russia.

- 55. Encryption: Do you support legislation to require technology companies to impose mandatory backdoors into their devices, so that the government has the keys to decrypt private conversations?
- We need to challenge our best minds in Silicon Valley and Washington to come together to develop solutions that will keep us safe and protect our privacy. I do believe that there need to be ways for law enforcement to get the information they need to solve crimes, and prevent terrorism. Now is the time to solve this problem, not after the next attack.
- Those solutions shouldn't destroy the very purpose of encryption in the first place, which is to protect people's private information from hacking. But they should empower those who protect us to go after threats.
- The term "backdoor" gets thrown around. And it means different things to different people. But let me be clear that I am not proposing a specific solution this is a complex problem with multiple competing interests and concerns. But I believe that the best minds if they come together as partners and not as adversaries can develop a solution.

- 56. Nuclear weapons: At the first debate, you said that the spread of nuclear weapons and nuclear material into the wrong hands is the greatest threat to our national security. What is your plan to prevent that?
- I continue to believe that the greatest threat facing the United States is from terrorists and other extremists getting their hands on nuclear weapons and nuclear materials. These groups can't be deterred. If they acquire nuclear weapons, we must assume they will use them.
- To address this threat, my Administration will do three things:
- First, we will continue to work to protect nuclear materials and nuclear weapons against theft or seizure. The United States has led global efforts to improve nuclear security since the 1990s.
- Second, we will prevent the smuggling of nuclear materials. The best approach is a layered one, using export controls, intelligence sharing, and border security systems to stop transfers before they start.
- Third, we will seek to reduce the amount of nuclear material worldwide that could be used in nuclear weapons and to limit its production. This starts with continuing work to identify and eliminate vulnerable stocks of nuclear material.
- We should negotiate a global ban on producing additional nuclear materials for nuclear weapons, and work with other countries to minimize the use of weapons-grade material for civil nuclear programs.
- These efforts will be part of a comprehensive approach to nonproliferation and arms control that my Administration will take, combining U.S. action, stronger international rules, and cooperation with our friends and partners around the world.

12/12/2015 TECHNOLOGY & ISIS

57. Tech & ISIS: What did YOU mean by YOUR remarks that we should "disrupt" ISIS on the internet? And that internet companies should be part of that endeavor?

- My plan to defeat ISIS and other terrorist groups that wish to harm our country is to lead a coalition fight them in the air, fight them on the ground, and yes, fight them on the internet. I think we need to deny radical jihadists virtual territory just as we work to deny them actual territory. Where they are trying to incite new attacks and recruiting fighters.
- So first, online companies already have terms of service that prohibit communications praising terrorist organizations, promoting violence, or calling for attacks. And they have done a great job enforcing them. Facebook has deleted posts and blocked accounts of people connected to ISIS. Twitter removed 10,000 accounts in April. YouTube and others took down the video of the gruesome beheading of James Foley.
- But we can all see this threat is getting more urgent. All of our efforts need to be more urgent. So I think these companies should continue to do everything they can to enforce their terms of service.
- Second, also think we should come up with more ways for information sharing consistent with the First Amendment and consistent with privacy. That's why I've said leaders from the government and from Silicon Valley should meet and hear each others' ideas for how we can come together to combat this threat on the internet while staying true to our values. These companies have people who have dedicated their careers to making the world a better place through technology I think government has a lot to learn from them.
- Third, the federal government needs to keep going after terrorists on the internet. At the State Department, I started a dedicated unit that tracked and targeted terrorists online. We need to improve those efforts, and it would help if we brought more experts from the tech community into government.
- The bottom line: the government shouldn't see tech as its enemy, and I hope our tech community doesn't see government as the enemy. We all need to be in this together.

12/12/2015 TECHNOLOGY & ISIS

How about the First Amendment?

• Well first, my call to private companies like Twitter and YouTube is to say, look we all can see this threat is getting more urgent, and so all of our efforts need to be more urgent. So they should do everything they can to enforce their own terms of service that already prohibit hateful, violent speech, and take this stuff down.

• But also, our First Amendment creates an exception for speech that directly incites violence. And the terrorism communications that I am referring to, do just that.

So are you supporting Diane Feinstein's bill, for mandatory reporting by technology companies to the government?

• I think what we need is more information sharing between tech companies and the government about terrorist communications and activities on their sites. We need to figure out a way to promote that, in a manner consistent with the First Amendment and with privacy. I think leaders from Washington and Silicon Valley should come together to discuss the problem, and what is possible.