

Vilnius University
Faculty of Philology

Liucija Klimaitė

The Metaphoricity of the US Presidential Debate: Democrats vs. Republicans

**Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of requirements for the degree of MA in English
Studies**

Supervisor: doc. dr. Inesa Šeškauskienė

2021

Acknowledgements

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor Inesa Šeškauskienė whose help and support was of the most significant importance for me. I am deeply grateful for her encouragements and advices which helped me along the way towards the completion of this thesis. I am also extremely grateful to my brothers and father who patiently and kindly supported me throughout my studies. Finally, I would like to say thank you for my closest friends, who believed in my successful completion of this thesis even at those times when I did not.

Abstract

This thesis analyses metaphors used in the US presidential election debates of the 2016 and 2020 elections following the Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). The aim of this thesis was to find out what kind of image US politicians construct with the help of metaphors and to verify whether the identified metaphors align with Lakoff's Nurturant Parent model for Democrats and Strict Father model for Republicans (1996). Metaphors were identified following methodologies by Stefanowitsch (2004) and Pragglez Group (2007). The analysis of metaphors revealed that the image of the US is constructed using metaphors AMERICA IS A PERSON and AMERICA IS AN OBJECT. Most frequently used person metaphor by Democrats constructed an image of the US who is kind, trustworthy, socially active, responsible and tolerant, while Republicans see the US as physically strong, self-centered and isolated. A few instances validating Lakoff's models of Nurturant Parent and Strict Father were found; however, as there were only few cases models were found not significantly effective.

Keywords: Conceptual Metaphor Theory, metaphors, debates, Republicans, Democrats, Strict Father, Nurturant Parent.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Theoretical background	8
2.1. US political discourse: Presidential debates	8
2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory	10
2.3. Conceptual Metaphor in political debate	13
2.4. Political context of the US election	16
3. Data and methods	18
4. Results and discussion	20
4.1. Major tendencies in noun usage	20
4.2. The Metaphorical Image of America	23
4.2.1. Metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON	25
4.2.2. America's relationships with other countries	33
4.2.3. Object metaphors	37
4.2.4. Other metaphors	41
5. Conclusions	44
6. References	46
7. Data sources	50
7. Summary in Lithuanian	51
Appendix 1. Transcripts of the debates separated by speaker	53
Trump_1	53
Trump_2	62
Trump_3	69
Trump_4	76
Trump_5	84
Trump_6	92
Pence_1	100
Pence_2	109
Clinton_1	115
Clinton_2	121
Clinton_3	127
Biden_1	134
Biden_2	142
Biden_3	149
Kaine	153
Harris	162

1. Introduction

The importance of metaphors in human languages has been recognized since Aristotle. However, since Lakoff and Johnson's (1980) brought new ideas regarding the cognitive aspect of metaphors, they have gained even more relevance over the last forty years. Both Classical and Conceptual metaphor theories, even though different in the ideas they put forward, contribute to the main purpose of metaphors: to allow language users expand their communication's effectiveness (Semino & Demjén 2017). The introduction of Conceptual Metaphor Theory (Lakoff & Johnson 1980) was the metaphorical spark that ignited researchers from various discourses to start applying it in practice. CMT over time was further developed (Kövesces 2015), applied in experiments (Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011), criticized (Murphy 1996, Vervaeke & Kennedy 1996), handbooks were published which comprehensively covered the theory and research based on it (Semino & Demjén 2017). CMT also led to the developments of metaphor identification methodologies (Stefanowitsch 2004, Pragglejaz Group 2007, Steen *et al.* 2010).

As the interest in metaphors kept growing, different researchers from different scientific fields began analysing the role of metaphors in various fields. Metaphoricity was analysed in the discourses of politics, economics, science, medicine, media and others. When Lakoff and Johnson were introducing CMT they based their research heavily on the examples from political discourse, thus it became the central discourse to analyse metaphors for other researchers as well (Lakoff 1991, 1996; Chilton 2005; Musolff 2004, 2007, 2014; Charteris-Black 2005, 2011, 2013; Cibulskienė 2005, 2012; Semino & Koller 2019; Urbonaitė & Šeškauskienė 2007, *inter alia*).

Lakoff (1996) specifically analysed political discourse in the US, basing his research on the differences between the two most significant parties of the US: Democrats and Republicans. Strongly asserting that parties use metaphors based on two models of Nurturant Parent and Strict Parent, he later received some amount of criticism. However, it became evident that metaphors play a significant role as a mediator between politicians and citizens when explaining abstract strategies and values of political parties in terms of more concrete and physical language.

This thesis will analyse the metaphors used by politicians from the US Democratic and Republican parties and will identify the values and ideas put forward through the metaphors. Identified metaphors will be compared to Lakoff's model of Strict Father, which supposedly correlates to the ideology of conservatism (this thesis will follow Lakoff's (1996) research in

which the US Republican Party is the representative of conservatism) and the model of Nurturant Parent, which should correlate with the ideology of liberalism (following Lakoff's (1996) research Democrats will be considered to be the representatives of liberalism).

The object of the thesis. The object of the analysis are metaphors used in the US presidential election debates of the 2016 and 2020 elections. Metaphors used by two parties are analysed separately in search of ideas and values they broadcast to potential voters. Due to the limited scope of this thesis only metaphors which construct the image of the US are analysed.

The aim of the thesis. The aim of this thesis is to identify and analyse the metaphors used in the USA presidential debates in which the participants will be the candidates from both Republican and Democratic parties. The analysis of the metaphors will lead to the identification of values and policies put forward by politicians. The analysis will as well allow to prove or disprove the hypothesis which, according to George Lakoff's Nurturant Parent vs. Strict Father models, is as follows: Democrats and their candidates will use metaphors that correlate with the Nurturant Parent model and Republicans with their candidates will use Strict Father model's metaphors.

The questions of the thesis. Questions are as follows:

1. What image of the US is constructed by metaphors used by political parties?
2. Are Lakoff's models of Nurturant Parent and Strict Father valid when analysing the debates between the two opposing parties?

The objectives of the thesis. The objectives are as follows:

1. to collect two separate corpora of Democratic and Republican discourse made in 2016 and 2020 debates of the US presidential elections;
2. to identify metaphors used by the participants of the debates with the assistance of corpus analysis tool AntConc (Anthony 2019), method created by Stefanowitsch of *metaphorical patterns* (2004) and the Pragglejaz Group method MIP (2007);
3. to establish tendencies of metaphoricity in the discourse of Democrats and of Republicans;
4. to analyse the context of the metaphors in order to interpret what ideas and images of the US are put forward by the politicians;
5. to verify whether the identified metaphors align with Lakoff's Nurturant Parent and Strict Father models.

The relevance of the thesis. Thesis applies 40 year old theoretical ideas of CMT and 30 year old Lakoff's Nurturant Parents vs. Strict Father onto recently created political discourse. The

analysis of the metaphors used by politicians representing opposing parties allows to better understand the strategies and policies put forward by the parties. During our times, when political radicalization is on the surge and media coverage might be biased, it is important to be aware of the values and ideas that political parties are representing and this thesis assists to do that.

2. Theoretical background

2.1. US political discourse: Presidential debates

Political discourse as a field of study is seemingly limitless and inexhaustible and its definition is a problematic issue. At first glance the uncomplicated route to definition would be declaring that political discourse consists of texts and speeches generated only by politicians and only when they are talking about political topics. However, in the same manner as in medical discourse, where not only doctors take part in the construction of the discourse but also patients, political discourse has the public and the media to add to its contents. As the claim that “the purpose of political rhetoric is persuasion or, more bluntly, the manipulation of the public” (Ungerer & Schmid 1996: 149) appears to be revealing the true nature of politics, it is only natural that as politics always seek to interact with the public, such interactions create a substantial part of political discourse. As the media and the public become participants and contributors in political discourse thus expanding its field, the difficulties of setting the boundaries appear (van Dijk 1997).

Thus, the first and foremost contributors to the political discourse are politicians: “the group of people who are being paid for their (political) activities, and who are being elected or appointed” (van Dijk 1997: 13). The recipients of politicians’ messages may be various: citizens, voters, members of a crisis group, demonstrators, organizations, institutions, newspapers, magazines, all of the media channels. All of them are active participants in political discourse.

However, if for example a politician has a conversation with a friend of his about the current law he or she is working on, does this dialogue contribute to political discourse? If the answer to this question is yes, then it would definitely be impossible to set boundaries for this discourse. Thus with a tentative no as an answer to this question, context takes on its importance. According to van Dijk, analysing the context is the key in the process of allocating texts within or out of the boundaries of political discourse. He established a list of categories which help in understanding the text and the context of political discourse. The list goes as follows: societal domain or field, political systems, political values, political ideologies, political institutions, political organizations, political groups, political actors, political relations, political process, political actions, political discourse, political cognition (van Dijk 1997). When trying to assert whether a text belongs to political discourse, describing these categories with regard to the text in question characterizes its genre. In his work van Dijk as an example takes a genre of text, parliamentary debate, which is a probable

candidate to be a part of political discourse and describes the categories taking into account the specifics of parliamentary debate:

- Domain: Politics;
- System: Democracy;
- Institution: Parliament;
- Values and ideologies: Democracy, group and party ideologies;
- Organizations: Political parties, lobbyists;
- Political actors: Members of parliament, cabinet ministers;
- Political relations: Legislative power;
- Political process: Legislation;
- Political action: Political decision making;
- Political cognitions: Attitudes about the relevant issue (e.g. about abortion, affirmative action or nuclear energy). (van Dijk 1997: 19)

It is evident that all contextual conditions are satisfied as all categories are somehow in connection with the field of politics thus parliamentary debates belong to political discourse. In a similar matter all other types of texts can be reviewed repeating the same process in order to decide whether they belong to political discourse or not.

Debates as a genre make up a considerable part of political discourse as there are various sub-genres of debates, e.g. parliamentary, presidential, pre-election etc. The styles and rules for this genre differ from country to country in which they are being held thus making them a generous topic for researchers. As proven in the previous paragraph, presidential debates as a genre belong to political discourse together with a long list of other genres or types of texts or speeches that start with such small units of speech as slogans or banners and end with extensive congressional hearings.

Etymologically the noun *debate* comes from 14th century Old French noun *debat*: “a quarrel, dispute, disagreement”, also “contention by argument” and “a formal dispute, a debating contest, interchange of arguments in a somewhat formal manner” (ED). Currently its definition is as follows: “a formal discussion of an issue at a public meeting or in a parliament. In a debate two or more speakers express opposite views and then there is often a vote on the issue“ (OALD). In comparison, Online Cambridge Dictionary gives such a definition of the noun *debate*: “serious discussion of a subject in which many people take part” (COD). Taking into consideration the third definition taken from Merriam Webster Online dictionary, debate is a “contention by words or arguments” (MWOD). Gathering all the recurring keywords, debate is an argument between at least two participants in a regulated setting. However, the sub-genre of presidential debates raises some difficulties with its definition as they are not exactly the same as the usual debates. Belonging neither to speeches because of their lack of

oratorical features nor to interviews which are less rehearsed and more conversational, presidential debates find themselves somewhere in between these genres. With their predetermined format, content and questions, the sub-genre lacks interaction between participants and the audience when comparing it to the usual debate (Myers 2008).

Having now dealt with the definition of presidential debates, it is necessary to discuss their lexical features and structures. As the main goal of such debates (and all other political genres) is positive self-appreciation and negative other-presentation, the ability to convince an audience with one's oratory skills is of great importance (van Dijk 1997, Chilton 2004, Myers 2008). However, when comparing texts from different discourses, in most cases no specific language features appear to stand out exclusively in political discourse. It is evident that the type of language structure used by politicians is not important but rather how well he or she is able to contextualize it, making the audience follow their message. Thus the analysis of lexical units becomes relevant only if they carry contextualized political meaning (van Dijk 1997).

Having established that various lexical units are used by politicians only if they have the ability to portray political context, it is consequential that this ability becomes the most crucial criterion for politicians to decide which lexical measures to use in their debates or other texts of political discourse. Should lexical features and structures be easy to manipulate by politicians conveying their political agenda, such tools would be used more often than others. Metaphors offer a great flexibility for being especially convenient to use for such purposes as they can be adapted to whatever context and in whichever discourse.

Even though there are not many lexical items that are bound to political discourse except for the obvious political lexicon (van Dijk 1997), metaphors appear to be an exception as all political texts and speeches are saturated with such expressions. As many scholars and researchers have proven this in their works (Lakoff 1992, Lakoff 1996/2002, Ungerer & Schmid 1996, Kövecses 2002, Musolff 2004, Cienki 2005, Charteris-Black 2006, Semino 2008, *etc.*), it becomes evident that metaphors are the main tool when trying to reach one's goal in politics.

2.2. Conceptual Metaphor Theory

It is necessary to explain the reason why metaphors have such an ability to influence the participants of (not only) political discourse. Some metaphors are so deeply ingrained in our

consciousness that we cannot recognize them as metaphors anymore, making them an integral part of our everyday life, thus repetitive and overlooked. It should lead to a conclusion that metaphors are not of significant importance; however, continuous flow of research on this topic proves the opposite.

Metaphors have been around us since the beginning of time. Aristotle was the first known author who wrote about them. First is his work *Poetics* where he said that: “Metaphor is the application of an alien name by transference either from genus to species, or from species to genus, or from species to species“ (Aristotle 2008: 23) and then in *Rhetoric*, explaining how metaphors help students in learning because of their ability to create a memorable image if chosen correctly (Aristotle 1954). For the longest period of time metaphors were considered to be only the embellishments of language, a tool for poets to create images in their poetry and only of significance in the topic of stylistics.

Only with the birth of cognitive linguistics in the second half of the twentieth century, a second use of metaphor was introduced by Lakoff and his colleagues, as metaphors were assigned a cognitive role as well. Lakoff and Johnson (1980) called the Aristotelian interpretation of metaphor the Classical Theory of Metaphor and constructed a new approach to metaphors and their role in the human thought process coining the term Conceptual Metaphor Theory.

The main idea in Lakoff and Johnson’s research was that metaphors can influence the way humans think and understand the world (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Conceptual metaphor consists of two domains: target and source domain. The source domain is less feasible and more concrete, easily explainable while the target domain is less within human understanding and more abstract. During the process of mapping, in other words, transfer of meaning, the source domain is being mapped onto the target domain, assigning easily understandable meanings of the source domain to the target domain in order to make the concepts of the target domain more transparent (Kövecses 2010). Conceptual metaphor is successful if there are enough coinciding points between the source and target domain and if there are no irregularities occurring during the process of mapping which would cause the analogy to collapse (Naegu 2013).

Lakoff and Johnson (1980) took some basic conceptual metaphors and presented how they can influence the way humans conceptualize abstract notions. Taking one of their examples LOVE IS A JOURNEY, one can try to see how it works as well. The target domain in this metaphor is LOVE, an abstract notion which is difficult to put into words. The source domain

in this conceptual metaphor is JOURNEY, which is a more tangible concept; thus, humans tend to transfer its meaning onto the concept of LOVE. Consequently, upon hearing a metaphor *their relationship is a dead-end street*, the constructed image implies that the relationship is facing difficulties or has even come to an end.

Unidirectionality was understood to be ever present in conceptual metaphors as it was believed that it is only possible to map out the meaning of the source domain onto the target domain due to people's bodily experience, implying that people conceptualize vague and difficult to grasp notions in terms of tangible ones rather than the other way round (Lakoff 1980, Kövecses 2010). Later psycho-physical studies revealed that conceptual mapping may, in fact, be bidirectional. As the conceptual metaphor SOCIAL RELATION IS TEMPERATURE determines that socially equipped individual is metaphorically perceived as warm, e. g. *Molly has such a warm personality*, psycho-physical studies proved that TEMPERATURE IS SOCIAL RELATION might as well be possible: when engaging in an unpleasant social interaction people tend to feel cold or at least indicate that the temperature in the room is low (Zhong & Leonardelli 2008, Shen & Porat 2017).

Lakoff and others received a lot of criticism, mainly because of the ways in which they compiled the data for their research. As “the lack of agreed criteria for metaphor identification“ (Pragglejaz Group 2007: 2) posed an issue on gathering an appropriate corpus for research, Lakoff and all other conceptual metaphor researchers used an approach where they firstly came up with a few metaphors on the basis of native speaker intuition in order to suggest conceptual metaphor and this led to harsh criticism (Pragglejaz Group 2007). Such an approach resulted in two problems: firstly, researchers subjectively decided on the metaphoricity of expression and secondly, it remained unclear if the metaphors were being used in everyday language of native speakers (Kövecses 2008). As “usage based” approach is common in cognitive linguistic research, it seems that the criticism was well placed. The need for a reliable methodology that would analyse empirical data to identify metaphors led various researchers to seek for solutions.

Several solutions were put forward, the first being the methodology of Anatol Stefanowitsch, in which he relied upon the usage of corpus and the notion of *metaphorical patterns* (Stefanowitsch 2004), the second being Metaphor Identification Procedure, or MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007), which later was further developed in Vrije University in Amsterdam with the researcher Gerard J. Steen leading the process and was named MIPVU (Steen *et al.* 2010). Pragglejaz Group and later on Steen created methodology on metaphor identification which relied on the linguistic aspect of metaphors, mainly using dictionaries to determine the

basic meaning of words and finding the clash between the semantic meanings to find a metaphor (Steen *et al.* 2010). Both methods to some extent will be used in analysis of metaphors in the paper, thus they will be explained in more detail in the data and method section of this thesis.

The modern perspective on metaphor that began with Lakoff took off with gusto, inspiring many cognitive linguistic researchers to look for evidence that the notion of conceptual metaphors can demonstrate how language influences one's thinking. Following the main idea that the most significant influence is evident in the field of media and politics, research in these fields and other ones began. Experiments conducted by Thibodeau and Boroditsky attempted to prove the claim that metaphors used in texts assisted in understanding the target domain, which in the experiments was CRIME and influenced the suggested reasons and solutions regarding the issue (Thibodeau & Boroditsky 2011). Such experiment included the empirical data that was missing in Lakoff's works and since the biggest part of criticism his ideas was the lack of systematic data, the experiments assisted in substantiating the idea that conceptual metaphors can influence cognitive processes.

2.3. Conceptual Metaphor in political debate

As established earlier, "(...) politics is an area in which we would expect metaphorical expressions to be used. Indeed, political speech is one of the recognized types of classical rhetoric, of which metaphors are an integral part" (Ungerer and Schmid 1996:149) and since "(...) political discourse must be perceived as deliberative and argumentative" (Neagu 2013: 2), conceptual metaphors must be included into this discourse as they have the underlying ability to advocate for certain claims (Neagu 2013). Furthermore, Musolff (2012) assigns even more importance to metaphors as he claims that metaphors help politicians to "express and insinuate even the most extreme views under the guise of 'subjectively' coloured figurative speech" (Musolff 2012: 303).

It was stated before that in the process of mapping, complicated and abstract topics of the target domain become more within the grasp of human understanding when they are perceived in terms of more concrete meanings from the source domain. Such a process is vital for politicians whose main goal is to make their potential voters understand that their, in most cases, incomprehensible policy plans and complex ideas would benefit them (Diez 2016). Conceptual metaphor is the main tool for a politician which helps to close the gap between the

politician and the audience, as one of its functions is explanatory (Šeškauskienė & Ostanina-Olszewska 2016).

Another function of metaphors is the ability to persuade and emotionally influence the audience, as “they communicate a lot with minimal linguistic effort, whereas attempts at literal paraphrases are often lengthy, clumsy and graceless” (Scheithauer 2007: 79). As the politicians’ main goal is to manipulate the public, being oratory well equipped is a necessity and politicians can only be successful in using the metaphor when he or she invokes pre-existing frames and shared values in the collective memory of the audience (Neagu 2013).

Conceptual metaphor theory from the beginning relied heavily on political discourse. The theory’s author Lakoff applied it to US politics in his book *Moral Politics* (1996/2002) and came up with conceptual metaphors NATION IS A FAMILY, THE GOVERNMENT IS A PARENT, THE CITIZENS ARE THE CHILDREN. According to him, both liberals and conservatives exploit this model in their advances to influence the public (Lakoff 1996/2002). The conceptual metaphor NATION IS A FAMILY invokes a social frame which is familiar for everyone thus making the public widely emotionally susceptible and responsive when hearing family metaphors.

Lakoff (1996/2002) proposed that two opposing parties in the US, Republicans and Democrats, use two different family models, thus both invoking different sets of values among their supporters. Republicans use the Strict Father (further also SF) family model and sympathise with the conservative approach to the roles of family members. The Father role is predominant in such a family and he has “a primary responsibility for supporting and protecting the family” (Lakoff 2002: 65-66). The child, however, whilst being protected by the father is supposed to fight his own way through life: such an attitude correlates closely with the American Dream which mainly claims that only self-discipline and hard work leads to success (Lakoff 1996/2002). Republicans have constructed their whole political agenda with regard to such issues as social programmes, death penalty, environment, crime and others. Their language of moral politics include such conceptual metaphors: BEING GOOD IS BEING UPRIGHT, MORALITY AS STRENGTH, AUTHORITY FIGURES AS PARENTS, A PERSON IS AN OBJECT, MORALITY IS PURITY and others, in total, 23 metaphors are identified (Lakoff 1996/2002).

On the other hand, Democrats support the liberal family model, Nurturant Parent model (further also NP). In this model both parents of the family have one responsibility: nurturing and protecting their children. If the Strict Father model requires respect from the children, the Nurturant Parent model in contrast builds the relationship between family members through empathy and care. These metaphors are common to use for liberal politicians: MORALITY IS

EMPATHY, MORAL AGENTS ARE NURTURING PARENTS, BEING GOOD IS BEING UPRIGHT, MORAL GROWTH IS PHYSICAL GROWTH, in total the set number of metaphors attributed to liberals is 20 (Lakoff 1996/2002).

Cienki (2005) took Lakoff's model of SF and NP and applied it in practice by analysing the debates between the two candidates of the US presidential elections: George W. Bush and Al Gore, searching for metaphors proposed by Lakoff. The results of his study showed that metaphors used by politicians do differ respectively to each party and that metaphors used comply with the frames proposed by Lakoff. However, it was also revealed that a relatively small number of metaphors in reference to the model were used by politicians thus raising the question whether this model is as relevant as Lakoff made it to be (Cienki 2005). However, Lakoff stood by his model and his later work *Don't Think of an Elephant* (2004) continued to argue for the NP metaphors among left wing politicians and SF among the right wing.

Apparently, Lakoff's model can only be applied when the political system of the country is binary (Cienki 2005). The model is only likely to be valid in the discourse of US politics, where the main battle over the governing of the country is between two parties, Democrats and Republicans, whose ideas and values differ radically. In countries with multiple different parties that represent a variety of ideologies Lakoff's model would be difficult to apply. The same way conceptual metaphor TIME IS MONEY is only valid in cultures where money is the foundation of the economy (Stefanowitsch 2004), Lakoff's metaphorical model has culturally restricted applicability as a significant part of conceptual metaphors are culture-driven.

The predominant conceptual metaphor that plays a significant role in political discourse is COUNTRY IS PERSON. The tendency to assign human-like features to the abstract concepts from the target domain has been well established. Countries are seen as persons who have relationships of various kinds (friends, enemies, neighbors, clients *etc.*) with other countries and are also seen as having personalities, sets of values or emotions (Chilton & Lakoff 1995). Such alignment between country and person plays a role in the construction of the collective identity of the nation (Musolff 2019). Politicians employ this function of metaphors and construct an image of the country as a person with whom their potential voters could identify thus influencing the citizens to vote for the image of a country they identify with.

Container metaphors are also among the most frequently used metaphors in political discourse as well as in other discourses. It is firstly because of our bodily experience, as "we are (...) set off from the rest of the world by the surface of our skins, and we experience the rest of the world as outside us" (Lakoff & Johnson 1980: 29) and secondly, we are always surrounded with confined and bounded spaces: rooms, buildings, vehicles. Such cognitive familiarity

makes the frame of containment a desirable source domain, as it is easy to grasp for every listener. Being a productive tool in terms of explaining abstract concepts, it is frequently used by politicians.

2.4. Political context of the US election

Campaigns for the election of the most powerful leader position in the world begin two years prior to the election. The process of campaigning is excessive thus it is difficult for the voters to stay on track with. In an overwhelming number of campaign speeches, rallies and other events, the pre-election debates take on an important role in shaping the voters' opinion as those are the only times when candidates from battling parties face each other. As evident in the viewers' ratings, presidential debates remain a relevant event which assists in getting oneself familiar with the candidates' political agendas. According to the post-election polls conducted by Pew Research Center (further also PRC), since 1988 three-fifths of the voters say that pre-election debates were very or somewhat helpful in deciding for which candidate to vote (PRC).

During the 2008 Obama-McCain and Biden-Palin (vice president) debates the accumulated number of viewers was 242 million, during the 2012 Obama-Romney and Biden-Ryan debates the viewers count was 243.2 million, and during the 2016 Clinton-Trump and Kaine-Pence debates a sweeping number of 259.1 million were watching the debates (PRC). 2020 Biden-Trump and Harris-Pence debates were the first in 20 years to have only three broadcasts rather than four, after Donald Trump tested positive for Covid-19 and declined to go forward with virtual debates and thus, the debates in total accumulated 194 million viewers (NYT). Such a high number of viewers reflects the fact that presidential debates are one of the most important events during presidential campaigns. With such a turn out the candidates do their best to achieve their main goal: put forward their plans and strategies. Debates become a stage where politicians also put forward the values they represent because, as Cienki points out, even though parties invest more in their strategies, people vote according to values which the politicians represent (Cienki 2005). Since all the policies and values generally are more abstract concepts, metaphors become the main tool to get in touch with the potential voters.

During the debates in 2016 and 2020 there were 6 speakers in total: Democrats were represented by two presidential candidates Hillary Clinton and Joseph Biden and also by two vice presidential candidates Tim Kaine and Kamala Harris, while Republicans were

represented by one presidential candidate Donald Trump and his vice president Mike Pence, as they were aiming at re-election, thus were the only ones to represent the conservatives.

3. Data and methods

Two party-separate corpora from the transcripts of the debates were compiled. The transcripts of the debates were taken from the official website of the Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD). In total there were seven debates, five of them being presidential debates and two being vice presidential. Because of the cancellation of the second 2020 presidential debate due to Trump getting Covid-19, both candidates instead gave interviews separately and they were broadcasted on live television. Both these interviews were included into the respective corpora as the purpose of the interviews was the same as in the debates: to present one's political agenda and answer the questions regarding the most pressing issues that the US faces. The transcripts were taken from the ABC news official website (ABC). Later, all of the transcripts were manually revised and the texts produced by different party representatives were separated into two documents. The two collected corpora consist of 56,173 words for Democratic speakers and 57,713 words for Republican representatives.

Both corpora were separately analysed with AntConc (Version 3.5.8; Anthony 2019) which is a tool used for concordance and text analysis. Using the AntConc word listing feature, words used in both corpora were listed starting with the most frequent and ending with the ones that were used only once. The corpus of Democrats had 4,241 different types of words, while Republicans' included 3,741 different types. As expected, the first twenty or so words were functional and included determiners, conjunctions, prepositions, pronouns, auxiliary verbs, modals, qualifiers, and question words. As functional words carry almost no lexical meaning, it was decided to eliminate all of them and focus on the content words.

As nouns carry the most significant lexical meaning, 25 most frequently used nouns from both corpora were chosen as the keywords for closer analysis. This analysis again included work with AntConc, where all the cases of chosen keywords were found by the program and then exported into separate documents. After that, manual work took place, firstly to decide on which keywords out of the list of 25 the analysis will be focusing and secondly, to try to find all the cases of metaphorical expressions used with the chosen keywords. Such a corpus-based approach was put forward by Stefanowitsch, who introduced a term *metaphorical pattern* (Stefanowitsch 2004: 139). According to him, metaphorical patterns must include one word either from target domain or source domain for the researcher to be able to notice and analyze the patterns. The chosen keywords for both corpora were *America*, *country* and *states*, because it was decided to analyse the metaphors which are concerned with the construction of the image of the US. All three nouns belong to the target domain. For example, an expression

from the Democrats' corpus *to heal our country* is considered to be a metaphorical pattern in which the target domain is COUNTRY and further analysis requires analysing all the cases of this target domain in order to find a pattern. The search of metaphorical patterns solves the issue of the lacking systematicity in the field of conceptual metaphors. And even though a new issue arises of the inability of finding all the metaphors that were used by the speakers, as only the metaphors regarding the keywords get selected for analysis, the limited extent of this paper would not allow the full analysis of all the metaphors used either way.

The process of metaphor identification complies with the metaphor identification procedure, also known as MIP (Pragglejaz Group 2007) which was further developed into MIPVU (Steen *et al.* 2010). The procedure originally contains 4 steps while step number 3 within itself contains another 3 steps. Not all steps of the procedure will be followed because the procedure is very time consuming and not that effective in specialized or topic-specific discourse. Since metaphors are the result of several words that refer to different experiential domains while being used in the same context, the most important step is to establish the basic meaning of those words in order to identify the metaphor. Following the principles of MIP, basic meanings of words are more concrete and precise, related to bodily experience and in some cases historically older (Pragglejaz Group 2007). Taking a look at the metaphorical pattern *to heal our country*, COUNTRY is the target domain referring to the United States of America and the verb *to heal* has a basic meaning of making one free from injury which refers to human experience (basic meaning was determined with the assistance of Merriam Webster Online Dictionary (further also MWOD), Cambridge Online Dictionary (further also COD) and Oxford Advanced Learner's Dictionary (further also OALD)). After the establishment of two different semantic fields (country with human-like experience), it becomes clear that from the metaphorical pattern *to heal the country* one can identify the conceptual metaphor COUNTRY IS PERSON/ANIMAL.

After the procedure of metaphor identification, a more in depth analysis relying on the clash of semantic meanings of words is carried out. While analysing the context it was tried to determine what was meant when using metaphorical expression involving healing when speaking about a country. Such insights assist in understanding different political ideologies and policies.

4. Results and discussion

4.1. Major tendencies in noun usage

As nouns carry the most significant meaning, two lists of 25 most frequently used nouns by Democrats and Republicans were compiled.

Table 1: Most frequently used nouns in both corpora (matching nouns in bold)

Nouns used by Democrats			Nouns used by Republicans		
Noun	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (per 10 000 words)	Noun	Absolute frequency	Relative frequency (per 10 000 words)
People	358	63.7	People	398	69.0
President	212	37.7	Country	202	35.0
Donald	197	35.0	President	189	32.7
Trump	153	27.2	Years	135	23.4
Country	118	21.0	Trump	123	21.3
Fact	116	20.7	Joe	111	19.2
Plan	94	16.7	Clinton	110	19.1
States	91	16.2	Hillary	109	18.9
Tax	90	16.0	States	93	16.1
Time	90	16.0	Time	92	15.9
Jobs	82	14.6	Senator	86	14.9
America	72	12.8	Money	79	13.7
Number	69	12.9	Russia	76	13.2
Years	68	12.1	World	76	13.2
Women	67	11.9	Taxes	75	13.0
Money	65	11.6	Obama	73	12.6
World	65	11.6	China	68	11.8
Economy	56	10.0	Donald	67	11.6
Biden	51	9.0	Jobs	67	11.6
China	50	8.9	Deal	62	10.7
Business	49	8.7	Tax	59	10.2
Election	48	8.5	Biden	58	10.0

Court	47	8.4	Law	58	10.0
Year	46	8.2	ISIS	57	9.9
Americans	44	7.8	America	53	9.2

The most frequently used noun by both parties was the same: *people*. Appealing to the public, to the potential voters is apparently the main priority, thus such expressions as *American people*, *our people*, *people need to know*, were used frequently by speakers from both parties in an attempt to show empathy for the US citizens. A few other words, even though not in the same order, also appear on both lists: *country* and *president*, which is not surprising, since *country* is mostly used when referring to the United States and *president* is used often as the debates themselves belong to the domain of presidential election.

As in political speech positive self-representation and negative other presentation is the main tool to convey one's message convincingly (van Dijk 1997, Chilton 2004, Myers 2008), both political parties talk about the opponents, thus Democrats have *Donald* and *Trump* high on the list and in most cases they are used for negative presentation of the Republicans. However, even though the Republicans very frequently used the names of the Democrats *Joe*, *Hillary*, *Clinton*, *Obama* and *Biden* for referencing the other depreciation, the name *Trump* being higher based on frequency than the other names, reveals that Republicans might be using the approach of positive self-representation more than the Democrats.

Two main topics can be identified looking at both lists: America and its relationships with other countries as well as economic issues. Nouns referring to the US are very frequent, e. g., *country*, which 68 times out of 118 was used with the pronoun *our* by Democrats and 104 times out of 202 by the Republicans, *America* and *states*, which is almost always used in the phrase *the United States*. Based on relative frequency, Democrats used noun *America* more frequently than Republicans (12.8 vs. 9.2), *states* was used almost equally by both parties and noun *country* was used significantly more frequently by Republicans than by Democrats (35.0 vs. 21.0). Other countries frequently mentioned by politicians include *China*, *Russia*, *ISIS* and the noun *world*, which is also used to construct an image of America and its relationship with the whole world as the usage of all those prior-mentioned countries do. However, Republicans show a tendency of speaking more about international relationships, as all four mentioned nouns appear on their list while Democrats only speak about two of them: *China* and the *world*.

Economic issues are being dealt with using a variety of nouns: *tax, jobs, money, economy, business* (used by Democrats) and *money, taxes, jobs, tax* (used by Republicans). It seems that both parties agree on which topic is the most relevant to the American voters but also it is possible that topics match as both candidates answer the same questions given by the moderators. The topics which according to the frequency of noun usage were the most important ones lead to an interesting conclusion, since questions given by the moderators included a great variety of issues that the US is dealing with: immigration, LGBT rights, drugs, social security and medical insurance, voting rights, gun control, Covid-19 crisis, systematic racial injustice, climate change, etc. Among so many controversial and complicated issues, the choice to devote most attention to the economy and foreign relations could reveal that the American dream is still one of the fundamental parts of the US society. The wish to make one's living and resume the leader's position among other countries could still be the main concern of the voters.

Even though the main themes match between both parties, there are some deviations on the lists depending on the party. Taking a look at the most apparent differences between the lists, there are some words which only appear on one or the other, e. g. *women, election, court* are used specifically by the Democrats, while *deal, law, ISIS* are used by the Republicans.

The noun *women* in most cases is used by Democrats to negatively represent the Republican candidate Donald Trump, who is being blamed on being misogynist, e. g.:

- (1) *We've seen him rate women on their appearance.* (Clinton_2)
- (2) *Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger.* (Clinton_3)
- (3) *But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs.* (Clinton_1)

As *women* is a concrete noun, there are no examples of its metaphorical usage with the exception of example (1), in which a metaphor WOMAN IS OBJECT is apparent, as verb *rate* according to its main meaning refers to estimating the value of an object (MWOD). The construction of Trump's misogynistic image appears to be the strategy of Democratic candidate Clinton in the elections of 2016, as such examples can only be found among her speech (see examples (2) and (3)).

A more interesting noun used specifically by the Republicans was *ISIS*, which was conceptualised as a person who is the biggest threat to the US and who needs to be neutralized. As it is an abstract noun, it is mostly used metaphorically, e. g.:

- (4) *Our primary threat today is ISIS.* (Pence_1)
- (5) *ISIS was able to be literally **conjured up** out of the desert.* (Pence_1)

- (6) (...) *that ISIS had infiltrated the United States.* (Pence_1)
(7) *We're going to defeat ISIS.* (Trump_2)

It is apparent that the topic of ISIS was relevant only in the elections of 2016, as all of the above examples and also in general, almost all the usage of this noun was in the debates of 2016. It was because in the period of 2013-2015 ISIS gained its strength and carried out its deadliest attacks on the Russian airplane, in Paris and Orlando, Florida. With the metaphors Republicans constructed an image of a dangerous (4), mystified and unearthly (5), secretive (6) enemy which must be defeated by the US led by Republicans (7).

Lakoff (2001) analysed the language used by liberals and conservatives in regard to the terrorist attack on the 9/11, and highlighted the advantage of conservatives as they spoke using the metaphors of Strict Father morality: "There is evil loose in the world. We must show our strength and wipe it out." (Lakoff 2001: 4). Democrats chose to use the Nurturant Parent metaphors, in which they highlighted the Democrats attitude towards the tragic events: "Justice is called for, not vengeance" and "We should not be like them, we should not take innocent lives in bringing the perpetrators to justice." (Lakoff 2001: 4). Lakoff even tied together the Republicans' win in the 2004 Presidential election and the language and metaphors used in response to the terrorist attack (Lakoff 2001).

The parallels between the Republicans' response to the 9/11 attack and the attacks carried out by ISIS can be easily drawn as the Republican candidates of the 2016 elections spoke about the issue more frequently, constructed the image of ISIS as an evil human being and in many cases spoke about a violent answer to ISIS attacks: "We have to knock the hell out of ISIS", "We're going to defeat ISIS", "And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS" (Trump_2). And even though it cannot be claimed that specifically this issue helped the Republican candidate Donald Trump to win the election, this could be a topic for a more thorough research; however, this is outside the scope of this paper and will not be pursued further.

4.2. The Metaphorical Image of America

There were a few cases in which the differences of the vocabulary used by two parties were apparent; however, a much more frequent case was that the vocabulary used was similar or the same, as seen from the lists of most frequently used nouns. However, metaphors used by two parties convey different messages in regard to the strategies and policies of the candidate's political agenda.

Taking into account that both parties excessively spoke about the US with the help of lexical items such as *country*, *states* and *America* and the fact that often in political discourse countries or places through metaphors are conceptualized as living beings characterized by physical features as well as mental features, it was decided to analyze the metaphors concerned with the image of America and analyze the differences of the images depending on the party of the candidate. In the Democratic corpus the noun *America* was used 63 times out of which 20 instances were metaphorical expressions, *states* was used 91 times out of which 16 instances were metaphorical expressions and *country* (only with regard to the United States) was used 108 times out of which 35 instances were metaphorical expressions.

After adding up the frequency of the words that refer to the United States of America, Democrats spoke about the United States of America 262 times, out of which 71 utterances were used metaphorically which makes up to 27 percent of all the utterances.

The analysis of the Republican corpus has demonstrated that the noun *America* was used 44 times out of which 35 instances were metaphorical expressions, *states* 93 times out of which 24 instances were metaphorical expressions and *country* was used 202 times out of which 89 instances were metaphorical expressions. Adding up the frequency of words that refer to the United States of America, Republicans spoke about America 339 times, out of which 148 utterances were metaphors, which make up almost 44 percent of all utterances.

Table 2: Most frequent conceptual metaphors used with nouns that refer to the US

	Democrats			Republicans		
	America	States	Country	America	States	Country
PERSON/ ANIMAL metaphor	18	14	25	19	16	33
OBJECT metaphor	-	2	5	13	6	37
Other	2	-	5	3	2	19
Total	20	16	35	35	24	89

It is evident that Republicans used metaphorical expressions much more frequently than Democrats. After calculating the relative frequency of metaphors used by each party, a comparison can be made, where Democrats produced around 12.6 metaphors per 10,000 words, while Republicans produced significantly more: 25.6 metaphors per 10,000 words.

The data in Table 2 shows that Republicans, when constructing the image of the US frequently used object metaphors. In total there were 56 instances of Republican speakers using object metaphors while Democrats produced 7 cases of such metaphors. According to Lakoff's Strict Parent model one of the metaphors said to be typical for Republicans is PERSON IS OBJECT (Lakoff 1996). Even though in this case object like qualities are assigned to a country, it could be of use to further investigate whether conservative politicians produce more object metaphors in comparison to liberals. However, due to the limited scope of this thesis further analysis of this hypothesis is not pursued.

4.2.1. Metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON

The most common metaphor used by both political parties was the same AMERICA IS A PERSON which is not surprising as such tendency is not only apparent across different discourses but also across cultures (Musolff 2004). In metaphors used by Democrats, 80 percent of all metaphors were person/animal and in metaphors used by Republicans, 46 percent of all metaphors were person/animal. Both physical and mental features were attributed to the US.

Both parties spoke about similar human-like characteristics and features of the country. Metaphors were used as a main tool in the political discourse strategy of negative *other* presentation and positive self-representation. A substantial number of metaphors regarded America's safety and protection, also its relationship with politicians. Democrats seem to underline the importance of morality and social responsibility, pinpointing that putting America above all other countries has led to its isolation (8), which reveals its social separation from other countries and it has happened because of the values that Republicans tried to instill into America. On the other hand, Republicans make their own point, saying that America has to discontinue helping other countries in order to maintain itself (9), continuing with their path to America's isolation:

(8) *America first has made America alone.* (Biden_3)

(9) (...) *because our country cannot afford to defend Saudi Arabia.* (Trump_3)

Even though topics taken into consideration in the debates are the same for both parties, e.g. safety and protection of the country, the context surrounding metaphors regarding the topics help to discern different understanding of the issue at hand. Consequently, though both parties use the same conceptual metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON, their understanding of what kind of person country is or what it should do, or what is being done to it, differs considerably.

Values and high morality is a recurring theme throughout the metaphors used by Democrats. America is being portrayed as a person who is good, true to one's values, someone who has to be trustworthy and help others to maintain peaceful relationships, e. g.:

(10) *America is great, because **America is good.*** (Clinton_3)

(11) *It is essential that **America's word be good.*** (Clinton_1)

(12) (...) *where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. **That is not who America is.*** (Clinton_3)

(13) (...) *to make clear to our children that **our country really is great** because we're good.* (Clinton_2)

(14) ***The United States has kept the peace** through our alliances.* (Clinton_3)

America must be an example of great morality for other countries as well as for the children of the Americans. When assigning politically motivated morality metaphors to liberals (Democrats) and conservatives (Republicans), Lakoff (1996) claimed that the metaphors MORALITY IS EMPATHY and MORALITY IS NURTURANCE characterized liberals which in the light of previous examples appears to be holding his reasoning. The importance of nurturing relationships and alliances with other countries, being good, which in other words could mean being empathetic to others, appears to be a part of Democrats policy.

After analyzing the context of the *being good* metaphors (10, 11, 13) used by Democrats, it appears that the *good* means ending the division and tension among the Americans, celebrating the nation's diversity, helping each other through difficulties, finding strength in numbers, working towards common goals together, being trustworthy and honouring the promises which were given to others. (14) Social responsibility and empathy and care for the ones who are next to you align perfectly with Lakoff's Nurturant Parent metaphors.

In example (12), Clinton is distancing America from the Republican candidate Trump, who is being portrayed as the opposite of *the good*: he encourages and applauds violence and division. With the use of the relative pronoun *who* Clinton takes one step further and rather than employing the metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON and assigning human-like features to a country, employs personification and speaks about a country as if it were a person.

The morality metaphors correlate successfully with Lakoff's (1996) ideas of Democrats being the Nurturant Parent; however, it is important to take into account that all these metaphors were put forward only by Hillary Clinton and by none of the other Democrats. It is possible that this tendency could be her own tactic of appealing to the voters and not the representation of the policies of the whole party.

When constructing the metaphorical image of America, Democrats also use a large number of metaphors regarding its character and identity, e. g.:

(15) *These are very important values to me, because **this is the America that I know and love.*** (Clinton_2)

(16) (...) *everything I did as secretary of state was in furtherance of **our country's interests and our values.*** (Clinton_3)

(17) *And the question for us, the question **our country must answer** is that this is not who we are.* (Clinton_2)

(18) (...) ***the character of the country** is on the ballot.* (Biden_2)

(19) (...) *to demonstrate who we are and **who our country is** (...).* (Clinton_3)

(20) (...) *what is on the ballot here is **the character of this country.*** (Biden_2)

Clinton brings the ideas of unity and social equality (15) as well as the importance of charities that help the sick (16), thus again underlining the social responsibility as one of the most important features of the US. However, this time another Democrats' candidate, Biden, also metaphorically speaks about the character of the country in examples (18) and (20), of which he underlines three main features: "Decency, honor, respect." (Biden_1).

These characteristics of the US assist in constructing the negative presentation of Republicans, constituting the fact that Republicans' ideas for the United States are not compatible with the character and identity of America. After the analysis of the context in which all of the above mentioned examples were used, Republicans appear as disrespectful towards minorities: "(...) he [Trump] has also targeted immigrants, African-Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others" (Clinton_2), deepening the divide between diverse communities and inciting violence: "It's with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run, and the inciting of violence at his rallies." (Clinton_2), and also belittling women: "He [Trump] goes after their [women] dignity, their self-worth." (Clinton_3) while the true character of America is all the contrary: truthful, honorable, decent, respectful, inclusive and kind and all these characteristics are in line with Democrats, making it an apparent case of negative other presentation and positive self-representation.

According to the data, another human-like feature attributed to the United States of America is the need to be protected or kept safe. The parallels between one's native country and mother-like figure, also taking into account that a synonymous term for *native country* is *motherland*,

construct an image in the minds of voters of a weak feminine figure who is incapable of standing for herself, thus needing protection either from the citizens or from politicians.

(21) (...) *because of Donald Trump's unilateral approach to foreign policy, coupled with his isolationism, he pulled us out and **has made America less safe***. (Harris)

(22) *That is the plan that Joe Biden has and that I have, knowing that we have to get a hold of what has been going on and **we need to save our country***. (Harris)

(23) *And I know the awesome responsibility of **protecting our country*** (...). (Clinton_3)

(24) (...) *the young man who sacrificed himself **defending our country** in the United States Army*. (Clinton_2)

(25) (...) *a president should take action to **defend the United States** against imminent threat*. (Kaine)

(26) *I think it makes the world safer and, frankly, it **makes the United States safer***. (Clinton_3)

These examples cover a few types of different threats that the US is facing and needs to be protected from. First being the most straightforward threat: terrorism, aggressive countries such as North Korea, Iran, Iraq and others, that threaten the world with their nuclear missiles programs and other violent actions. According to Democrats, such danger can only be neutralized by strong alliances. Safety is in numbers thus Republican policy of cutting ties with allies and pulling out of peace agreements has potentially exposed the US to danger (21). Putting example (26) into its context, Clinton is speaking about the president's responsibility to protect the US by keeping peace: "I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere." (Clinton_3). Her running partner Tim Kaine in example (25) spoke about the threat of North Korea and how the sanctions placed of the aggressor by the US was a thoughtful step in the interest of their country and how other countries, namely China and the U. N., followed the US example which helped in creating a stronger stance against North Korea. This constitutes the Democrats' idea that only alliances and well-thought through plans can maintain the safety of the US.

The second dangerous situation that the US has to be protected from is Covid-19. This danger became relevant only in the debates of 2020, but the strategy put forward by the Democrats on how to save the US from this danger is similar to the strategy on how to defend America against the terrorism and countries-aggressors. Harris speaks about saving the US (22) by coming up with a precise plan that will help in putting a stop on the chaos that was brought by the virus and the Republican-led administration. The aspect of working in unity is also put forward: everyone must wear masks, practice social distancing and be responsible as the inability to unite against the enemy will lead to the victory.

The third type of threat that the US must be protected from is a different one. In example (23) Clinton speaks about the protection of the US, meaning protection of the US working class families against big and powerful corporations. Taking up a role of the protector of the weak ones she again complies to Lakoff's (1996) ideas linked to the liberals (in this case the Democrats). The Nurturant Parent family model constructed by Lakoff suggests that a parent must be a protective figure who guides and nurtures the children and even though there is no direct metaphor that would put the working class families into a role of children, Clinton by assigning herself a role of a protector still invokes such framework.

Republicans, on the other hand, have an opposite role. Metaphors used by Democrats make their opponents appear clueless and the lack of knowledge is dangerous as America experiences losses because of that are being portrayed not like protectors but they seem to put America in danger and because of that the country experiences losses, e.g.:

(27) (...) *the President's trade war with China. You lost that trade war. You lost it. What ended up happening is, because of a so-called trade war with China, **America lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs.*** (Harris)

In the strategies which were put forward by Democrats to defend and protect the US against war-like actions, significant importance was given to thorough planning. In example (27) the Republican president Trump started a trade war with China and lost it because he was not aware about the issue at hand of not having the proper knowledge and plan before getting the US involved in a war, thus resulting in metaphorical casualties: jobs were lost to China like soldiers would be lost in an actual war.

Quite a few metaphorical expressions that realise the conceptual metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON are taken from a human relationship framework. According to the Democrats the US is being treated badly by its partner Republican Trump resulting in more of the negative Republicans.

(28) ***America should really wonder** about a President Trump, who had a campaign manager with ties to Putin, pro-Putin elements in the Ukraine, who had to be fired for that reason.* (Kaine)

(29) *He, on the issue of Charlottesville, where people were peacefully protesting the need for racial justice, where a young woman was killed and on the other side there were neo-Nazis carrying tiki torches shouting racial epithets, anti semitic slurs. And Donald Trump, when asked about it, said there were fine people on both sides. This is who we have as the President of the United States. And **America, you deserve better.*** (Harris)

(30) *So if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of **our country***

see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he's trying to hide. (Clinton_1)

(31) (...) *he owes our country an apology.* (Clinton_2)

In example (28), Kaine questions Trump's loyalty to America, metaphorically suggesting that it should firstly find out where Trump's loyalty lies before getting into a *relationship* with him and electing him to be the President. The attention of the US should also be brought to the fact that Trump is hiding his tax returns (30), making him untrustworthy. To make the matters worse, Trump *owes our country an apology* (31), because of an insult directed to Barack Obama with whom the US was in a great relationship, thus meaning that Trump has no respect towards the decisions made by the US. Using the metaphor *America, you deserve better* (29), Harris refers to Trump's values and beliefs, as she speaks about his inclination to defend white supremacists and neo-Nazis, making a point that since America got into a *relationship* with Trump and saw his moral flaws, it should not stay in this *relationship*. Ending the relationship would require not to re-elect Trump as the President of the United States. Someone *better* would be a candidate from the Democratic Party.

Analyzing the metaphors that suggest negative other presentation, it is important to note that all criticism is directed to the Republican candidate Donald Trump personally and does not refer to Republican Party in general. The message that Democrats are trying to put forward is that the US having Trump as its President is being mistreated and getting hurt.

At the same time, while criticizing the relationship between Trump and the US, Democrats are describing their own relationship with the country. This relationship is healthier, Democrats are supportive of America, help America get back on its feet, become a doctor of America that heals and revitalizes.

(32) *If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do.* (Clinton_2)

(33) *I want us to heal our country.* (Clinton_2)

(34) *I'm the only candidate from the very beginning of this campaign who had a plan to help us revitalize coal country.* (Clinton_2)

According to the Democrats, holding on to each other, cooperating with each other is the only way to achieve success; being supportive, having faith in America's abilities (32) is the main strategy by Democrats. Metaphors about healing and revitalizing the US spoken by Clinton (33, 34) bring back earlier ideas by Democrats: healing the country means unifying the people of America and the revitalization of coal country means nurturing the working class families,

coal workers, remaining by their side and not abandoning them while at the same time creating jobs for clean energy workers as well.

Taking a look at the Republican corpus, physical strength is an important feature that the US must have, as it gains respect from other countries and naturally, in the light of negative other presentation, weakness is something that Democrats brought to this country. Looking through the frequency of the words used in both corpora, Republicans used the word *strong* 62 times while Democrats used it only 24 times.

(35) (...) *we can **have a stronger America** at home and abroad, who believe we can get this economy moving again, who believe that we can end illegal immigration once and for all.* (Pence_1)

(36) *Look, **America is stronger than Russia**. Our economy is 16 times larger than the Russian economy. America's political system is superior (...).* (Pence_1)

(37) *We are going to **make America strong again**, and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama (...).* (Trump_3)

(38) *For the last seven-and-a-half years, we've seen **America's place in the world weakened**.* (Pence_1)

(39) *We've **weakened America's place in the world**. It's been a combination of factors, but mostly it's been a lack of leadership.* (Pence_1)

As mentioned earlier, strength manifests in military force; however, other instances of metaphors referring to the strength of America speak about other fields: economy (35), having a superior political system (36) and strict leadership (37, 39). Weakness stems from the Democrats' leadership (38), America's place in a metaphorical list that rates countries according to their strength, has moved several positions downwards. A variation of the metaphorical slogan MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN appears (it will be analysed in detail further in the thesis), *make America strong again*, repeatedly implying that the last Democratic administration had ruined the previously great and strong America.

The Republicans' metaphors GREAT IS UP, GREATNESS IS STRENGTH, WEAK IS DOWN are similar to Lakoff's (1996) metaphors which he identified as characteristic of the conservative discourse: BEING GOOD IS BEING UPWARDS, MORALITY IS STRENGTH, BEING BAD IS BEING LOW. Even though throughout the corpus there are no instances of family metaphors, in which the Strict Father metaphor could be truly evident, even without the frame of Republicans being the father and America being the child, metaphors from that frame are still relevant as seen in examples (35-39).

Just as safety and protection of the US was an issue that Democrats spoke about, Republicans seem to also have plans regarding the country's safety. Whether in the light of Democrat-run administration negative presentation or by putting themselves into the defender's role, Republicans put forward their understanding of safety, e.g.:

(40) *I'm going to **make our country safe**. We're going to have borders in our country, which we don't have now.* (Trump_2)

(41) *People are pouring into our country, and they're coming in from the Middle East and other places. We're going to **make America safe again**.* (Trump_2)

(42) *And when Qassem Soleimani was traveling to Baghdad... To do harm to Americans, President Donald Trump took him out... And **America is safer** (...).* (Pence_2)

According to the Republicans, the US can only be safe and protected if the country has walls surrounding it, borders which will stop people from entering it (40). The biggest threat comes from Mexico and other southern countries, from which people are crossing America's borders illegally; also from the Middle East, bringing a threat of terrorism. Republicans create a terrifying scenario for the US, in which everyone that comes from other countries is a threat either to Americans' jobs or to Americans' safety. Since Democrats are the ones who let dangerous foreigners reign freely throughout the country, Republicans are set to put that to a stop and *make America safe again* (41). Putting borders and separating themselves from the outer world is the safety strategy that the Republicans want to put in place.

Aggression and violence is also a strategy when assuring the US safety according to the Republicans: if a threat to America arises, the best solution is to eliminate it. America is safer if its enemies are dead, and Trump, a protector with a strong character, made it happen in the case of Qassem Soleimani (42).

The human-like image of the US is being continuously constructed by the Republicans mostly based on the negative Democrats' administration presentation, not only in the 2016 debates when Democrats were in charge but also in 2020 debates, after four years of their own presidency.

(43) *When President Trump and I took office, **America had gone through the slowest economic recovery** since the Great Depression.* (Pence_2)

(44) *And we're going to **make America wealthy again** (...). Right now, other nations are taking our jobs and they're taking our wealth.* (Trump_2)

(45) *We are going to start the engine rolling again, because... right now, **our country is dying** at 1 percent GDP.* (Trump_3)

(46) ***Our country is suffering** because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs (...).* (Trump_1)

After Democratic administration America is left poor, having experienced suffering and on the verge of death. The metaphorical expression *America is going through recovery*, creates a scenario in which America suffered an injury as its economy struggled and because of the Democrats either hindering the process or not knowing the proper way of healing, America has gone through a very slow recovery (43). Also, under Obama's watch, the US is being robbed of jobs and wealth by immigrants from other countries and Democrats are letting it to continue happening, while Republicans are going to put a stop to such exploitation and help America regain its wealth (44).

The US as a metaphorical person is also suffering and dying because of poor economic decisions made by Democrats (45, 46). The US is dying because the Obama administration entangled America into many unprofitable deals with other countries and those deals must be either terminated or renegotiated. America's metaphorical health and livelihood appears to be fully dependent on the country's economic situation; as a result, Democrats have no proper skills to take care of it.

4.2.2. America's relationships with other countries

Relationships with other countries also have a great significance when constructing a metaphorical image of the US. It was mentioned in the first overview of the most frequently used nouns' lists that Republicans in general spoke more about other countries than Democrats but both parties had a similar number of metaphors regarding foreign countries. The analysis will include America's relationship with China and Russia. With regard to China, Democrats used 21 metaphorical expressions, while Republicans had 28 instances, all metaphors by both parties were CHINA IS PERSON and in most cases they were used while describing the relationship between the US and China.

Democrats regard China as someone who can be pushed around and made to bend against their will but also someone who might be offensive or might cause other harm, e.g.:

(47) *I'm going to rejoin Paris Accord and **make China abide** by what they agreed to.* (Biden_2)

(48) ***China is illegally dumping steel** in the United States and Donald Trump is buying it to build his buildings.* (Biden_2)

(49) (...) *to make sure that **we don't get taken advantage of by China** on steel.* (Biden_2)

Joe Biden by saying that he, as the President of the US, will *make China abide*, implies that the US has a significant authority amongst other countries or has serious leverages to make China do as he (the representative of the US) says (47). Speaking about China in such terms he disregards China's plans or intentions, putting it in a lower position than America.

However, taking into account the other two examples, it seems that Joe Biden understands that China might be dangerous should it not be dealt carefully. He accuses China of *dumping steel* in the US at the same time implying that Donald Trump, a Republican president, might have something to do with this (48). To *dump* in its first dictionary meaning, means "to let something fall in or as if in a heap or mass" (MWOD); however, in this case the meaning of this verb is "the practice of selling goods in another country so cheaply that companies in that country cannot compete fairly" (COD). According to Democrats, Trump, being the President of the US, allows China to continue dumping steel into the US steel market as Trump benefits from the situation and lets China *take advantage* of America (49).

Republicans, like Democrats, hold America as a higher authority to China but in a different way. Republicans are blaming China for causing and then transferring Covid-19 to the US and threatening to *hold China accountable* for the deeds that it has done (50), even though not specifying the repercussions, e.g.:

(50) *We're going to **hold China accountable** for what they did to America with the coronavirus.* (Pence_2)

(51) *China that had been taking **advantage of America** for decades in the wake of Joe Biden's **cheerleading for China**.* (Pence_2)

(52) ***China ate your lunch, Joe.*** (Trump_4)

Another source domain that is familiar to cognitive human experience, which is used by Republicans when speaking about the US relationship with China is stereotypes about school life. In example (51), Pence is blaming Democrat Biden for letting China take advantage of the US while he is *cheerleading for China*. Cheerleading is a popular "activity of leading the crowd in shouting encouragement and supporting a team at a sports event. The activity usually involves dancing and chanting" (COD). Cheerleading is a highly popular activity in high schools in the US during which high school students cheer their school sports team in a sports event. According to the Republicans, Biden is cheering for China while China at the same time is taking advantage of the US. Also, the metaphor used by Republicans in example (52) assigns Joe Biden a role of a school boy who is being bullied by a stronger, more popular boy who represents China. Both these metaphors speak about China being mean to America while also depicting Biden negatively, as someone who is being pushed around.

Both parties in the use of their metaphors CHINA IS PERSON, create an image of China in which this country is somewhat weaker than the US, who can be bent whichever way the US wishes (50). China is also depicted as a harm causing person, who must be taken under control; if not taken seriously, it can cause problems to the US.

The relationship between Russia and the US is also described through metaphorical expressions. Even though the proper noun *Russia* was not included in the list of the most frequently used nouns by Democrats, this party also spoke about Russia, but fewer times than the Republican Party. Republicans spoke about it 76 times, out of which 43 were metaphorical expressions realising the metaphor RUSSIA IS HUMAN, while Democrats mentioned Russia only 31 times, out of which 21 were metaphors, also the RUSSIA IS HUMAN metaphor.

Democrats put forward a clear image of Russia and its relationship with the US. It is clear that their party's presidential candidates are both capable of defending the US interests should the situation arise. Russia is being portrayed as a possible threat, a danger to the US:

(53) *Hillary Clinton has gone **toe-to-toe with Russia**.* (Kaine)

(54) *Joe Biden would **hold Russia to account** for any threat to our nation security.* (Harris)

(55) *You've got to be **tough on Russia**.* (Kaine)

(56) ***You guys love Russia**. (...) you both have said Vladimir Putin is a better leader than the president.* (Kaine)

Clinton has already had proven to be able to stand her ground in a challenging situation when dealing with Russia, not giving in while negotiating (53), while Biden is said to be capable of doing the same, of having a strong character and authority to make Russia face consequences brought on by its harmful actions towards the US security (54). Interestingly, both claims were made by vice-president candidates with regard to respective presidential candidates, making it a case of positive self-representation but with regard to the colleague from the same party and not exactly self-praise. Meanwhile, Republicans are being blamed by Democrats for having romantic feelings for Russia (56), saying that Republicans prefer Russia's leader over the US president Barack Obama. In the strategy of positive self-representation, Democrats portray themselves as being strict and strongly-willed, enough to control Russia (55), while Republicans are lenient and biased in situations regarding Russia.

The Republican attitude towards Russia shifted during the 4-year period between the presidential election debates. During the 2016 debates, Trump and Pence speak about possible friendship between countries, friendship meaning an alliance with Russia when fighting with

ISIS (57). Also, while Democrats are blaming Russia for performing cyber attacks on the Democratic National Committee, Trump is hesitant and does not blame Russia for the crime (58):

(57) *I think it would be great if **we got along with Russia** because we could fight ISIS together* (Trump_2)

(58) *I don't think anybody knows it was **Russia that broke into the DNC**. She's saying Russia, Russia, Russia, but I don't—maybe it was.* (Trump_1)

While Democrats are putting forward the idea that Russia is a threat, a possible criminal, who hacks and attacks the US, Republicans see Russia as a useful ally that could help in dealing with the most relevant threat at the time – ISIS. Republicans are defending Russia against supposedly false accusations and insinuate friendship with the country. Taking into account that during previous analysis, it was found out that Republicans construct an image of America as a socially isolated and aggressive person, thus the idea of instigating friendship and an alliance with Russia creates an idea of Russia being someone trustworthy and special with whom a closer relationship could be beneficial.

However, during the 4 year of the presidency of Trump, Republicans' attitude towards Russia changed. During his presidency it was proven that Russia was indeed guilty of hacking into the DNC and to make matters worse, it became clear that Russia interfered in the 2016 presidential elections. Trump and his presidential campaign was investigated for possible collusion with Russia's interference in the 2016 presidential elections but the investigation came to a conclusion that Trump did not collude with Russia. Metaphors used in 2020 presidential election debates and the context they were used in created a different image of Russia as a person, as it can be seen in the examples:

(59) *There has been nobody **tougher on Russia** than Donald Trump.* (Trump_5)

(60) *I've got the NATO countries to put up an extra \$130 billion going to \$420 billion a year. That's **to guard against Russia**.* (Trump_5)

In examples taken from the 2020 debates, Russia becomes a misbehaving person who needs to be dealt with force and Trump is the most suitable candidate to make Russia comply, *tougher*; metaphorically meaning severe economic sanctions that were placed on Russia to punish it for the interference into 2016 US presidential elections (59). Russia is transformed to a person from whom the US must protect itself and the rest of the countries (60). Republicans even reached out to other alliances to help with the defense against the newly found enemy, changing its attitude completely.

The analysis reveals that Democrats when assigning human-like features to Russia are consistent throughout the period of time, seeing Russia as someone who can be dangerous, commits crimes and does not deserve trust. Democrats portray themselves as being capable of dealing with the misdemeanors committed by Russia, meanwhile blaming Republicans for being in love with Russia. Republicans themselves during the 2016 debates consider Russia as a trusted ally and a partner who deserves a benefit of a doubt when facing serious allegations. However, after Russia is proved to be at fault, Trump and Pence distance themselves from it, now portraying the country as dangerous and criminal.

4.2.3. Object metaphors

Ontological metaphors, or to put it in simpler terms, various object metaphors are also deeply ingrained into human consciousness and sub-consciousness. As humans are surrounded with physical objects, they become the foundation for all other experiences, thus it is only natural that various abstract concepts are understood in terms of physical objects (Lakoff & Johnson 1980). Because of that objects make a perfect source domain in the process of metaphor construction.

The most frequently used object metaphor that stands out in its frequency is AMERICA IS A CONTAINER, which portrayed the US as or at least having features of a container. Democrats produced 7 such metaphors while Republicans used it 43 times, which is to be expected, as it was already noted, on that Republicans' speech has a greater number of metaphors.

Container metaphors are the ones of the most frequent object metaphors in speech as the human conceptual system has a tendency to perceive various objects and situations as having a structure of a container (Lakoff and Johnson 1980). The main reason behind this being the same principle of all conceptual metaphors: source domain (the container) has a clear structure that can be used in understanding a less clear cut target domain (Kövecses 1990: 145). Democrats speak about America being a container when talking about the issue of illegal immigration and refugees, e. g.:

(61) (...) *rounding up people who are undocumented. And we would then have to put them on trains, on buses to get them **out of our country**. I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it's an idea that would **rip our country apart**.*
(Clinton_3)

(62) (...) *I will not let anyone **into our country** that I think poses a risk to us.*
(Clinton_2)

When discussing the situation of illegal immigrants who are already integrated into the society, Clinton sees the action of transporting those people out of the US as an act of destruction that will rip the *container* or the country apart (61). It would seem that he portrays the immigrants who already have a life in the US as a part of the container, thus taking something out of the container causes damage in it. Clinton regards the sudden act of deportation as a threat to the US values, which regarding previous analysis are solidarity and unity, and assumes that this could cause damage to the citizens of the US.

However, in example (62), Clinton, when metaphorically speaking about the US as a container, says that she will not let anyone in, should they pose a threat. This was said in the context of the dangerous situation of the continuous growth of ISIS, which in the debates of the 2016 elections was considered to be the biggest threat in the world. Regarding this possibly dangerous situation there is a shift in the way Democrats are portraying the US as a container and their reaction to foreigners who want to be in this country: illegal immigrants who already have a life in America, even though technically are committing a crime, cannot be simply taken out of the country because such behaviour contradicts the US values, while unknown, possibly dangerous foreigners will not be allowed into the country, even though they have not committed any crimes against the US yet.

Republicans use this metaphor mainly when regarding two issues. Firstly, the illegal immigrants and refugees like Democrats do and secondly, in 2020 debates, when speaking about the Covid-19 crisis. Even though both parties use the same metaphor when debating the topic of illegal immigration, the context reveals different attitudes towards the issue, for example:

(63) (...) *we are letting people **into this country** that are going to cause problems and crime like you've never seen.* (Trump_2)

(64) *She wants open borders. People are going **to pour into our country**. People are going to come in from Syria.* (Trump_3)

(65) *I mean, Donald Trump has called for extreme vetting for people coming **into this country** so that we don't bring people (...) who are hostile to the American way of life.* (Pence_1)

According to the Republicans, people who are coming into the US are the biggest threat which America has faced in history. Letting unfamiliar people in, economic immigrants or war refugees, is dangerous to the US as they might cause damage to it (63). Using the metaphor of water pouring into the container, when water accounts for immigrants and container for the US (64), Trump creates an image of an uncontrollable situation such as a

flood, which will cause damage to everything that is in its way: immigrants and refugees filling up the country and threatening *the American way of life*. Such fear instilling image is being subdued by a solution brought by Trump, the extreme vetting for everyone coming into the country (65). The process of vetting would play a role of a barrier that would stop dangerous people from flooding the US. In example 78, pronoun *she* refers to Democrat Hillary Clinton, who with the help of the strategy of negative other presentation, is portrayed as opening the container borders and letting it to be flooded while Republican Trump is the one who holds the container unbreached and saves the American way of life from the natural disaster of flood which is impossible to control.

The metaphor AMERICA IS A CONTAINER is widely used by both parties in regard to the Covid-19 crisis. Republicans use the metaphor *close the country* putting forward the negative Democrats presentation and *open the country* when presenting themselves positively, e. g.:

(66) *We have to **open our country**. We're not going to have a country. You can't do this. We can't keep this country closed. (...) And he wants to close down.* (Trump_5)

The opening of the container lid stands for letting the country continue its bustling life, letting it breath and thrive and Trump is being portrayed as a life savior who wants to set the US free, while Biden is said to have an intention of keeping the container closed, of keeping the US closed, in which case it will become stagnant and even disappear completely (66). Democrats and their strategy of dealing with Covid-19 is said to cause bigger damage than the virus itself.

Another significant object metaphor is found in only Republican corpus. One of the most significant metaphorical expression that is realizing the conceptual metaphor AMERICA IS AN OBJECT is *MAKE AMERICA GREAT AGAIN*. An impactful slogan created by Trump for his campaign not only carries hidden political and social messages, but it is also metaphorical, as the most concrete meaning of an adjective *great* is “large in amount, size, or degree“ (COD), which is used to describe the US. However, as the size of the country has not changed for it to require going back to its previous state, it becomes clear that the adjective *great* is used metaphorically, making the slogan metaphorical. As adjective *great* can be used for describing both objects and live beings, analysis of the verb *make* does not signal a personification. Following the basic meaning of *to make*, which is “to produce something, often using a particular substance or material” (COD), it signals that the slogan creates metaphor AMERICA IS AN OBJECT.

Firstly, the slogan also serves as the other negative presentation tool as *again* refers to the US being great in the past but having lost all of its greatness during the eight year long presidency of Barack Obama, a Democrats' representative. Numerous examples of Trump and Pence using this metaphor, paints a vivid picture of what *being great* means for the Republicans, e. g.:

(67) *My whole concept was to **make America great again**. When I watch the deals being made, (...) when I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, (...) we've made them a strong country from really a very weak country just three years ago. (Trump_2)*

(68) *We're going to **make America great**. We have a depleted military. It has to be helped, has to be fixed. (Trump_3)*

(69) *I want to **make America great again**. We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We're losing our jobs. People are pouring into our country. (Trump_1)*

(70) *They want to see us supporting our military, rebuilding our military, commanding the respect of the world, and they want to see the American economy off to the races again. They want to see an American comeback. (...) When you hear him say he wants to **make America great again**, when we do that, I truly do believe the American people are going to be standing taller. (Pence_1)*

Taking on a different approach to the positive attitude towards alliances from the Democrats, Trump brings in the idea of pulling out of the deals that are not beneficial for the US (67). The US is made great if Americans do not negotiate with terrorist countries and do not lift the sanctions placed on them if they do not hold onto their end of a deal. According to Trump, Iran is still proceeding with its nuclear trials and thus the US leaders must reinforce their authority by stepping out of the deal and bringing the sanctions back on Iran. He talks about stepping away from the deal in which way leaving behind everyone who had signed the deal: the EU, Russia and China. America can be made great only if the politicians of the country do not rely on the help of other countries and make decisions based of self interests.

Military strength is also a way to ensure America's greatness (68). Physical strength of American forces can be considered to be *the substance* out of which *great America* is being made. The army, whose budget was cut by the Democrats, is broken and in need of fixing and funding. America was made weak without its defenders thus it became weak in the context of the world and other countries. Respect from others comes only because of strong military forces (70). Should politicians revive military the US will be made great and Americans will be able to stand tall, the metaphor BEING GREAT IS BEING UPRIGHT brings in Lakoff's metaphor allocated to the conservative parties (in this case, the Republican Party): BEING GOOD IS BEING UPRIGHT. Even though the metaphor GOOD IS UP or BAD IS DOWN are fairly common across various discourses, the fact that Democrats did not employ this metaphor when

creating the image of America leads to an assumption, that Lakoff's (1996) allocation of this metaphor to the conservative discourse seems to be partially substantiated.

Illegal immigration is another threat to making America great (69), since because of immigration the US as a nation is in danger and American jobs are being taken by immigrants. Strict laws and severe actions need to be taken in order to restore American integrity; the US leaders must not allow illegal immigrants into the country, as Republicans portray them as criminals and a danger to the society.

The analysis of this metaphorical slogan reveals Republicans' ideas on what policies regarding various issues would make America great again. As leaders of the US Republicans would isolate the US from other countries, strengthen the US military forces and fight illegal immigration which is causing damage to the country. These measures are steps which let Republicans make America great again.

4.2.4. Other metaphors

A few other conceptual metaphors contributing to the image of the US are found. Metaphors such as AMERICA IS A VEHICLE/MACHINE or AMERICA IS A PLANT are not unusual and are found frequently across the discourses as their source domains, vehicle and plant are close to human cognitive perception. Since these metaphors are not limited to the political discourse, it is not these metaphors that disclose the attitudes and strategies of politicians but rather the context in which they are used do. Due to such low frequency of this type of metaphors a fully consistent image of a vehicle or a plant which would reflect the US cannot be constructed but general tendencies of both parties' ideologies and strategies can be observed.

Metaphor AMERICA IS A VEHICLE/MACHINE

In a few metaphorical expressions realising the metaphor AMERICA IS A VEHICLE/MACHINE, Democrats portray the US as a watercraft or aircraft, as usually this type of vehicle requires a set course. Republicans refer to the US as a more complicated machine which requires to be operated as *to run* has a basic meaning of *to operate*.

(71) *We have it within our power in these next 27 days to make the decision about what will be the **course of our country** for the next four years.* (Harris)

(72) *But if he ever got **to run this country** and they ran it the way he would want to run it, (...) you would see problems like you've never seen before.* (Trump_4)

Analyzing the implications made by Harris, the US is a vehicle, which is being driven by the voters and the presidential elections is a tool that makes the country change its course one way or the other (71). According to Harris, if the people vote for Trump, a Republican candidate, the course of the country will be set farther from the principles of democracy, as she is blaming Trump for the suppression of voter registration. Meanwhile, Harris poses Democratic candidate Biden as a protector of democracy by calling out everyone to vote.

The Republican Trump refers to the US as a machine which is being operated by politicians and should the Democrats take control of it, they would cause many serious problems (72). From a wider context of this metaphor, Trump implies that Democrats would create housing, economic and social problems.

Metaphor AMERICA IS A PLANT

As the framework of nature or more specifically plants is familiar to humans it becomes another probable source domain for a more abstract target domain which in this case is the US and the processes that happen within it. During the process of mapping, politicians from both parties use verbs from the framework of plants *to thrive* and *to grow* in order to give vivid explanations on what is happening in the country. This type of metaphors is rarely found, but they still reveal the attitude of the speakers.

(73) *Well, I think when the middle class thrives, **America thrives**. And so my plan is based on **growing the economy**, giving middle-class families many more opportunities.* (Clinton_3)

(74) *It is—our **country has the slowest growth** and jobs are a disaster.* (Trump_2)

Democratic candidate Clinton used both verbs *to thrive* and *to grow* (73) when speaking about the US and its economy. In order for the US to be successful or to thrive, America's middle class families must be successful. Clinton's plan for thriving America is based on assisting middle-class families which is in compliance with Lakoff's Nurturant Parent model. As this model is mostly focused on "growth stimulated through nurturance" (Cienki 2005: 3), Clinton's ideas on assisting families in order for the US to thrive and grow align with the NP model.

Trump uses noun *growth* when metaphorically describing the US economy (74), which was recovering from the 2008 economic crisis. Country's economy is a plant and its growth was slowed down due to the Democratic administration's inability to properly take care of the

plant. Focusing on the negative other presentation Trump criticizes Democrats but through this metaphor he does not reveal his party's plans or values.

5. Conclusions

The analysis revealed that metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON was used most frequently and constituted the most when constructing the image of the US by both parties. 80 percent of all metaphors produced by Democrats and 45 percent of all metaphors produced by Republicans were AMERICA IS A PERSON. Republicans showed a tendency to much more frequently use object metaphors in comparison to the Democrats (56 vs. 7). The main purpose of most metaphors was either negative other presentation or positive-self presentation, which is not surprising, considering the fact that all political discourse produced by politicians themselves is based on this principle.

Democrats employed metaphor AMERICA IS A PERSON to create an image of America as a person who is good, trustworthy, maintains peaceful relationships with others, socially responsible, emphatic, tolerant and truthful to oneself. In regards to the negative other (in this case Republican) presentation, Republican politicians are being portrayed as disrespectful towards minorities and women, inciting violence and distance among communities, thus not capable of representing America. When employing positive self-representation ideas, Democrats put themselves in a role of the US defenders from various threats: enemies, Covid-19 and big corporations, while Republicans are considered to be harmful to the country if given a possibility to make decisions regarding the US. Another human-like feature assigned to America is an ability to be in a relationship. According to metaphors used by Democrats, when in a relationship with Republicans, the US is being hurt, mistreated and lied to and when in a relationship with the Democrats, the US is getting the support it needs to recover.

Republicans with the help of AMERICA IS A PERSON metaphors construct a different image of the US: America must be physically strong, reserved, focus on its self-interests, closed from others. Being also concerned with America's safety, Republicans are determined to defend it from illegal immigrants and hostile countries, often with force. When using negative other (in this case Democrats) presentation, Republicans say that Democrats caused harm and injuries to America and in result America is suffering and dying.

Regarding America's relationship with other countries, both parties concentrate on two countries: China and Russia. In metaphors regarding the US relationship with China, politicians from both parties consider the US as being a higher authority, who is physically stronger. However, implications regarding Russia differ: Democrats admit that Russia can cause harm to the US and is untruthful, while Republicans consider Russia as an ally of the US.

Object metaphors further confirm the image of the US constructed by the previous person metaphors: according to Democrats social responsibility and inclusiveness is important while Republicans advocate for isolation and separation from others.

After the analysis some differences in the use of metaphors not only between parties but also between different periods of time in the same party were found. Republicans changed their portrayal of the relationship between the US and Russia, as in 2016 debates Russia was considered to be an ally and a friend, while in 2020, after it was made clear that Russia committed a crime against the US, Russia became dangerous criminal. Democrats did not display significant differences between years in metaphors usage; however, Clinton used some specific metaphors which other three Democratic representatives did not put forward. This could lead to a conclusion that metaphors used by politicians are not only party policy specific but also person specific.

Although not frequently, some instances validating Lakoff's models of Nurturant Parent and Strict Father were found. Democrats used metaphors MORALITY IS EMPATHY and MORALITY IS NURTURANCE. This revealed that among Democratic values are social responsibility and empathy which correspond with values assigned to the liberals by Lakoff. Republicans used metaphors BEING GOOD IS BEING UPWARDS, MORALITY IS STRENGTH, BEING BAD IS BEING LOW, which belong to the Strict Father model and are assigned to conservatives. However, as only a few metaphors from both the NP and SF models were used by respective parties, it can be concluded that even though valid, Lakoff's models are not significantly effective.

Based on the statistical data of metaphor usage, a hypothesis was raised whether Republicans have a tendency to more frequently use object metaphors in comparison to the Democrats, which could be a question for further research. Furthermore, differences in the usage of metaphors between different speakers from the same party could be researched and the reasons behind these differences could be sought to understand.

6. References

- Anthony, Laurence. 2019. AntConc (Version 3.5.8) [Computer Software]. Tokyo, Japan: Waseda University. Available from <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/> (accessed 15 November 2020).
- Aristotle. *Poetics*. English text: Butcher, Samuel H. 1972. *Gutenberg Ebook of Poetics, by Aristotle*.
<https://www.amherst.edu/system/files/media/1812/The%252520Poetics%252520of%252520Aristotle%252520C%252520by%252520Aristotle.pdf> (accessed 19 March 2021).
- Aristotle., Roberts, Rhys W., Bywater, Ingram, & Solmsen, Friedrich. 1954. *Rhetoric*. [1st Modern Library ed.] New York: Modern Library.
- Cambridge Online Dictionary (COD). <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/> (accessed 24 April 2021).
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2005. *Politicians and Rhetoric: The Persuasive Power of Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2006. Britain as a Container: Immigration Metaphors in the 2005 Election Campaign. *Discourse & Society* 17 (5): 563-581.
- Charteris-Black, Jonathan. 2013. *Analysing Political Speeches: Rhetoric, Discourse and Metaphor*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chilton, Paul. 2004. *Analysing political discourse: Theory and practice*. London: Routledge.
- Chilton, Paul & Lakoff, George. 1995. Foreign Policy by Metaphor. In: Schäffner, Christina & Wenden, Anita L. (eds.) *Language and Peace*. Aldershot: Dartmouth: 37-60.
- Cibulskienė, Jurga. 2005. Konceptualioji kelio metafora Lietuvos rinkimų diskurse. *Kalbotyra*, LIV(1): 51–64.
- Cibulskienė, Jurga. 2012. The development of the journey metaphor in political discourse. *Metaphor and the Social World*, 2 (2): 131–153.
- Cienki, Alan. 2005. Researching Conceptual Metaphors that (may) Underlie Political Discourse. *ECPR Workshop on Metaphor in Political Science*, Grenada, Spain: 1-18.
<http://ecpr.eu/Filestore/PaperProposal/60476c8f-960f-40d2-9194-c342a40cf7c6.pdf> (accessed 17 January 2021).
- Díez-Prados, Mercedes. 2016. The use of metaphor and evaluation as discourse strategies in pre-electoral debates: Just about winning votes. In *Exploring Discourse Strategies in Social*

and Cognitive Interaction: 217-246. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Etymological dictionary (ED). <https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=debate> (accessed 16 February 2021).

Kövecses, Zoltán. 1990. The Concept of Emotion: The Container Metaphor. *Emotion Concepts*. Springer, New York, NY, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-3312-1_9 (accessed 23 March 2021).

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2002. *Metaphor. A Practical Introduction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2008. Conceptual metaphor theory: Some criticisms and alternative proposals. *Annual Review of Cognitive Linguistics*. 6. 168-184. <https://doi.org/10.1075/arcl.6.08kov>.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2010. *Metaphor: A Practical Introduction*. 2nd edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Kövecses, Zoltán. 2015. *Where Metaphors Come From: Reconsidering Context in Metaphor*, Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.

Lakoff, George & Johnson, Mark. 1980. *Metaphors we Live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 1991. Metaphor and war: the metaphor system used to justify war in the Gulf. *Peace Research*, 23 (2/3): 25–32.

Lakoff, George. 1996. *Moral Politics: What Conservatives Know That Liberals Don't*. Chicago & London: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2001. *Metaphors of Terror*. UC Berkeley. <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8zb6m59x> (accessed 3 February 2021).

Lakoff, George. 2002. *Moral politics*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Lakoff, George. 2004. *Don't Think of an Elephant. Know your Values and Frame the Debate*. Chelsea Green: White River Junction.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary (MWOD). <https://www.merriam-webster.com/> (accessed 24 April 2021).

Murphy, Gregory L. (1996). On metaphoric representation. *Cognition* 60: 173–204.

- Musolff, Andreas. 2004. *Metaphor and Political Discourse. Analogical Reasoning in Debates about Europe*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2012. The study of metaphor as part of critical discourse analysis. *Critical Discourse Studies* 9 (3): 301-310.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2014. Metaphorical parasites and “parasitic” metaphors: Semantic exchanges between political and scientific vocabularies. *Journal of Language and Politics* 13 (2): 218–233.
- Musolff, Andreas. 2018. Nations as Persons. *Collective Identities in Conflict*. John Benjamins Publishing Company. https://www.academia.edu/37162279/Nations_as_Persons_Collective_Identities_in_Conflict (accessed 6 March 2021).
- Myers, Greg. 2008. Analysing Interaction in Broadcast Debates. *Qualitative Discourse Analysis in the Social Sciences*, ed. By Ruth Wodak and Michal Krzyzanowski, 121-144. Houndmills, Basingstoke; New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Neagu, Maria-Ionela. 2013. *Decoding Political Discourse: Conceptual Metaphors and Argumentation*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary (OALD). <https://www.oxfordlearnersdictionaries.com/> (accessed 19 April 2021)
- Pragglejaz group. 2007. MIP: a method for identifying metaphorically used words in discourse. *Metaphor and Symbol* 22 (1). 1–39.
- Scheithauer, Rut. 2007. Metaphor in election night television coverage in Britain, the United States and Germany. In Anita Fetzer & Gerda Eva Lauerbach (eds.), *Political discourse in the media*, 75–106. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Semino, Elena. 2008. *Metaphors in Discourse*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Semino, Elena & Koller, Veronika. 2009. Metaphor, politics and gender: A case study from Italy, in Ahrens, K. (ed.) *Politics, Gender and Conceptual Metaphors*. Basingstoke: Palgrave. 36–61.
- Semino, Elena & Zsófia, Demjén. (eds.) 2017. *The Routledge handbook of Metaphor and Language*. Routledge.

- Shen, Yeshayahu & Porat, Roy. 2017. *Metaphorical Directionality: The Role of Language*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108182324.005> (accessed 19 February 2021)
- Steen, Gerard J., Dorst, Aletta G., Herrmann, Berenike J., Kaal, Anna A., Krennmayr, Tina, & Pasma, Trijntje. 2010. *A method for linguistic metaphor identification: from MIP to MIPVU*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Stefanowitsch, Anatol. 2004. Happiness in English and German: a metaphorical pattern analysis. In Michel Achard & Susanne Kemmer (eds.), *Language, Culture, and Mind*. 137–149. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Šeškauskienė, Inesa., Ostanina-Olszewska, Julia. 2015. Conceptualizing events in Ukraine: a cross-cultural analysis of online news reports. *Lodz Papers in Pragmatics*. 11.2: 247-270.
- Thibodeau, Paul H., & Boroditsky, Lera. 2011. Metaphors we think with: The role of metaphor in reasoning. *PLoS ONE*, 6(2): 1-11. <http://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0016782>. (accessed 3 March 2021)
- Ungerer, Friedrich, & Schmid, Hans-Jörg. 1996. *An Introduction to Cognitive Linguistics*. New York: Longman.
- Urbonaitė, Justina, & Šeškauskienė, Inesa. 2007. HEALTH metaphor in political and economic discourse: a cross-linguistic analysis. *Kalbų studijos / Studies about Languages*. 11: 68–73.
- van Dijk, Teun A. 1997. What is political discourse analysis? In Blommaert, Jan, & Bulcaen, Chris (eds.), *Political linguistics*, 11–52. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Vervaeke, John, & Kennedy, John M. 1996. Metaphor in language and thought: Falsification and multiple meanings. *Metaphor and Symbol* 11: 273–284.
- Zhong, Chen-Bo, & Leonardelli, Geoffrey J. 2008. Cold and Lonely: Does Social Exclusion Literally Feel Cold? In *Psychological Science*. 19 (9): 838-842. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02165.x> (accessed 15 January 2021).

7. Data sources

Statistics:

New York Times (NYT). <https://www.nytimes.com/2020/10/08/business/media/pence-harris-debate-is-no-2-in-vice-presidential-ratings-with-58-million-tv-viewers.html> (accessed 16 January 2021).

Pew Research Center (PRC). <https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/08/28/5-facts-about-presidential-and-vice-presidential-debates/> (accessed 16 January 2021).

Transcripts:

Commission on Presidential Debates (CPD). <https://www.debates.org/voter-education/debate-transcripts/> (accessed 20 November 2020).

ABC News (ABC). <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/read-full-transcript-joe-bidens-abc-news-town/story?id=73643517>; <https://abcnews.go.com/Politics/trumps-abc-news-town-hall-full-transcript/story?id=73035489> (accessed 2 December 2020).

7. Summary in Lithuanian

Šiame magistro darbe yra analizuojamos metaforos rastos 2016 ir 2020 metų Jungtinių Amerikos Valstijų priešrinkiminiuose, kandidatų į prezidentus ir vice prezidentus, debatuose. Debatuose dalyvavusių, dviejų pagrindinių JAV politinių partijų, demokratų ir respublikonų, atstovų panaudotos metaforos buvo analizuojamos, bandant sukurti du skirtingus metaforinius JAV paveikslus.

Šio darbo tikslai buvo surasti politikų naudojamas metaforas, kurios atskleistų dviejų skirtingų partijų atstovaujamas vertybes ir politines strategijas ir vėliau jas analizuojant ieškoti paralelių su George'o Lakoff'o idėjomis apie tam tikras metaforas, kurias dažniausiai naudoja liberalai (šiuo tyrime liberalams atstovauja JAV demokratų partija) ir konservatoriai (jiems atstovauja JAV respublikonų partija). Buvo tikrinama ar G. Lakoff'o liberalams sukurtas globojančių tėvų ir konservatoriams sukurtas griežto tėvo modeliai atitinka politikų debatuose naudojamas metaforas. Darbas grindžiamas konceptualiosios metaforos teorija (Lakoff & Johnson 1980), bei globojančių tėvų ir griežto tėvo metaforiniais modeliais (Lakoff 1996).

Debatų leksikos ypatumai pirmiausiai buvo nustatyti naudojant AntConc kompiuterinę programą (versija 3.5.8; Anthony 2019). Vėliau buvo pasirinkti trys raktiniai žodžiai (šalis, Amerika ir valstijos), šalia kurių buvo ieškoma metaforų, kurios padėtų atskleisti kokį metaforinį JAV įvaizdį kuria politikai iš skirtingų partijų. Metaforų nustatymui buvo pasitelkta A. Stefanowitsch sukurta metaforinių modelių metodologija (2004) ir Pragglejaz grupės sukurta metaforų identifikavimo procedūra (2007).

Analizė atskleidė, kad dažniausia metaforų funkcija buvo teigiamas savęs pateikimas ir neigiamas kito vaizdavimas. Dažniausiai abiejų partijų politikai naudojo AMERIKA YRA ASMUO metaforas, tačiau skirtingų partijų kuriami JAV metaforiniai paveikslai turėjo skirtingus bruožus ir savybes. Demokratai Ameriką apibūdino kaip žmogų, kuris yra geras, patikimas, taikus, socialiai atsakingas, jautrus, tolerantiškas ir tvirtai laikosi savo įsitikinimų. Demokratai metaforų pagalba save pateikė kaip Amerikos gynėjus nuo įvairių grėsmių, o respublikonai buvo vaizduojami kaip keliantys grėsmę šalies saugumui ir ekonomikai. Respublikonai vaizdavo JAV kaip žmogų, kuris yra fiziškai stiprus, rimtas, rūpinasi savo gerove, nepalaikantis ryšių su kitais. Respublikonai taip pat pateikė save kaip šalies gynėjus, o demokratų kaltino, kad jie sukėlė Amerikai žalos ir šalis dėl to kenčia ir miršta. Kita didelė naudotų metaforų grupė buvo AMERIKA YRA OBJEKTAS. Šias objekto metaforas žymiai dažniau naudojo respublikonų partijos atstovai ir toliau kurdami panašų JAV įvaizdį, kurį kūrė ir naudodami žmogaus metaforas.

G. Lakoff'o globojančių tėvų ir griežto tėvo modeliai ir jiems priskirtos metaforos dalinai pasitvirtino, nes tarp demokratų naudotų metaforų buvo metaforų priskirtų globojančių tėvų modeliui, o tarp respublikonų naudotų metaforų buvo metaforų priskirtų griežto tėvo modeliui. Tačiau kadangi buvo rasti tik keli tokių metaforų naudojimo atvejai, galima daryti išvadą, kad nors ir pasitvirtinę, Lakoff'o modeliai nėra efektyvūs bandant nuspėti, kokias metaforas naudos partijų atstovai.

Appendix 1. Transcripts of the debates separated by speaker

Trump_1

September 26th, 2016

Thank you, Lester. Our jobs are fleeing the country. They're going to Mexico. They're going to many other countries. You look at what China is doing to our country in terms of making our product. They're devaluing their currency, and there's nobody in our government to fight them. And we have a very good fight. And we have a winning fight. Because they're using our country as a piggy bank to rebuild China, and many other countries are doing the same thing.

So we're losing our good jobs, so many of them. When you look at what's happening in Mexico, a friend of mine who builds plants said it's the eighth wonder of the world. They're building some of the biggest plants anywhere in the world, some of the most sophisticated, some of the best plants. With the United States, as he said, not so much.

So Ford is leaving. You see that, their small car division leaving. Thousands of jobs leaving Michigan, leaving Ohio. They're all leaving. And we can't allow it to happen anymore. As far as child care is concerned and so many other things, I think Hillary and I agree on that. We probably disagree a little bit as to numbers and amounts and what we're going to do, but perhaps we'll be talking about that later.

But we have to stop our jobs from being stolen from us. We have to stop our companies from leaving the United States and, with it, firing all of their people. All you have to do is take a look at Carrier air conditioning in Indianapolis. They left—fired 1,400 people. They're going to Mexico. So many hundreds and hundreds of companies are doing this.

We cannot let it happen. Under my plan, I'll be reducing taxes tremendously, from 35 percent to 15 percent for companies, small and big businesses. That's going to be a job creator like we haven't seen since Ronald Reagan. It's going to be a beautiful thing to watch.

Companies will come. They will build. They will expand. New companies will start. And I look very, very much forward to doing it. We have to renegotiate our trade deals, and we have to stop these countries from stealing our companies and our jobs.

Well, for one thing—and before we start on that—my father gave me a very small loan in 1975, and I built it into a company that's worth many, many billions of dollars, with some of the greatest assets in the world, and I say that only because that's the kind of thinking that our country needs.

Our country's in deep trouble. We don't know what we're doing when it comes to devaluations and all of these countries all over the world, especially China. They're the best, the best ever at it. What they're doing to us is a very, very sad thing.

So we have to do that. We have to renegotiate our trade deals. And, Lester, they're taking our jobs, they're giving incentives, they're doing things that, frankly, we don't do.

Let me give you the example of Mexico. They have a VAT tax. We're on a different system. When we sell into Mexico, there's a tax. When they sell in—automatic, 16 percent, approximately. When they sell into us, there's no tax. It's a defective agreement. It's been defective for a long time, many years, but the politicians haven't done anything about it.

Now, in all fairness to Secretary Clinton—yes, is that OK? Good. I want you to be very happy. It's very important to me.

But in all fairness to Secretary Clinton, when she started talking about this, it was really very recently. She's been doing this for 30 years. And why hasn't she made the agreements better? The NAFTA agreement is defective. Just because of the tax and many other reasons, but just because of the fact...

Secretary Clinton and others, politicians, should have been doing this for years, not right now, because of the fact that we've created a movement. They should have been doing this for years. What's happened to our jobs and our country and our economy generally is—look, we owe \$20 trillion. We cannot do it any longer, Lester.

Well, the first thing you do is don't let the jobs leave. The companies are leaving. I could name, I mean, there are thousands of them. They're leaving, and they're leaving in bigger numbers than ever.

And what you do is you say, fine, you want to go to Mexico or some other country, good luck. We wish you a lot of luck. But if you think you're going to make your air conditioners or your cars or your cookies or whatever you make and bring them into our country without a tax, you're wrong.

And once you say you're going to have to tax them coming in, and our politicians never do this, because they have special interests and the special interests want those companies to leave, because in many cases, they own the companies. So what I'm saying is, we can stop them from leaving. We have to stop them from leaving. And that's a big, big factor.

That's called business, by the way.

I did not. I did not. I do not say that.

I do not say that.

She talks about solar panels. We invested in a solar company, our country. That was a disaster. They lost plenty of money on that one.

Now, look, I'm a great believer in all forms of energy, but we're putting a lot of people out of work. Our energy policies are a disaster. Our country is losing so much in terms of energy, in terms of paying off our debt. You can't do what you're looking to do with \$20 trillion in debt.

The Obama administration, from the time they've come in, is over 230 years' worth of debt, and he's topped it. He's doubled it in a course of almost eight years, seven-and-a-half years, to be semi- exact.

So I will tell you this. We have to do a much better job at keeping our jobs. And we have to do a much better job at giving companies incentives to build new companies or to expand, because they're not doing it.

And all you have to do is look at Michigan and look at Ohio and look at all of these places where so many of their jobs and their companies are just leaving, they're gone.

And, Hillary, I'd just ask you this. You've been doing this for 30 years. Why are you just thinking about these solutions right now? For 30 years, you've been doing it, and now you're just starting to think of solutions.

I will bring—excuse me. I will bring back jobs. You can't bring back jobs.

Yeah, for 30 years.

Well, he approved NAFTA...

He approved NAFTA, which is the single worst trade deal ever approved in this country.

But you haven't done it in 30 years or 26 years or any number you want to...

You haven't done it. You haven't done it.

Excuse me.

Your husband signed NAFTA, which was one of the worst things that ever happened to the manufacturing industry.

You go to New England, you go to Ohio, Pennsylvania, you go anywhere you want, Secretary Clinton, and you will see devastation where manufacture is down 30, 40, sometimes 50 percent. NAFTA is the worst trade deal maybe ever signed anywhere, but certainly ever signed in this country.

And now you want to approve Trans-Pacific Partnership. You were totally in favor of it. Then you heard what I was saying, how bad it is, and you said, I can't win that debate. But you know that if you did win, you would approve that, and that will be almost as bad as NAFTA. Nothing will ever top NAFTA.

You called it the gold standard.

You called it the gold standard of trade deals. You said it's the finest deal you've ever seen.

And then you heard what I said about it, and all of a sudden you were against it.

Not.

So is it President Obama's fault?

Is it President Obama's fault?

Secretary, is it President Obama's fault?

Because he's pushing it.

But you have no plan.

Secretary, you have no plan.

That's about all you've...

You are going to approve one of the biggest tax cuts in history. You are going to approve one of the biggest tax increases in history. You are going to drive business out. Your regulations are a disaster, and you're going to increase regulations all over the place.

And by the way, my tax cut is the biggest since Ronald Reagan. I'm very proud of it. It will create tremendous numbers of new jobs. But regulations, you are going to regulate these businesses out of existence.

When I go around—Lester, I tell you this, I've been all over. And when I go around, despite the tax cut, the thing—the things that business as in people like the most is the fact that I'm cutting regulation. You have regulations on top of regulations, and new companies cannot form and old companies are going out of business.

And you want to increase the regulations and make them even worse.

I'm going to cut regulations. I'm going to cut taxes big league, and you're going to raise taxes big league, end of story.

Facts.

And take a look at mine, also, and you'll see.

Well, could I just finish—I think I...

I think I should—you go to her website, and you take a look at her website.

She's going to raise taxes \$1.3 trillion.

And look at her website. You know what? It's no difference than this. She's telling us how to fight ISIS. Just go to her website. She tells you how to fight ISIS on her website. I don't think General Douglas MacArthur would like that too much.

No, no, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do.

See, you're telling the enemy everything you want to do. No wonder you've been fighting—no wonder you've been fighting ISIS your entire adult life.

Well, I'm really calling for major jobs, because the wealthy are going to create tremendous jobs. They're going to expand their companies. They're going to do a tremendous job.

I'm getting rid of the carried interest provision. And if you really look, it's not a tax—it's really not a great thing for the wealthy. It's a great thing for the middle class. It's a great thing for companies to expand.

And when these people are going to put billions and billions of dollars into companies, and when they're going to bring \$2.5 trillion back from overseas, where they can't bring the money back, because politicians like Secretary Clinton won't allow them to bring the money back, because the taxes are so onerous, and the bureaucratic red tape, so what—is so bad.

So what they're doing is they're leaving our country, and they're, believe it or not, leaving because taxes are too high and because some of them have lots of money outside of our country. And instead of bringing it back and putting the money to work, because they can't work out a deal to—and everybody agrees it should be brought back.

Instead of that, they're leaving our country to get their money, because they can't bring their money back into our country, because of bureaucratic red tape, because they can't get together. Because we have—we have a president that can't sit them around a table and get them to approve something.

And here's the thing. Republicans and Democrats agree that this should be done, \$2.5 trillion. I happen to think it's double that. It's probably \$5 trillion that we can't bring into our country, Lester. And with a little leadership, you'd get it in here very quickly, and it could be put to use on the inner cities and lots of other things, and it would be beautiful.

But we have no leadership. And honestly, that starts with Secretary Clinton.

Why not?

There's nothing crazy about not letting our companies bring their money back into their country.

Yes.

Then you didn't read it.

Who gave it that name? The first I've—who gave it that name?

How much? How much for my family?

Lester, how much?

Typical politician. All talk, no action. Sounds good, doesn't work. Never going to happen. Our country is suffering because people like Secretary Clinton have made such bad decisions in terms of our jobs and in terms of what's going on.

Now, look, we have the worst revival of an economy since the Great Depression. And believe me: We're in a bubble right now. And the only thing that looks good is the stock market, but if you raise interest rates even a little bit, that's going to come crashing down.

We are in a big, fat, ugly bubble. And we better be awfully careful. And we have a Fed that's doing political things. This Janet Yellen of the Fed. The Fed is doing political—by keeping the interest rates at this level. And believe me: The day Obama goes off, and he leaves, and goes out to the golf course for the rest of his life to play golf, when they raise interest rates, you're going to see some very bad things happen, because the Fed is not doing their job. The Fed is being more political than Secretary Clinton.

I don't mind releasing—I'm under a routine audit. And it'll be released. And—as soon as the audit's finished, it will be released.

But you will learn more about Donald Trump by going down to the federal elections, where I filed a 104-page essentially financial statement of sorts, the forms that they have. It shows income—in fact, the income—I just looked today—the income is filed at \$694 million for this past year, \$694 million. If you would have told me I was going to make that 15 or 20 years ago, I would have been very surprised.

But that's the kind of thinking that our country needs. When we have a country that's doing so badly, that's being ripped off by every single country in the world, it's the kind of thinking that our country needs, because everybody—Lester, we have a trade deficit with all of the countries that we do business with, of almost \$800 billion a year. You know what that is? That means, who's negotiating these trade deals?

We have people that are political hacks negotiating our trade deals.

Excuse me.

Well, I told you, I will release them as soon as the audit. Look, I've been under audit almost for 15 years. I know a lot of wealthy people that have never been audited. I said, do you get audited? I get audited almost every year. And in a way, I should be complaining. I'm not even complaining. I don't mind it. It's almost become a way of life. I get audited by the IRS. But other people don't.

I will say this. We have a situation in this country that has to be taken care of. I will release my tax returns—against my lawyer's wishes—when she releases her 33,000 e-mails that have been deleted. As soon as she releases them, I will release. [applause]

I will release my tax returns. And that's against—my lawyers, they say, "Don't do it." I will tell you this. No—in fact, watching shows, they're reading the papers. Almost every lawyer says, you don't release your returns until the audit's complete. When the audit's complete, I'll do it. But I would go against them if she releases her e-mails.

It's not negotiable, no. Let her release the e-mails. Why did she delete 33,000...

That makes me smart.

That's for sure.

That was more than a mistake. That was done purposely. OK? That was not a mistake. That was done purposely. When you have your staff taking the Fifth Amendment, taking the Fifth so they're not prosecuted, when you have the man that set up the illegal server taking the Fifth, I think it's disgraceful. And believe me, this country thinks it's—really thinks it's disgraceful, also.

As far as my tax returns, you don't learn that much from tax returns. That I can tell you. You learn a lot from financial disclosure. And you should go down and take a look at that.

The other thing, I'm extremely underleveraged. The report that said \$650—which, by the way, a lot of friends of mine that know my business say, boy, that's really not a lot of money. It's not a lot of money relative to what I had.

The buildings that were in question, they said in the same report, which was—actually, it wasn't even a bad story, to be honest with you, but the buildings are worth \$3.9 billion. And the \$650 isn't even on that. But it's not \$650. It's much less than that.

But I could give you a list of banks, I would—if that would help you, I would give you a list of banks. These are very fine institutions, very fine banks. I could do that very quickly.

I am very underleveraged. I have a great company. I have a tremendous income. And the reason I say that is not in a braggadocious way. It's because it's about time that this country had somebody running it that has an idea about money.

When we have \$20 trillion in debt, and our country's a mess, you know, it's one thing to have \$20 trillion in debt and our roads are good and our bridges are good and everything's in great shape, our airports. Our airports are like from a third world country.

You land at LaGuardia, you land at Kennedy, you land at LAX, you land at Newark, and you come in from Dubai and Qatar and you see these incredible—you come in from China, you see these incredible airports, and you land—we've become a third world country.

So the worst of all things has happened. We owe \$20 trillion, and we're a mess. We haven't even started. And we've spent \$6 trillion in the Middle East, according to a report that I just saw. Whether it's 6 or 5, but it looks like it's 6, \$6 trillion in the Middle East, we could have rebuilt our country twice.

And it's really a shame. And it's politicians like Secretary Clinton that have caused this problem. Our country has tremendous problems. We're a debtor nation. We're a serious debtor nation. And we have a country that needs new roads, new tunnels, new bridges, new airports, new schools, new hospitals. And we don't have the money, because it's been squandered on so many of your ideas.

It would be squandered, too, believe me.

Maybe he didn't do a good job and I was unsatisfied with his work...

Which our country should do, too.

Wrong. Wrong.

So, yeah, I think—I do think it's time. Look, it's all words, it's all sound bites. I built an unbelievable company. Some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, real estate assets anywhere in the world, beyond the United States, in Europe, lots of different places. It's an unbelievable company.

But on occasion, four times, we used certain laws that are there. And when Secretary Clinton talks about people that didn't get paid, first of all, they did get paid a lot, but taken advantage of the laws of the nation.

Now, if you want to change the laws, you've been there a long time, change the laws. But I take advantage of the laws of the nation because I'm running a company. My obligation right now is to do well for myself, my family, my employees, for my companies. And that's what I do.

But what she doesn't say is that tens of thousands of people that are unbelievably happy and that love me. I'll give you an example. We're just opening up on Pennsylvania Avenue right next to the White House, so if I don't get there one way, I'm going to get to Pennsylvania Avenue another.

But we're opening the Old Post Office. Under budget, ahead of schedule, saved tremendous money. I'm a year ahead of schedule. And that's what this country should be doing.

We build roads and they cost two and three and four times what they're supposed to cost. We buy products for our military and they come in at costs that are so far above what they were supposed to be, because we don't have people that know what they're doing.

When we look at the budget, the budget is bad to a large extent because we have people that have no idea as to what to do and how to buy. The Trump International is way under budget and way ahead of schedule. And we should be able to do that for our country.

Well, first of all, Secretary Clinton doesn't want to use a couple of words, and that's law and order. And we need law and order. If we don't have it, we're not going to have a country.

And when I look at what's going on in Charlotte, a city I love, a city where I have investments, when I look at what's going on throughout various parts of our country, whether it's—I mean, I can just keep naming them all day long—we need law and order in our country.

I just got today the, as you know, the endorsement of the Fraternal Order of Police, we just—just came in. We have endorsements from, I think, almost every police group, very—I mean, a large percentage of them in the United States.

We have a situation where we have our inner cities, African- Americans, Hispanics are living in hell because it's so dangerous. You walk down the street, you get shot.

In Chicago, they've had thousands of shootings, thousands since January 1st. Thousands of shootings. And I'm saying, where is this? Is this a war-torn country? What are we doing? And we have to stop the violence. We have to bring back law and order. In a place like Chicago, where thousands of people have been killed, thousands over the last number of years, in fact, almost 4,000 have been killed since Barack Obama became president, over—almost 4,000 people in Chicago have been killed. We have to bring back law and order.

Now, whether or not in a place like Chicago you do stop and frisk, which worked very well, Mayor Giuliani is here, worked very well in New York. It brought the crime rate way down. But you take the gun away from criminals that shouldn't be having it.

We have gangs roaming the street. And in many cases, they're illegally here, illegal immigrants. And they have guns. And they shoot people. And we have to be very strong. And we have to be very vigilant.

We have to be—we have to know what we're doing. Right now, our police, in many cases, are afraid to do anything. We have to protect our inner cities, because African-American communities are being decimated by crime, decimated.

No, you're wrong. It went before a judge, who was a very against-police judge. It was taken away from her. And our mayor, our new mayor, refused to go forward with the case. They would have won an appeal. If you look at it, throughout the country, there are many places where it's allowed.

No, the argument is that we have to take the guns away from these people that have them and that are bad people that shouldn't have them.

These are felons. These are people that are bad people that shouldn't be—when you have 3,000 shootings in Chicago from January 1st, when you have 4,000 people killed in Chicago by guns, from the beginning of the presidency of Barack Obama, his hometown, you have to have stop-and-frisk.

You need more police. You need a better community, you know, relation. You don't have good community relations in Chicago. It's terrible. I have property there. It's terrible what's going on in Chicago.

But when you look—and Chicago's not the only—you go to Ferguson, you go to so many different places. You need better relationships. I agree with Secretary Clinton on this.

You need better relationships between the communities and the police, because in some cases, it's not good.

But you look at Dallas, where the relationships were really studied, the relationships were really a beautiful thing, and then five police officers were killed one night very violently. So there's some bad things going on. Some really bad things.

But we need—Lester, we need law and order. And we need law and order in the inner cities, because the people that are most affected by what's happening are African-American and Hispanic people. And it's very unfair to them what our politicians are allowing to happen.

Ugh.

I'd like to respond to that.

First of all, I agree, and a lot of people even within my own party want to give certain rights to people on watch lists and no-fly lists. I agree with you. When a person is on a watch list or a no-fly list, and I have the endorsement of the NRA, which I'm very proud of. These are very, very good people, and they're protecting the Second Amendment.

But I think we have to look very strongly at no-fly lists and watch lists. And when people are on there, even if they shouldn't be on there, we'll help them, we'll help them legally, we'll help them get off. But I tend to agree with that quite strongly.

I do want to bring up the fact that you were the one that brought up the words super-predator about young black youth. And that's a term that I think was a—it's—it's been horribly met, as you know. I think you've apologized for it. But I think it was a terrible thing to say.

And when it comes to stop-and-frisk, you know, you're talking about taking guns away. Well, I'm talking about taking guns away from gangs and people that use them. And I don't think—I really don't think you disagree with me on this, if you want to know the truth.

I think maybe there's a political reason why you can't say it, but I really don't believe—in New York City, stop-and-frisk, we had 2,200 murders, and stop-and-frisk brought it down to 500 murders. Five hundred murders is a lot of murders. It's hard to believe, 500 is like supposed to be good?

But we went from 2,200 to 500. And it was continued on by Mayor Bloomberg. And it was terminated by current mayor. But stop-and-frisk had a tremendous impact on the safety of New York City. Tremendous beyond belief. So when you say it has no impact, it really did. It had a very, very big impact.

No, you're wrong. You're wrong.

Murders are up. All right. You check it.

I'd like to just respond, if I might.

I'd just like to respond.

I will. Look, the African-American community has been let down by our politicians. They talk good around election time, like right now, and after the election, they said, see ya later, I'll see you in four years. The African-American community—because—look, the community within the inner cities has been so badly treated. They've been abused and used in order to get votes by Democrat politicians, because that's what it is. They've controlled these communities for up to 100 years.

And I will tell you, you look at the inner cities—and I just left Detroit, and I just left Philadelphia, and I just—you know, you've seen me, I've been all over the place. You decided to stay home, and that's OK. But I will tell you, I've been all over. And I've met some of the greatest people I'll ever meet within these communities. And they are very, very upset with what their politicians have told them and what their politicians have done.

I'll tell you very—well, just very simple to say. Sidney Blumenthal works for the campaign and close—very close friend of Secretary Clinton. And her campaign manager, Patti Doyle, went to—during the campaign, her campaign against President Obama, fought very hard. And you can go look it up, and you can check it out. And if you look at CNN this past week, Patti Solis Doyle was on Wolf Blitzer saying that this happened. Blumenthal sent McClatchy, highly respected reporter at McClatchy, to Kenya to find out about it. They were pressing it very hard. She failed to get the birth certificate.

When I got involved, I didn't fail. I got him to give the birth certificate. So I'm satisfied with it. And I'll tell you why I'm satisfied with it.

Because I want to get on to defeating ISIS, because I want to get on to creating jobs, because I want to get on to having a strong border, because I want to get on to things that are very important to me and that are very important to the country.

Yeah.

Well, nobody was pressing it, nobody was caring much about it. I figured you'd ask the question tonight, of course. But nobody was caring much about it. But I was the one that got him to produce the birth certificate. And I think I did a good job.

Secretary Clinton also fought it. I mean, you know—now, everybody in mainstream is going to say, oh, that's not true. Look, it's true. Sidney Blumenthal sent a reporter—you just have to take a look at CNN, the last week, the interview with your former campaign manager. And she was involved. But just like she can't bring back jobs, she can't produce.

Well, it was very—I say nothing. I say nothing, because I was able to get him to produce it. He should have produced it a long time before. I say nothing.

But let me just tell you. When you talk about healing, I think that I've developed very, very good relationships over the last little while with the African-American community. I think you can see that.

And I feel that they really wanted me to come to that conclusion. And I think I did a great job and a great service not only for the country, but even for the president, in getting him to produce his birth certificate.

I would love to respond. First of all, I got to watch in preparing for this some of your debates against Barack Obama. You treated him with terrible disrespect. And I watched the way you talk now about how lovely everything is and how wonderful you are. It doesn't work that way. You were after him, you were trying to—you even sent out or your campaign sent out pictures of him in a certain garb, very famous pictures. I don't think you can deny that.

But just last week, your campaign manager said it was true. So when you tried to act holier than thou, it really doesn't work. It really doesn't.

Now, as far as the lawsuit, yes, when I was very young, I went into my father's company, had a real estate company in Brooklyn and Queens, and we, along with many, many other companies throughout the country—it was a federal lawsuit—were sued. We settled the suit with zero—with no admission of guilt. It was very easy to do. But they sued many people.

I notice you bring that up a lot. And, you know, I also notice the very nasty commercials that you do on me in so many different ways, which I don't do on you. Maybe I'm trying to save the money.

But, frankly, I look—I look at that, and I say, isn't that amazing? Because I settled that lawsuit with no admission of guilt, but that was a lawsuit brought against many real estate firms, and it's just one of those things.

I'll go one step further. In Palm Beach, Florida, tough community, a brilliant community, a wealthy community, probably the wealthiest community there is in the world, I opened a club, and really got great credit for it. No discrimination against African-Americans, against Muslims, against anybody. And it's a tremendously successful club. And I'm so glad I did it. And I have been given great credit for what I did. And I'm very, very proud of it. And that's the way I feel. That is the true way I feel.

I do want to say that I was just endorsed—and more are coming next week—it will be over 200 admirals, many of them here—admirals and generals endorsed me to lead this country. That just happened, and many more are coming. And I'm very proud of it.

In addition, I was just endorsed by ICE. They've never endorsed anybody before on immigration. I was just endorsed by ICE. I was just recently endorsed—16,500 Border Patrol agents.

So when Secretary Clinton talks about this, I mean, I'll take the admirals and I'll take the generals any day over the political hacks that I see that have led our country so brilliantly over the last 10 years with their knowledge. OK? Because look at the mess that we're in. Look at the mess that we're in.

As far as the cyber, I agree to parts of what Secretary Clinton said. We should be better than anybody else, and perhaps we're not. I don't think anybody knows it was Russia that broke into the DNC. She's saying Russia, Russia, Russia, but I don't—maybe it was. I mean, it could be Russia, but it could also be China. It could also be lots of other people. It also could be somebody sitting on their bed that weighs 400 pounds, OK?

You don't know who broke in to DNC.

But what did we learn with DNC? We learned that Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of by your people, by Debbie Wasserman Schultz. Look what happened to her. But Bernie Sanders was taken advantage of. That's what we learned.

Now, whether that was Russia, whether that was China, whether it was another country, we don't know, because the truth is, under President Obama we've lost control of things that we used to have control over.

We came in with the Internet, we came up with the Internet, and I think Secretary Clinton and myself would agree very much, when you look at what ISIS is doing with the Internet, they're beating us at our own game. ISIS.

So we have to get very, very tough on cyber and cyber warfare. It is—it is a huge problem. I have a son. He's 10 years old. He has computers. He is so good with these computers, it's unbelievable. The security aspect of cyber is very, very tough. And maybe it's hardly doable.

But I will say, we are not doing the job we should be doing. But that's true throughout our whole governmental society. We have so many things that we have to do better, Lester, and certainly cyber is one of them.

Well, first I have to say one thing, very important. Secretary Clinton is talking about taking out ISIS. "We will take out ISIS." Well, President Obama and Secretary Clinton created a vacuum the way they got out of Iraq, because they got out—what, they shouldn't have been in, but once they got in, the way they got out was a disaster. And ISIS was formed.

So she talks about taking them out. She's been doing it a long time. She's been trying to take them out for a long time. But they wouldn't have even been formed if they left some troops behind, like 10,000 or maybe something more than that. And then you wouldn't have had them.

Or, as I've been saying for a long time, and I think you'll agree, because I said it to you once, had we taken the oil—and we should have taken the oil—ISIS would not have been able to form either, because the oil was their primary source of income. And now they have the oil all over the place, including the oil—a lot of the oil in Libya, which was another one of her disasters.

Wrong.

Wrong. Wrong.

Well, I have to respond.

The secretary said very strongly about working with—we've been working with them for many years, and we have the greatest mess anyone's ever seen. You look at the Middle East, it's a total mess. Under your direction, to a large extent.

But you look at the Middle East, you started the Iran deal, that's another beauty where you have a country that was ready to fall, I mean, they were doing so badly. They were choking on the sanctions. And now they're going to be actually probably a major power at some point pretty soon, the way they're going.

But when you look at NATO, I was asked on a major show, what do you think of NATO? And you have to understand, I'm a businessperson. I did really well. But I have common sense. And I said, well, I'll tell you. I haven't given lots of thought to NATO. But two things.

Number one, the 28 countries of NATO, many of them aren't paying their fair share. Number two—and that bothers me, because we should be asking—we're defending them, and they should at least be paying us what they're supposed to be paying by treaty and contract.

And, number two, I said, and very strongly, NATO could be obsolete, because—and I was very strong on this, and it was actually covered very accurately in the New York Times, which is unusual for the New York Times, to be honest—but I said, they do not focus on terror. And I was very strong. And I said it numerous times.

And about four months ago, I read on the front page of the Wall Street Journal that NATO is opening up a major terror division. And I think that's great. And I think we should get—because we pay approximately 73 percent of the cost of NATO. It's a lot of money to protect other people. But I'm all for NATO. But I said they have to focus on terror, also.

And they're going to do that. And that was—believe me—I'm sure I'm not going to get credit for it—but that was largely because of what I was saying and my criticism of NATO.

I think we have to get NATO to go into the Middle East with us, in addition to surrounding nations, and we have to knock the hell out of ISIS, and we have to do it fast, when ISIS formed in this vacuum created by Barack Obama and Secretary Clinton. And believe me, you were the ones that took out the troops. Not only that, you named the day. They couldn't believe it. They sat back probably and said, I can't believe it. They said...

No, wait a minute.

When they formed, when they formed, this is something that never should have happened. It should have never happened. Now, you're talking about taking out ISIS. But you were there, and you were secretary of state when it was a little infant. Now it's in over 30 countries. And you're going to stop them? I don't think so.

I did not support the war in Iraq.

That is a mainstream media nonsense put out by her, because she—frankly, I think the best person in her campaign is mainstream media.

Just—would you like to hear...

Wait a minute. I was against the war in Iraq. Just so you put it out.

The record does not show that.

The record shows that I'm right. When I did an interview with Howard Stern, very lightly, first time anyone's asked me that, I said, very lightly, I don't know, maybe, who knows? Essentially. I then did an interview with Neil Cavuto. We talked about the economy is more important. I then spoke to Sean Hannity, which everybody refuses to call Sean Hannity. I had numerous conversations with Sean Hannity at Fox. And Sean Hannity said—and he called me the other day—and I spoke to him about it—he said you were totally against the war, because he was for the war.

And when he—excuse me. And that was before the war started. Sean Hannity said very strongly to me and other people—he's willing to say it, but nobody wants to call him. I was against the war. He said, you used to have fights with me, because Sean was in favor of the war.

And I understand that side, also, not very much, because we should have never been there. But nobody called Sean Hannity. And then they did an article in a major magazine, shortly after the war started. I think in '04. But they did an article which had me totally against the war in Iraq.

And one of your compatriots said, you know, whether it was before or right after, Trump was definitely—because if you read this article, there's no doubt. But if somebody—and I'll ask the press—if somebody would call up Sean Hannity, this was before the war started. He and I used to have arguments about the war. I said, it's a terrible and a stupid thing. It's going to destabilize the Middle East. And that's exactly what it's done. It's been a disaster.

No, no. You didn't hear what I said.

Well, I have much better judgment than she does. There's no question about that. I also have a much better temperament than she has, you know? [laughter]

I have a much better—she spent—let me tell you—she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on an advertising—you know, they get Madison Avenue into a room, they put names—oh, temperament, let's go after—I think my strongest asset, maybe by far, is my temperament. I have a winning temperament. I know how to win. She does not have a...

Wait. The AFL-CIO the other day, behind the blue screen, I don't know who you were talking to, Secretary Clinton, but you were totally out of control. I said, there's a person with a temperament that's got a problem.

That would not start a war.

No, they were taunting us.

Wrong.

It's lies.

That line's getting a little bit old, I must say. I would like to...

It's not an accurate one at all. It's not an accurate one. So I just want to give a lot of things—and just to respond. I agree with her on one thing. The single greatest problem the world has is nuclear armament, nuclear weapons, not global warming, like you think and your—your president thinks.

Nuclear is the single greatest threat. Just to go down the list, we defend Japan, we defend Germany, we defend South Korea, we defend Saudi Arabia, we defend countries. They do not pay us. But they should be paying us, because we are providing tremendous service and we're losing a fortune. That's why we're losing—we're losing—we lose on everything. I say, who makes these—we lose on everything. All I said, that it's very possible that if they don't pay a fair share, because this isn't 40 years ago where we could do what we're doing. We can't defend Japan, a behemoth, selling us cars by the million...

Well, wait, but it's very important. All I said was, they may have to defend themselves or they have to help us out. We're a country that owes \$20 trillion. They have to help us out.

As far as the nuclear is concerned, I agree. It is the single greatest threat that this country has.

Well, I have to say that, you know, for what Secretary Clinton was saying about nuclear with Russia, she's very cavalier in the way she talks about various countries. But Russia has been expanding their—they have a much newer capability than we do. We have not been updating from the new standpoint.

I looked the other night. I was seeing B-52s, they're old enough that your father, your grandfather could be flying them. We are not—we are not keeping up with other countries. I would like everybody to end it, just get rid of it. But I would certainly not do first strike.

I think that once the nuclear alternative happens, it's over. At the same time, we have to be prepared. I can't take anything off the table. Because you look at some of these countries, you look at North Korea, we're doing nothing there. China should solve that problem for us. China should go into North Korea. China is totally powerful as it relates to North Korea.

And by the way, another one powerful is the worst deal I think I've ever seen negotiated that you started is the Iran deal. Iran is one of their biggest trading partners. Iran has power over North Korea.

And when they made that horrible deal with Iran, they should have included the fact that they do something with respect to North Korea. And they should have done something with respect to Yemen and all these other places.

And when asked to Secretary Kerry, why didn't you do that? Why didn't you add other things into the deal? One of the great giveaways of all time, of all time, including \$400 million in cash. Nobody's ever seen that before. That turned out to be wrong. It was actually \$1.7 billion in cash, obviously, I guess for the hostages. It certainly looks that way.

So you say to yourself, why didn't they make the right deal? This is one of the worst deals ever made by any country in history. The deal with Iran will lead to nuclear problems. All they have to do is sit back 10 years, and they don't have to do much.

And they're going to end up getting nuclear. I met with Bibi Netanyahu the other day. Believe me, he's not a happy camper.

Lester, one thing I'd like to say.

I will go very quickly. But I will tell you that Hillary will tell you to go to her website and read all about how to defeat ISIS, which she could have defeated by never having it, you know, get going in the first place. Right now, it's getting tougher and tougher to defeat them, because they're in more and more places, more and more states, more and more nations.

And it's a big problem. And as far as Japan is concerned, I want to help all of our allies, but we are losing billions and billions of dollars. We cannot be the policemen of the world. We cannot protect countries all over the world...

where they're not paying us what we need.

And she doesn't say that, because she's got no business ability. We need heart. We need a lot of things. But you have to have some basic ability. And sadly, she doesn't have that. All of the things that she's talking about could have been taken care of during the last 10 years, let's say, while she had great power. But they weren't taken care of. And if she ever wins this race, they won't be taken care of.

She doesn't have the look. She doesn't have the stamina. I said she doesn't have the stamina. And I don't believe she does have the stamina. To be president of this country, you need tremendous stamina.

You have—wait a minute. Wait a minute, Lester. You asked me a question. Did you ask me a question?

You have to be able to negotiate our trade deals. You have to be able to negotiate, that's right, with Japan, with Saudi Arabia. I mean, can you imagine, we're defending Saudi Arabia? And with all of the money they have, we're defending them, and they're not paying? All you have to do is speak to them. Wait. You have so many different things you have to be able to do, and I don't believe that Hillary has the stamina.

The world—let me tell you. Let me tell you. Hillary has experience, but it's bad experience. We have made so many bad deals during the last—so she's got experience, that I agree. [applause]

But it's bad, bad experience. Whether it's the Iran deal that you're so in love with, where we gave them \$150 billion back, whether it's the Iran deal, whether it's anything you can—name—you almost can't name a good deal. I agree. She's got experience, but it's bad experience. And this country can't afford to have another four years of that kind of experience.

I never said that.

I didn't say that.

Where did you find this? Where did you find this?

Where did you find this?

Oh, really?

OK, good. Let me just tell you...

You know, Hillary is hitting me with tremendous commercials. Some of it's said in entertainment. Some of it's said—somebody who's been very vicious to me, Rosie O'Donnell, I said very tough things to her, and I think everybody would agree that she deserves it and nobody feels sorry for her.

But you want to know the truth? I was going to say something...

extremely rough to Hillary, to her family, and I said to myself, "I can't do it. I just can't do it. It's inappropriate. It's not nice." But she spent hundreds of millions of dollars on negative ads on me, many of which are absolutely untrue. They're untrue. And they're misrepresentations.

And I will tell you this, Lester: It's not nice. And I don't deserve that.

But it's certainly not a nice thing that she's done. It's hundreds of millions of ads. And the only gratifying thing is, I saw the polls come in today, and with all of that money...

\$200 million is spent, and I'm either winning or tied, and I've spent practically nothing. [applause]

I want to make America great again. We are a nation that is seriously troubled. We're losing our jobs. People are pouring into our country.

The other day, we were deporting 800 people. And perhaps they passed the wrong button, they pressed the wrong button, or perhaps worse than that, it was corruption, but these people that we were going to deport for good reason ended up becoming citizens. Ended up becoming citizens. And it was 800. And now it turns out it might be 1,800, and they don't even know.

Look, here's the story. I want to make America great again. I'm going to be able to do it. I don't believe Hillary will. The answer is, if she wins, I will absolutely support her.

Trump_2

October 9th, 2016

Well, I actually agree with that. I agree with everything she said. I began this campaign because I was so tired of seeing such foolish things happen to our country. This is a great country. This is a great land. I've gotten to know the people of the country over the last year-and-a-half that I've been doing this as a politician. I cannot believe I'm saying that about myself, but I guess I have been a politician.

And my whole concept was to make America great again. When I watch the deals being made, when I watch what's happening with some horrible things like Obamacare, where your health insurance and health care is going up by numbers that are astronomical, 68 percent, 59 percent, 71 percent, when I look at the Iran deal and how bad a deal it is for us, it's a one-sided transaction where we're giving back \$150 billion to a terrorist state, really, the number one terror state, we've made them a strong country from really a very weak country just three years ago.

When I look at all of the things that I see and all of the potential that our country has, we have such tremendous potential, whether it's in business and trade, where we're doing so badly. Last year, we had an almost \$800 billion trade deficit. In other words, trading with other countries. We had an \$800 billion deficit. It's hard to believe. Inconceivable.

You say who's making these deals? We're going to make great trade deals. We're going to have a strong border. We're going to bring back law and order. Just today, policemen was shot, two killed. And this is happening on a weekly basis. We have to bring back respect to law enforcement. At the same time, we have to take care of people on all sides. We need justice.

But I want to do things that haven't been done, including fixing and making our inner cities better for the African-American citizens that are so great, and for the Latinos, Hispanics, and I look forward to doing it. It's called make America great again.

No, I didn't say that at all. I don't think you understood what was—this was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I apologize to my family. I apologize to the American people. Certainly, I'm not proud of it. But this is locker room talk.

You know, when we have a world where you have ISIS chopping off heads, where you have—and, frankly, drowning people in steel cages, where you have wars and horrible, horrible sights all over, where you have so many bad things happening, this is like medieval times. We haven't seen anything like this, the carnage all over the world.

And they look and they see. Can you imagine the people that are, frankly, doing so well against us with ISIS? And they look at our country and they see what's going on.

Yes, I'm very embarrassed by it. I hate it. But it's locker room talk, and it's one of those things. I will knock the hell out of ISIS. We're going to defeat ISIS. ISIS happened a number of years ago in a vacuum that was left because of bad judgment. And I will tell you, I will take care of ISIS.

And we should get on to much more important things and much bigger things.

I have great respect for women. Nobody has more respect for women than I do.

I've said things that, frankly, you hear these things I said. And I was embarrassed by it. But I have tremendous respect for women.

And women have respect for me. And I will tell you: No, I have not. And I will tell you that I'm going to make our country safe. We're going to have borders in our country, which we don't have now. People are pouring into our country, and they're coming in from the Middle East and other places.

We're going to make America safe again. We're going to make America great again, but we're going to make America safe again. And we're going to make America wealthy again, because if you don't do that, it just—it sounds harsh to say, but we have to build up the wealth of our nation.

Right now, other nations are taking our jobs and they're taking our wealth.

And that's what I want to talk about.

Am I allowed to respond to that? I assume I am.

It's just words, folks. It's just words. Those words, I've been hearing them for many years. I heard them when they were running for the Senate in New York, where Hillary was going to bring back jobs to upstate New York and she failed.

I've heard them where Hillary is constantly talking about the inner cities of our country, which are a disaster education-wise, job-wise, safety-wise, in every way possible. I'm going to help the African-Americans. I'm going to help the Latinos, Hispanics. I am going to help the inner cities.

She's done a terrible job for the African-Americans. She wants their vote, and she does nothing, and then she comes back four years later. We saw that firsthand when she was a United States senator. She campaigned where the primary part of her campaign...

So, she's allowed to do that, but I'm not allowed to respond?

Sounds fair.

It was locker room talk, as I told you. That was locker room talk. I'm not proud of it. I am a person who has great respect for people, for my family, for the people of this country. And certainly, I'm not proud of it. But that was something that happened.

If you look at Bill Clinton, far worse. Mine are words, and his was action. His was what he's done to women. There's never been anybody in the history of politics in this nation that's been so abusive to women. So you can say any way you want to say it, but Bill Clinton was abusive to women.

Hillary Clinton attacked those same women and attacked them viciously. Four of them here tonight. One of the women, who is a wonderful woman, at 12 years old, was raped at 12. Her client she represented got him off, and she's seen laughing on two separate occasions, laughing at the girl who was raped. Kathy Shelton, that young woman is here with us tonight.

So don't tell me about words. I am absolutely—I apologize for those words. But it is things that people say. But what President Clinton did, he was impeached, he lost his license to practice law. He had to pay an \$850,000 fine to one of the women. Paula Jones, who's also here tonight.

And I will tell you that when Hillary brings up a point like that and she talks about words that I said 11 years ago, I think it's disgraceful, and I think she should be ashamed of herself, if you want to know the truth.

Well, you owe the president an apology, because as you know very well, your campaign, Sidney Blumenthal—he's another real winner that you have—and he's the one that got this started, along with your campaign manager, and they were on television just two weeks ago, she was, saying exactly that. So you really owe him an apology. You're the one that sent the pictures around your campaign, sent the pictures around with President Obama in a certain garb. That was long before I was ever involved, so you actually owe an apology.

Number two, Michelle Obama. I've gotten to see the commercials that they did on you. And I've gotten to see some of the most vicious commercials I've ever seen of Michelle Obama talking about you, Hillary.

So, you talk about friend? Go back and take a look at those commercials, a race where you lost fair and square, unlike the Bernie Sanders race, where you won, but not fair and square, in my opinion. And all you have to do is take a look at WikiLeaks and just see what they said about Bernie Sanders and see what Deborah Wasserman Schultz had in mind, because Bernie Sanders, between super-delegates and Deborah Wasserman Schultz, he never had a chance. And I was so surprised to see him sign on with the devil.

But when you talk about apology, I think the one that you should really be apologizing for and the thing that you should be apologizing for are the 33,000 e-mails that you deleted, and that you acid washed, and then the two boxes of e-mails and other things last week that were taken from an office and are now missing.

And I'll tell you what. I didn't think I'd say this, but I'm going to say it, and I hate to say it. But if I win, I am going to instruct my attorney general to get a special prosecutor to look into your situation, because there has never been so many lies, so much deception. There has never been anything like it, and we're going to have a special prosecutor.

When I speak, I go out and speak, the people of this country are furious. In my opinion, the people that have been long-term workers at the FBI are furious. There has never been anything like this, where e-mails—and you get a subpoena, you get a subpoena, and after getting the subpoena, you delete 33,000 e-mails, and then you acid wash them or bleach them, as you would say, very expensive process.

So we're going to get a special prosecutor, and we're going to look into it, because you know what? People have been—their lives have been destroyed for doing one-fifth of what you've done. And it's a disgrace. And honestly, you ought to be ashamed of yourself.

Oh, really?

Because you'd be in jail.

And yet she didn't know the word—the letter C on a document. Right? She didn't even know what that word—what that letter meant.

You know, it's amazing. I'm watching Hillary go over facts. And she's going after fact after fact, and she's lying again, because she said she—you know, what she did with the e-mails was fine. You think it was fine to delete 33,000 e-mails? I don't think so.

She said the 33,000 e-mails had to do with her daughter's wedding, number one, and a yoga class. Well, maybe we'll give three or three or four or five or something. 33,000 e-mails deleted, and now she's saying there wasn't anything wrong.

And more importantly, that was after getting a subpoena. That wasn't before. That was after. She got it from the United States Congress. And I'll be honest, I am so disappointed in congressmen, including Republicans, for allowing this to happen.

Our Justice Department, where her husband goes onto the back of an airplane for 39 minutes, talks to the attorney general days before a ruling is going to be made on her case. But for you to say that there was nothing wrong with you deleting 39,000 e-mails, again, you should be ashamed of yourself. What you did—and this is after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

You did that. Wait a minute. One second.

If you did that in the private sector, you'd be put in jail, let alone after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

Oh, you didn't delete them?

Oh, 33,000? Yeah.

Oh, yeah. What about the other 15,000?

Because you have nothing to say.

And get off this question.

Let's see what happens...

I'd like to know, Anderson, why aren't you bringing up the e-mails? I'd like to know. Why aren't you bringing...

No, it hasn't. It hasn't. And it hasn't been finished at all.

It's nice to—one on three.

No, I'm a gentleman, Hillary. Go ahead. [laughter]

It is such a great question and it's maybe the question I get almost more than anything else, outside of defense. Obamacare is a disaster. You know it. We all know it. It's going up at numbers that nobody's ever seen worldwide. Nobody's ever seen numbers like this for health care.

It's only getting worse. In '17, it implodes by itself. Their method of fixing it is to go back and ask Congress for more money, more and more money. We have right now almost \$20 trillion in debt.

Obamacare will never work. It's very bad, very bad health insurance. Far too expensive. And not only expensive for the person that has it, unbelievably expensive for our country. It's going to be one of the biggest line items very shortly.

We have to repeal it and replace it with something absolutely much less expensive and something that works, where your plan can actually be tailored. We have to get rid of the lines around the state, artificial lines, where we stop insurance companies from coming in and competing, because they want—and President Obama and whoever was working on it—they want to leave those lines, because that gives the insurance companies essentially monopolies. We want competition.

You will have the finest health care plan there is. She wants to go to a single-payer plan, which would be a disaster, somewhat similar to Canada. And if you haven't noticed the Canadians, when they need a big operation, when something happens, they come into the United States in many cases because their system is so slow. It's catastrophic in certain ways.

But she wants to go to single payer, which means the government basically rules everything. Hillary Clinton has been after this for years. Obamacare was the first step. Obamacare is a total disaster. And not only are your rates going up by numbers that nobody's ever believed, but your deductibles are going up, so that unless you get hit by a truck, you're never going to be able to use it.

It is a disastrous plan, and it has to be repealed and replaced.

Well, I just want—just one thing. First of all, Hillary, everything's broken about it. Everything. Number two, Bernie Sanders said that Hillary Clinton has very bad judgment. This is a perfect example of it, trying to save Obamacare, which is a disaster.

By the way...

We're going to be able to. You're going to have plans...

Well, I'll tell you what it means. You're going to have plans that are so good, because we're going to have so much competition in the insurance industry. Once we break out—once we break out the lines and allow the competition to come...

President Obama—Anderson, excuse me. President Obama, by keeping those lines, the boundary lines around each state, it was almost gone until just very toward the end of the passage of Obamacare, which, by the way, was a fraud. You know that, because Jonathan Gruber, the architect of Obamacare, was said—he said it was a great lie, it was a big lie. President Obama said you keep your doctor, you keep your plan. The whole thing was a fraud, and it doesn't work.

But when we get rid of those lines, you will have competition, and we will be able to keep pre-existing, we'll also be able to help people that can't get—don't have money because we are going to have people protected.

And Republicans feel this way, believe it or not, and strongly this way. We're going to block grant into the states. We're going to block grant into Medicaid into the states...

so that we will be able to take care of people without the necessary funds to take care of themselves.

Well, you're right about Islamophobia, and that's a shame. But one thing we have to do is we have to make sure that—because there is a problem. I mean, whether we like it or not, and we could be very politically correct, but whether we like it or not, there is a problem. And we have to be sure that Muslims come in and report when they see something going on. When they see hatred going on, they have to report it.

As an example, in San Bernardino, many people saw the bombs all over the apartment of the two people that killed 14 and wounded many, many people. Horribly wounded. They'll never be the same. Muslims have to report the problems when they see them.

And, you know, there's always a reason for everything. If they don't do that, it's a very difficult situation for our country, because you look at Orlando and you look at San Bernardino and you look at the World Trade Center. Go outside. Look at Paris. Look at that horrible—these are radical Islamic terrorists.

And she won't even mention the word and nor will President Obama. He won't use the term "radical Islamic terrorism." Now, to solve a problem, you have to be able to state what the problem is or at least say the name.

She won't say the name and President Obama won't say the name. But the name is there. It's radical Islamic terror. And before you solve it, you have to say the name.

First of all, Captain Khan is an American hero, and if I were president at that time, he would be alive today, because unlike her, who voted for the war without knowing what she was doing, I would not have had our people in Iraq. Iraq was a disaster. So he would have been alive today.

The Muslim ban is something that in some form has morphed into an extreme vetting from certain areas of the world. Hillary Clinton wants to allow hundreds of thousands—excuse me. Excuse me..

Why don't you interrupt her? You interrupt me all the time.

Why don't you interrupt her?

It's called extreme vetting. We are going to areas like Syria where they're coming in by the tens of thousands because of Barack Obama. And Hillary Clinton wants to allow a 550 percent increase over Obama. People are coming into our country like we have no idea who they are, where they are from, what their feelings about our country is, and she wants 550 percent more. This is going to be the great Trojan horse of all time.

We have enough problems in this country. I believe in building safe zones. I believe in having other people pay for them, as an example, the Gulf states, who are not carrying their weight, but they have nothing but money, and take care of people. But I don't want to have, with all the problems this country has and all of the problems that you see going on, hundreds of thousands of people coming in from Syria when we know nothing about them. We know nothing about their values and we know nothing about their love for our country.

That's not been debunked.

That has not been debunked.

I was against—I was against the war in Iraq. Has not been debunked. And you voted for it. And you shouldn't have. Well, I just want to say...

Excuse me. She just went about 25 seconds over her time.

Could I just respond to this, please?

Hillary Clinton, in terms of having people come into our country, we have many criminal illegal aliens. When we want to send them back to their country, their country says we don't want them. In some cases, they're murderers, drug lords, drug problems. And they don't want them.

And Hillary Clinton, when she was secretary of state, said that's OK, we can't force it into their country. Let me tell you, I'm going to force them right back into their country. They're murderers and some very bad people.

And I will tell you very strongly, when Bernie Sanders said she had bad judgment, she has really bad judgment, because we are letting people into this country that are going to cause problems and crime like you've never seen. We're also letting drugs pour through our southern border at a record clip. At a record clip. And it shouldn't be allowed to happen.

ICE just endorsed me. They've never endorsed a presidential candidate. The Border Patrol agents, 16,500, just recently endorsed me, and they endorsed me because I understand the border. She doesn't. She wants amnesty for everybody. Come right in. Come right over. It's a horrible thing she's doing. She's got bad judgment, and honestly, so bad that she should never be president of the United States. That I can tell you.

Well, I think I should respond, because—so ridiculous. Look, now she's blaming—she got caught in a total lie. Her papers went out to all her friends at the banks, Goldman Sachs and everybody else, and she said things—WikiLeaks that just came out. And she lied. Now she's blaming the lie on the late, great Abraham Lincoln. That's one that I haven't...[laughter]

OK, Honest Abe, Honest Abe never lied. That's the good thing. That's the big difference between Abraham Lincoln and you. That's a big, big difference. We're talking about some difference.

But as far as other elements of what she was saying, I don't know Putin. I think it would be great if we got along with Russia because we could fight ISIS together, as an example. But I don't know Putin.

But I notice, anytime anything wrong happens, they like to say the Russians are—she doesn't know if it's the Russians doing the hacking. Maybe there is no hacking. But they always blame Russia. And the reason they blame Russia because they think they're trying to tarnish me with Russia. I know nothing about Russia. I know—I know about Russia, but I know nothing about the inner workings of Russia. I don't deal there. I have no businesses there. I have no loans from Russia.

I have a very, very great balance sheet, so great that when I did the Old Post Office on Pennsylvania Avenue, the United States government, because of my balance sheet, which they actually know very well, chose me to do the Old Post Office, between the White House and Congress, chose me to do the Old Post Office. One of the primary things, in fact, perhaps the primary thing was balance sheet. But I have no loans with Russia. You could go to the United States government, and they would probably tell you that, because they know my sheet very well in order to get that development I had to have.

Now, the taxes are a very simple thing. As soon as I have—first of all, I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. Many of her friends took bigger deductions. Warren Buffett took a massive deduction. Soros, who's a friend of hers, took a massive deduction. Many of the people that are giving her all this money that she can do many more commercials than me gave her—took massive deductions.

I pay hundreds of millions of dollars in taxes. But—but as soon as my routine audit is finished, I'll release my returns. I'll be very proud to. They're actually quite great.

Well, one thing I'd do is get rid of carried interest. One of the greatest provisions for people like me, to be honest with you, I give up a lot when I run, because I knock out the tax code. And she could have done this years ago, by the way. She's a United States—she was a United States senator.

She complains that Donald Trump took advantage of the tax code. Well, why didn't she change it? Why didn't you change it when you were a senator? The reason you didn't is that all your friends take the same advantage that I do. And I do. You have provisions in the tax code that, frankly, we could change. But you wouldn't change it, because all of these people give you the money so you can take negative ads on Donald Trump.

But—and I say that about a lot of things. You know, I've heard Hillary complaining about so many different things over the years. "I wish you would have done this." But she's been there for 30 years she's been doing this stuff. She never changed. And she never will change. She never will change.

We're getting rid of carried interest provisions. I'm lowering taxes actually, because I think it's so important for corporations, because we have corporations leaving—massive corporations and little ones, little ones can't form. We're getting rid of regulations which goes hand in hand with the lowering of the taxes.

But we're bringing the tax rate down from 35 percent to 15 percent. We're cutting taxes for the middle class. And I will tell you, we are cutting them big league for the middle class.

And I will tell you, Hillary Clinton is raising your taxes, folks. You can look at me. She's raising your taxes really high. And what that's going to do is a disaster for the country. But she is raising your taxes and I'm lowering your taxes. That in itself is a big difference. We are going to be thriving again. We have no growth in this country. There's no growth. If China has a GDP of 7 percent, it's like a national catastrophe. We're down at 1 percent. And that's, like, no growth. And we're going lower, in my opinion. And a lot of it has to do with the fact that our taxes are so high, just about the highest in the world. And I'm bringing them down to one of the lower in the world. And I think it's so important—one of the most important things we can do. But she is raising everybody's taxes massively.

Of course I do. Of course I do. And so do all of her donors, or most of her donors. I know many of her donors. Her donors took massive tax write-offs.

A lot of my—excuse me, Anderson—a lot of my write-off was depreciation and other things that Hillary as a senator allowed. And she'll always allow it, because the people that give her all this money, they want it. That's why.

See, I understand the tax code better than anybody that's ever run for president. Hillary Clinton—and it's extremely complex—Hillary Clinton has friends that want all of these provisions, including they want the carried interest provision, which is very important to Wall Street people. But they really want the carried interest provision, which I believe Hillary's leaving. Very interesting why she's leaving carried interest.

But I will tell you that, number one, I pay tremendous numbers of taxes. I absolutely used it. And so did Warren Buffett and so did George Soros and so did many of the other people that Hillary is getting money from. Now, I won't mention their names, because they're rich, but they're not famous. So we won't make them famous.

No, but I pay tax, and I pay federal tax, too. But I have a write-off, a lot of it's depreciation, which is a wonderful charge. I love depreciation. You know, she's given it to us.

Hey, if she had a problem—for 30 years she's been doing this, Anderson. I say it all the time. She talks about health care. Why didn't she do something about it? She talks about taxes. Why didn't she do something about it? She doesn't do anything about anything other than talk. With her, it's all talk and no action.

And, again, Bernie Sanders, it's really bad judgment. She has made bad judgment not only on taxes. She's made bad judgments on Libya, on Syria, on Iraq. I mean, her and Obama, whether you like it or not, the way they got out of Iraq, the vacuum they've left, that's why ISIS formed in the first place. They started from that little area, and now they're in 32 different nations, Hillary. Congratulations. Great job.

Why didn't you do it? Why didn't you do it?

Oh, really?

You could have done it, if you were an effective—if you were an effective senator, you could have done it. If you were an effective senator, you could have done it. But you were not an effective senator.

She said a lot of things that were false. I mean, I think we should be allowed to maybe...

Excuse me. Because she has been a disaster as a senator. A disaster.

First of all, she was there as secretary of state with the so-called line in the sand, which...

OK. But you were in contact—excuse me. You were...

You were in total contact with the White House, and perhaps, sadly, Obama probably still listened to you. I don't think he would be listening to you very much anymore.

Obama draws the line in the sand. It was laughed at all over the world what happened.

Now, with that being said, she talks tough against Russia. But our nuclear program has fallen way behind, and they've gone wild with their nuclear program. Not good. Our government shouldn't have allowed that to happen. Russia is new in terms of nuclear. We are old. We're tired. We're exhausted in terms of nuclear. A very bad thing.

Now, she talks tough, she talks really tough against Putin and against Assad. She talks in favor of the rebels. She doesn't even know who the rebels are. You know, every time we take rebels, whether it's in Iraq or anywhere else, we're arming people. And you know what happens? They end up being worse than the people.

Look at what she did in Libya with Gadhafi. Gadhafi's out. It's a mess. And, by the way, ISIS has a good chunk of their oil. I'm sure you probably have heard that. It was a disaster. Because the fact is, almost everything she's done in foreign policy has been a mistake and it's been a disaster.

But if you look at Russia, just take a look at Russia, and look at what they did this week, where I agree, she wasn't there, but possibly she's consulted. We sign a peace treaty. Everyone's all excited. Well, what Russia did with Assad and, by the way, with Iran, who you made very powerful with the dumbest deal perhaps I've ever seen in the history of deal-making, the Iran deal, with the \$150 billion, with the \$1.7 billion in cash, which is enough cash to fill up this room.

But look at that deal. Iran now and Russia are now against us. So she wants to fight. She wants to fight for rebels. There's only one problem. You don't even know who the rebels are. So what's the purpose?

And one thing I have to say.

I don't like Assad at all, but Assad is killing ISIS. Russia is killing ISIS. And Iran is killing ISIS. And those three have now lined up because of our weak foreign policy.

OK. He and I haven't spoken, and I disagree. I disagree.

I think you have to knock out ISIS. Right now, Syria is fighting ISIS. We have people that want to fight both at the same time. But Syria is no longer Syria. Syria is Russia and it's Iran, who she made strong and Kerry and Obama made into a very powerful nation and a very rich nation, very, very quickly, very, very quickly.

I believe we have to get ISIS. We have to worry about ISIS before we can get too much more involved. She had a chance to do something with Syria. They had a chance. And that was the line. And she didn't.

I think Aleppo is a disaster, humanitarian-wise.

I think that it basically has fallen. OK? It basically has fallen. Let me tell you something. You take a look at Mosul. The biggest problem I have with the stupidity of our foreign policy, we have Mosul. They think a lot of the ISIS leaders are in Mosul. So we have announcements coming out of Washington and coming out of Iraq, we will be attacking Mosul in three weeks or four weeks.

Well, all of these bad leaders from ISIS are leaving Mosul. Why can't they do it quietly? Why can't they do the attack, make it a sneak attack, and after the attack is made, inform the American public that we've knocked out the leaders, we've had a tremendous success? People leave. Why do they have to say we're going to be attacking Mosul within the next four to six weeks, which is what they're saying? How stupid is our country?

I can't think of any. I can't think of any. And I'm pretty good at it.

And we have General Flynn. And we have—look, I have 200 generals and admirals who endorsed me. I have 21 Congressional Medal of Honor recipients who endorsed me. We talk about it all the time. They understand, why can't they do something secretly, where they go in and they knock out the leadership? How—why would these people stay there? I've been reading now...

for weeks—I've been reading now for weeks about Mosul, that it's the harbor of where—you know, between Raqqa and Mosul, this is where they think the ISIS leaders are. Why would they be saying—they're not staying there anymore. They're gone. Because everybody's talking about how Iraq, which is us with our leadership, goes in to fight Mosul.

Now, with these 200 admirals and generals, they can't believe it. All I say is this. General George Patton, General Douglas MacArthur are spinning in their grave at the stupidity of what we're doing in the Middle East.

Everything.

You know what's funny? She went over a minute over, and you don't stop her. When I go one second over, it's like a big deal.

It's really—it's really very interesting.

Absolutely. I mean, she calls our people deplorable, a large group, and irredeemable. I will be a president for all of our people. And I'll be a president that will turn our inner cities around and will give strength to people and will give economics to people and will bring jobs back.

Because NAFTA, signed by her husband, is perhaps the greatest disaster trade deal in the history of the world. Not in this country. It stripped us of manufacturing jobs. We lost our jobs. We lost our money. We lost our plants. It is a disaster. And now she wants to sign TPP, even though she says now she's for it. She called it the gold standard. And by the way, at the last debate, she lied, because it turned out that she did say the gold standard and she said she didn't say it. They actually said that she lied. OK? And she lied. But she's lied about a lot of things.

I would be a president for all of the people, African-Americans, the inner cities. Devastating what's happening to our inner cities. She's been talking about it for years. As usual, she talks about it, nothing happens. She doesn't get it done.

Same with the Latino Americans, the Hispanic Americans. The same exact thing. They talk, they don't get it done. You go into the inner cities and—you see it's 45 percent poverty. African-Americans now 45 percent poverty in the inner cities. The education is a disaster. Jobs are essentially nonexistent.

I mean, it's—you know, and I've been saying at big speeches where I have 20,000 and 30,000 people, what do you have to lose? It can't get any worse. And she's been talking about the inner cities for 25 years. Nothing's going to ever happen.

Let me tell you, if she's president of the United States, nothing's going to happen. It's just going to be talk. And all of her friends, the taxes we were talking about, and I would just get it by osmosis. She's not doing any me favors. But by doing all the others' favors, she's doing me favors.

But I will tell you, she's all talk. It doesn't get done. All you have to do is take a look at her Senate run. Take a look at upstate New York.

It turned out to be a disaster.

but we believed that we could make the country better. And I was proud of that.

We have a divided nation. We have a very divided nation. You look at Charlotte. You look at Baltimore. You look at the violence that's taking place in the inner cities, Chicago, you take a look at Washington, D.C.

We have an increase in murder within our cities, the biggest in 45 years. We have a divided nation, because people like her—and believe me, she has tremendous hate in her heart. And when she said deplorables, she meant it. And when she said irredeemable, they're irredeemable, you didn't mention that, but when she said they're irredeemable, to me that might have been even worse.

She's got tremendous—she's got tremendous hatred. And this country cannot take another four years of Barack Obama, and that's what you're getting with her.

No, there wasn't check out a sex tape. It was just take a look at the person that she built up to be this wonderful Girl Scout who was no Girl Scout.

By the way, just so you understand, when she said 3 o'clock in the morning, take a look at Benghazi. She said who is going to answer the call at 3 o'clock in the morning? Guess what? She didn't answer it, because when Ambassador Stevens...

600—wait a minute, Anderson, 600 times. Well, she said she was awake at 3 o'clock in the morning, and she also sent a tweet out at 3 o'clock in the morning, but I won't even mention that. But she said she'll be awake. Who's going—the famous thing, we're going to answer our call at 3 o'clock in the morning. Guess what happened? Ambassador Stevens—Ambassador Stevens sent 600 requests for help. And the only one she talked to was Sidney Blumenthal, who's her friend and not a good guy, by the way. So, you know, she shouldn't be talking about that.

Now, tweeting happens to be a modern day form of communication. I mean, you can like it or not like it. I have, between Facebook and Twitter, I have almost 25 million people. It's a very effective way of communication. So you can put it down, but it is a very effective form of communication. I'm not un-proud of it, to be honest with you.

I'm shocked to hear that.

We have the slowest growth since 1929.

It is—our country has the slowest growth and jobs are a disaster.

Absolutely. I think it's such a great question, because energy is under siege by the Obama administration. Under absolutely siege. The EPA, Environmental Protection Agency, is killing these energy companies. And foreign companies are now coming in buying our—buying so many of our different plants and then re-jiggering the plant so that they can take care of their oil.

We are killing—absolutely killing our energy business in this country. Now, I'm all for alternative forms of energy, including wind, including solar, et cetera. But we need much more than wind and solar.

And you look at our miners. Hillary Clinton wants to put all the miners out of business. There is a thing called clean coal. Coal will last for 1,000 years in this country. Now we have natural gas and so many other things because of technology. We have unbelievable—we have found over the last seven years, we have found tremendous wealth right under our feet. So good. Especially when you have \$20 trillion in debt.

I will bring our energy companies back. They'll be able to compete. They'll make money. They'll pay off our national debt. They'll pay off our tremendous budget deficits, which are tremendous. But we are putting our energy companies out of business. We have to bring back our workers.

You take a look at what's happening to steel and the cost of steel and China dumping vast amounts of steel all over the United States, which essentially is killing our steelworkers and our steel companies. We have to guard our energy companies. We have to make it possible.

The EPA is so restrictive that they are putting our energy companies out of business. And all you have to do is go to a great place like West Virginia or places like Ohio, which is phenomenal, or places like Pennsylvania and you see what they're doing to the people, miners and others in the energy business. It's a disgrace.

It's an absolute disgrace.

Well, I consider her statement about my children to be a very nice compliment. I don't know if it was meant to be a compliment, but it is a great—I'm very proud of my children. And they've done a wonderful job, and they've been wonderful, wonderful kids. So I consider that a compliment.

I will say this about Hillary. She doesn't quit. She doesn't give up. I respect that. I tell it like it is. She's a fighter. I disagree with much of what she's fighting for. I do disagree with her judgment in many cases. But she does fight hard, and she doesn't quit, and she doesn't give up. And I consider that to be a very good trait.

Trump_3

October 19th, 2016

Well, first of all, it's great to be with you, and thank you, everybody. The Supreme Court: It's what it's all about. Our country is so, so—it's just so imperative that we have the right justices.

Something happened recently where Justice Ginsburg made some very, very inappropriate statements toward me and toward a tremendous number of people, many, many millions of people that I represent. And she was forced to apologize. And apologize she did. But these were statements that should never, ever have been made.

We need a Supreme Court that in my opinion is going to uphold the Second Amendment, and all amendments, but the Second Amendment, which is under absolute siege. I believe if my opponent should win this race, which I truly don't think will happen, we will have a Second Amendment which will be a very, very small replica of what it is right now. But I feel that it's absolutely important that we uphold, because of the fact that it is under such trauma.

I feel that the justices that I am going to appoint—and I've named 20 of them—the justices that I'm going to appoint will be pro-life. They will have a conservative bent. They will be protecting the Second Amendment. They are great scholars in all cases, and they're people of tremendous respect. They will interpret the Constitution the way the founders wanted it interpreted. And I believe that's very, very important.

I don't think we should have justices appointed that decide what they want to hear. It's all about the Constitution of—of—and so important, the Constitution the way it was meant to be. And those are the people that I will appoint.

Well, the D.C. vs. Heller decision was very strongly—and she was extremely angry about it. I watched. I mean, she was very, very angry when upheld. And Justice Scalia was so involved. And it was a well-crafted decision. But Hillary was extremely upset, extremely angry. And people that believe in the Second Amendment and believe in it very strongly were very upset with what she had to say.

Well, let me just tell you before we go any further. In Chicago, which has the toughest gun laws in the United States, probably you could say by far, they have more gun violence than any other city. So we have the toughest laws, and you have tremendous gun violence.

I am a very strong supporter of the Second Amendment. And I am—I don't know if Hillary was saying it in a sarcastic manner, but I'm very proud to have the endorsement of the NRA. And it's the earliest endorsement they've ever given to anybody who ran for president. So I'm very honored by all of that.

We are going to appoint justices—this is the best way to help the Second Amendment. We are going to appoint justices that will feel very strongly about the Second Amendment, that will not do damage to the Second Amendment.

Right.

Well, if that would happen, because I am pro-life, and I will be appointing pro-life judges, I would think that that will go back to the individual states.

If they overturned it, it will go back to the states.

Well, if we put another two or perhaps three justices on, that's really what's going to be—that will happen. And that'll happen automatically, in my opinion, because I am putting pro-life justices on the court. I will say this: It will go back to the states, and the states will then make a determination.

Well, I think it's terrible. If you go with what Hillary is saying, in the ninth month, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb of the mother just prior to the birth of the baby.

Now, you can say that that's OK and Hillary can say that that's OK. But it's not OK with me, because based on what she's saying, and based on where she's going, and where she's been, you can take the baby and rip the baby out of the womb in the ninth month on the final day. And that's not acceptable.

And, honestly, nobody has business doing what I just said, doing that, as late as one or two or three or four days prior to birth. Nobody has that.

Well, first of all, she wants to give amnesty, which is a disaster and very unfair to all of the people that are waiting in line for many, many years. We need strong borders.

In the audience tonight, we have four mothers of—I mean, these are unbelievable people that I've gotten to know over a period of years whose children have been killed, brutally killed by people that came into the country illegally. You have thousands of mothers and fathers and relatives all over the country. They're coming in illegally. Drugs are pouring in through the border. We have no country if we have no border.

Hillary wants to give amnesty. She wants to have open borders. The border—as you know, the Border Patrol agents, 16,500-plus ICE last week, endorsed me. First time they've ever endorsed a candidate. It means their job is tougher. But they know what's going on. They know it better than anybody. They want strong borders. They feel we have to have strong borders.

I was up in New Hampshire the other day. The biggest complaint they have—it's with all of the problems going on in the world, many of the problems caused by Hillary Clinton and by Barack Obama. All of the problems—the single biggest problem is heroin that pours across our southern border. It's just pouring and destroying their youth. It's poisoning the blood of their youth and plenty of other people. We have to have strong borders. We have to keep the drugs out of our country. We are—right now, we're getting the drugs, they're getting the cash. We need strong borders. We need absolute—we cannot give amnesty.

Now, I want to build the wall. We need the wall. And the Border Patrol, ICE, they all want the wall. We stop the drugs. We shore up the border. One of my first acts will be to get all of the drug lords, all of the bad ones—we have some bad, bad people in this country that have to go out. We're going to get them out; we're going to secure the border. And once the border is secured, at a later date, we'll make a determination as to the rest. But we have some bad hombres here, and we're going to get them out.

Chris, I think it's...

I think I should respond to that. First of all, I had a very good meeting with the president of Mexico. Very nice man. We will be doing very much better with Mexico on trade deals. Believe me. The NAFTA deal signed by her husband is one of the worst deals ever made of any kind, signed by anybody. It's a disaster.

Hillary Clinton wanted the wall. Hillary Clinton fought for the wall in 2006 or thereabouts. Now, she never gets anything done, so naturally the wall wasn't built. But Hillary Clinton wanted the wall.

We are a country of laws. We either have—and by the way...

Well—well, but she said one thing.

And the wall.

President Obama has moved millions of people out. Nobody knows about it, nobody talks about it. But under Obama, millions of people have been moved out of this country. They've been deported. She doesn't want to say that, but that's what's happened, and that's what happened big league.

As far as moving these people out and moving—we either have a country or we don't. We're a country of laws. We either have a border or we don't.

Now, you can come back in and you can become a citizen. But it's very unfair. We have millions of people that did it the right way. They're on line. They're waiting. We're going to speed up the process, big league, because it's very inefficient. But they're on line and they're waiting to become citizens.

Very unfair that somebody runs across the border, becomes a citizen, under her plan, you have open borders. You would have a disaster on trade, and you will have a disaster with your open borders.

But what she doesn't say is that President Obama has deported millions and millions of people just the way it is. Thank you.

That was a great pivot off the fact that she wants open borders, OK? How did we get on to Putin?

So just to finish on the borders...

She wants open borders. People are going to pour into our country. People are going to come in from Syria. She wants 550 percent more people than Barack Obama, and he has thousands and thousands of people. They have no idea where they come from.

And you see, we are going to stop radical Islamic terrorism in this country. She won't even mention the words, and neither will President Obama. So I just want to tell you, she wants open borders.

Now we can talk about Putin. I don't know Putin. He said nice things about me. If we got along well, that would be good. If Russia and the United States got along well and went after ISIS, that would be good.

He has no respect for her. He has no respect for our president. And I'll tell you what: We're in very serious trouble, because we have a country with tremendous numbers of nuclear warheads—1,800, by the way—where they expanded and we didn't, 1,800 nuclear warheads. And she's playing chicken. Look, Putin...

from everything I see, has no respect for this person.

No puppet. No puppet.

You're the puppet!

No, you're the puppet.

She has no idea whether it's Russia, China, or anybody else.

She has no idea.

Hillary, you have no idea.

And our country has no idea.

Yeah, I doubt it. I doubt it.

She doesn't like Putin because Putin has outsmarted her at every step of the way.

Excuse me. Putin has outsmarted her in Syria.

He's outsmarted her every step of the way.

Yes, that's fine.

By Russia or anybody else.

Of course I condemn. Of course I—I don't know Putin. I have no idea.

I never met Putin. This is not my best friend. But if the United States got along with Russia, wouldn't be so bad.

Let me tell you, Putin has outsmarted her and Obama at every single step of the way. Whether it's Syria, you name it. Missiles. Take a look at the "startup" that they signed. The Russians have said, according to many, many

reports, I can't believe they allowed us to do this. They create warheads, and we can't. The Russians can't believe it. She has been outsmarted by Putin.

And all you have to do is look at the Middle East. They've taken over. We've spent \$6 trillion. They've taken over the Middle East. She has been outsmarted and outplayed worse than anybody I've ever seen in any government whatsoever.

And she always will be.

Wrong.

I have 200 generals...

and admirals, 21 endorsing me, 21 congressional Medal of Honor recipients. As far as Japan and other countries, we are being ripped off by everybody in the—we're defending other countries. We are spending a fortune doing it. They have the bargain of the century.

All I said is, we have to renegotiate these agreements, because our country cannot afford to defend Saudi Arabia, Japan, Germany, South Korea, and many other places. We cannot continue to afford—she took that as saying nuclear weapons.

Look, she's been proven to be a liar on so many different ways. This is just another lie.

There's no quote. You're not going to find a quote from me.

And defend yourselves.

And defend yourselves. I didn't say nuclear. And defend yourself.

Yes.

Well, first of all, before I start on my plan, her plan is going to raise taxes and even double your taxes. Her tax plan is a disaster. And she can say all she wants about college tuition. And I'm a big proponent. We're going to do a lot of things for college tuition. But the rest of the public's going to be paying for it. We will have a massive, massive tax increase under Hillary Clinton's plan.

But I'd like to start off where we left, because when I said Japan and Germany, and I'm—not to single them out, but South Korea, these are very rich, powerful countries. Saudi Arabia, nothing but money. We protect Saudi Arabia. Why aren't they paying?

She immediately—when she heard this, I questioned it, and I questioned NATO. Why aren't the NATO questioned—why aren't they paying? Because they weren't paying.

Since I did this—this was a year ago—all of a sudden, they're paying. And I've been given a lot—a lot of credit for it. All of a sudden, they're starting to pay up. They have to pay up. We're protecting people, they have to pay up. And I'm a big fan of NATO. But they have to pay up.

She comes out and said, we love our allies, we think our allies are great. Well, it's awfully hard to get them to pay up when you have somebody saying we think how great they are.

We have to tell Japan in a very nice way, we have to tell Germany, all of these countries, South Korea, we have to say, you have to help us out. We have, during his regime, during President Obama's regime, we've doubled our national debt. We're up to \$20 trillion.

So my plan—we're going to renegotiate trade deals. We're going to have a lot of free trade. We're going to have free trade, more free trade than we have right now. But we have horrible deals. Our jobs are being taken out by the deal that her husband signed, NAFTA, one of the worst deals ever. Our jobs are being sucked out of our economy.

You look at all of the places that I just left, you go to Pennsylvania, you go to Ohio, you go to Florida, you go to any of them. You go upstate New York. Our jobs have fled to Mexico and other places. We're bringing our jobs back.

I am going to renegotiate NAFTA. And if I can't make a great deal—then we're going to terminate NAFTA and we're going to create new deals. We're going to have trade, but we're going—we're going to terminate it, we're going to make a great trade deal.

And if we can't, we're going to do it—we're going to go a separate way, because it has been a disaster. We are going to cut taxes massively. We're going to cut business taxes massively. They're going to start hiring people. We're going to bring the \$2.5 trillion...

that's offshore back into the country. We are going to start the engine rolling again, because...

right now, our country is dying at 1 percent GDP.

You can't.

Correct.

Over a 10-year period.

So I just left some high representatives of India. They're growing at 8 percent. China is growing at 7 percent. And that for them is a catastrophically low number.

We are growing—our last report came out—and it's right around the 1 percent level. And I think it's going down. Last week, as you know, the end of last week, they came out with an anemic jobs report. A terrible jobs report. In fact I said, is that the last jobs report before the election? Because if it is, I should win easily, it was so bad. The report was so bad.

Look, our country is stagnant. We've lost our jobs. We've lost our businesses. We're not making things anymore, relatively speaking. Our product is pouring in from China, pouring in from Vietnam, pouring in from all over the world.

I've visited so many communities. This has been such an incredible education for me, Chris. I've gotten to know so many—I've developed so many friends over the last year. And they cry when they see what's happened. I pass factories that were thriving 20, 25 years ago, and because of the bill that her husband signed and she blessed 100 percent, it is just horrible what's happened to these people in these communities.

Now, she can say that her husband did well, but, boy, did they suffer as NAFTA kicked in, because it didn't really kick in very much, but it kicked in after they left. Boy, did they suffer. That was one of the worst things that's ever been signed by our country.

Now she wants to sign Trans-Pacific Partnership. And she wants it. She lied when she said she didn't call it the gold standard in one of the debates. She totally lied. She did call it the gold standard. And they actually fact-checked, and they said I was right. I was so honored.

And that will be as bad as NAFTA.

Well, let me just say—let me just say.

I ask a simple question. She's been doing this for 30 years. Why the hell didn't you do it over the last 15, 20 years?

You were very much involved—excuse me. My turn. You were very much involved in every aspect of this country. Very much. And you do have experience. I say the one thing you have over me is experience, but it's bad experience, because what you've done has turned out badly.

For 30 years, you've been in a position to help, and if you say that I use steel or I use something else, I—make it impossible for me to do that. I wouldn't mind.

The problem is, you talk, but you don't get anything done, Hillary. You don't. Just like when you ran the State Department, \$6 billion was missing. How do you miss \$6 billion? You ran the State Department, \$6 billion was either stolen. They don't know. It's gone, \$6 billion. If you become president, this country is going to be in some mess. Believe me.

Give me a break.

Well, I think I did a much better job. I built a massive company, a great company, some of the greatest assets anywhere in the world, worth many, many billions of dollars. I started with a \$1 million loan. I agree with that. It's a \$1 million loan. But I built a phenomenal company.

And if we could run our country the way I've run my company, we would have a country that you would be so proud of. You would even be proud of it.

And frankly, when you look at her real record, take a look at Syria. Take a look at the migration. Take a look at Libya. Take a look at Iraq. She gave us ISIS, because her and Obama created this huge vacuum, and a small group came out of that huge vacuum because when—we should have never been in Iraq, but once we were there, we should have never got out the way they wanted to get out. She gave us ISIS as sure as you are sitting there. And what happened is now ISIS is in 32 countries. And now I listen how she's going to get rid of ISIS. She's going to get rid of nobody.

Well, first of all, those stories have been largely debunked. Those people—I don't know those people. I have a feeling how they came. I believe it was her campaign that did it.

Just like if you look at what came out today on the clips where I was wondering what happened with my rally in Chicago and other rallies where we had such violence? She's the one and Obama that caused the violence. They hired people—they paid them \$1,500, and they're on tape saying be violent, cause fights, do bad things.

I would say the only way—because those stories are all totally false, I have to say that. And I didn't even apologize to my wife, who's sitting right here, because I didn't do anything. I didn't know any of these—I didn't see these women.

These women—the woman on the plane, the—I think they want either fame or her campaign did it. And I think it's her campaign. Because what I saw what they did, which is a criminal act, by the way, where they're telling people to go out and start fist-fights and start violence.

And I'll tell you what, in particular in Chicago, people were hurt and people could have been killed in that riot. And that was now all on tape, started by her. I believe, Chris, that she got these people to step forward. If it wasn't, they get their 10 minutes of fame. But they were all totally—it was all fiction. It was lies, and it was fiction.

I did not say that. I did not say that.

I did not say that.

Nobody has more respect for women than I do. Nobody. [laughter]

Nobody has more respect...

And frankly, those stories have been largely debunked. And I really want to just talk about something slightly different.

She mentions this, which is all fiction, all fictionalized, probably or possibly started by her and her very sleazy campaign. But I will tell you what isn't fictionalized are her e-mails, where she destroyed 33,000 e-mails criminally, criminally, after getting a subpoena from the United States Congress.

What happened to the FBI, I don't know. We have a great general, four-star general, today you read it in all of the papers, going to potentially serve five years in jail for lying to the FBI. One lie. She's lied hundreds of times to the people, to Congress, and to the FBI. He's going to probably go to jail. This is a four-star general. And she gets away with it, and she can run for the presidency of the United States? That's really what you should be talking about, not fiction, where somebody wants fame or where they come out of her crooked campaign.

Wrong.

So sad when she talks about violence at my rallies, and she caused the violence. It's on tape.

The other things are false, but honestly, I'd love to talk about getting rid of ISIS, and I'd love to talk about other things...

but those other charges, as she knows, are false.

I think that it's been very well...

It's been very well studied.

and it's a criminal enterprise, and so many people know it.

It's a criminal enterprise. Saudi Arabia giving \$25 million, Qatar, all of these countries. You talk about women and women's rights? So these are people that push gays off business—off buildings. These are people that kill women and treat women horribly. And yet you take their money.

So I'd like to ask you right now, why don't you give back the money that you've taken from certain countries that treat certain groups of people so horribly? Why don't you give back the money? I think it would be a great gesture.

Because she takes a tremendous amount of money. And you take a look at the people of Haiti. I was at a little Haiti the other day in Florida. And I want to tell you, they hate the Clintons, because what's happened in Haiti with the Clinton Foundation is a disgrace. And you know it, and they know it, and everybody knows it.

They don't want you to help them anymore.

I'd like to mention one thing. Trump Foundation, small foundation. People contribute, I contribute. The money goes 100 percent—100 percent goes to different charities, including a lot of military. I don't get anything. I don't buy boats. I don't buy planes. What happens—the money goes to them.

No, it was—we put up the American flag. And that's it. They put up the American flag. We fought for the right in Palm Beach to put up the American flag.

There was. There was. And, by the way...

the money—the money went to Fisher House, where they build houses—the money that you're talking about went to Fisher House, where they build houses for veterans and disabled vets.

So let me just tell you very quickly, we're entitled because of the laws that people like her passed to take massive amounts of depreciation on other charges, and we do it. And all of her donors—just about all of them—I know Buffett took hundreds of millions of dollars, Soros, George Soros, took hundreds of millions of dollars...

Let me just explain.

Most of her donors have done the same thing as I do.

You know what she should have done?

And you know, Hillary, what you should have done, you should have changed the law when you were a United States senator...

because your donors and your special interests are doing the same thing as I do, except even more so.

You should have changed the law. But you won't change the law, because you take in so much money. I mean, I sat in my apartment today on a very beautiful hotel down the street known as Trump...

But I will tell you, I sat there... I sat there watching ad after ad after ad, false ad. All paid for by your friends on Wall Street that gave so much money because they know you're going to protect them. And, frankly, you should have changed the laws.

If you don't like what I did, you should have changed the laws.

I will look at it at the time. I'm not looking at anything now. I'll look at it at the time.

What I've seen—what I've seen is so bad. First of all, the media is so dishonest and so corrupt, and the pile-on is so amazing. The New York Times actually wrote an article about it, but they don't even care. It's so dishonest. And they've poisoned the mind of the voters.

But unfortunately for them, I think the voters are seeing through it. I think they're going to see through it. We'll find out on November 8th. But I think they're going to see through it.

If you look—excuse me, Chris—if you look at your voter rolls, you will see millions of people that are registered to vote—millions, this isn't coming from me—this is coming from Pew Report and other places—millions of people that are registered to vote that shouldn't be registered to vote.

So let me just give you one other thing. So I talk about the corrupt media. I talk about the millions of people—tell you one other thing. She shouldn't be allowed to run. It's crooked—she's—she's guilty of a very, very serious crime. She should not be allowed to run.

And just in that respect, I say it's rigged, because she should never...

Chris, she should never have been allowed to run for the presidency based on what she did with e-mails and so many other things.

What I'm saying is that I will tell you at the time. I'll keep you in suspense. OK?

Should have gotten it.

I think what the FBI did and what the Department of Justice did, including meeting with her husband, the attorney general, in the back of an airplane on the tarmac in Arizona, I think it's disgraceful. I think it's a disgrace.

I think we've never had a situation so bad in this country. [applause]

Let me tell you, Mosul is so sad. We had Mosul. But when she left, when she took everybody out, we lost Mosul. Now we're fighting again to get Mosul. The problem with Mosul and what they wanted to do is they wanted to get the leaders of ISIS who they felt were in Mosul.

About three months ago, I started reading that they want to get the leaders and they're going to attack Mosul. Whatever happened to the element of surprise, OK? We announce we're going after Mosul. I have been reading about going after Mosul now for about—how long is it, Hillary, three months? These people have all left. They've all left.

The element of surprise. Douglas MacArthur, George Patton spinning in their graves when they see the stupidity of our country. So we're now fighting for Mosul, that we had. All she had to do was stay there, and now we're going in to get it.

But you know who the big winner in Mosul is going to be after we eventually get it? And the only reason they did it is because she's running for the office of president and they want to look tough. They want to look good. He violated the red line in the sand, and he made so many mistakes, made all mistakes. That's why we have the great migration. But she wanted to look good for the election. So they're going in.

But who's going to get Mosul, really? We'll take Mosul eventually. But the way—if you look at what's happening, much tougher than they thought. Much, much tougher. Much more dangerous. Going to be more deaths than they thought.

But the leaders that we wanted to get are all gone because they're smart. They say, what do we need this for? So Mosul is going to be a wonderful thing. And Iran should write us a letter of thank you, just like the really stupid—the stupidest deal of all time, a deal that's going to give Iran absolutely nuclear weapons. Iran should write us yet another letter saying thank you very much, because Iran, as I said many years ago, Iran is taking over Iraq, something they've wanted to do forever, but we've made it so easy for them.

So we're now going to take Mosul. And you know who's going to be the beneficiary? Iran. Oh, yeah, they're making—I mean, they are outsmarting—look, you're not there, you might be involved in that decision. But you were there when you took everybody out of Mosul and out of Iraq. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but you did vote for it. You shouldn't have been in Iraq, but once you were in Iraq, you should have never left the way.

The point is, the big winner is going to be Iran.

Wrong.

Wrong.

Wrong.

Chris, we don't gain anything.

Iran is taking over Iraq.

Iran is taking over Iraq. We don't gain anything.

We would've gained if they did it by surprise...

We would have gained if they did it by surprise.

No, you are the one that's unfit. You know, WikiLeaks just actually came out—John Podesta said some horrible things about you, and, boy, was he right. He said some beauties. And you know, Bernie Sanders, he said you have bad judgment. You do.

And if you think that going into Mosul after we let the world know we're going in, and all of the people that we really wanted—the leaders—they're all gone. If you think that was good, then you do. Now, John Podesta said you have terrible instincts. Bernie Sanders said you have bad judgment. I agree with both.

Which is a big mistake.

It's a catastrophe. I mean...

it's a mess.

Have you seen it? Have you seen it?

Have you seen what's happened to Aleppo?

OK, so it hasn't fallen. Take a look at it.

That's right. And they are being slaughtered...

because of bad decisions.

Well, Aleppo is a disaster. It's a humanitarian nightmare. But it has fallen from the—from any standpoint. I mean, what do you need, a signed document? Take a look at Aleppo. It is so sad when you see what's happened.

And a lot of this is because of Hillary Clinton, because what's happened is, by fighting Assad, who turned out to be a lot tougher than she thought, and now she's going to say, oh, he loves Assad, she's—he's just much tougher and much smarter than her and Obama. And everyone thought he was gone two years ago, three years ago. He—he aligned with Russia.

He now also aligned with Iran, who we made very powerful. We gave them \$150 billion back. We give them \$1.7 billion in cash. I mean, cash. Bundles of cash as big as this stage. We gave them \$1.7 billion. Now they have—he has aligned with Russia and with Iran. They don't want ISIS, but they have other things, because we're backing—we're backing rebels. We don't know who the rebels are. We're giving them lots of money, lots of everything. We don't know who the rebels are. And when and if—and it's not going to happen, because you have Russia and you have Iran now. But if they ever did overthrow Assad, you might end up with—as bad as Assad is, and he's a bad guy, but you may very well end up with worse than Assad.

If she did nothing, we'd be in much better shape. And this is what's caused the great migration, where she's taking in tens of thousands of Syrian refugees, who probably in many cases—not probably, who are definitely... in many cases, ISIS-aligned, and we now have them in our country, and wait until you see—this is going to be the great Trojan horse. And wait until you see what happens in the coming years. Lots of luck, Hillary. Thanks a lot for doing a great job.

But I just have to...

It's so ridiculous what she—she will defeat ISIS. We should have never let ISIS happen in the first place. And right now, they're in 32 countries.

We should have—wait one second. They had a cease-fire three weeks ago. A cease-fire, United States, Russia, and Syria. And during the cease-fire, Russia took over vast swatches of land, and then they said we don't want the cease-fire anymore.

We are so outplayed on missiles, on cease-fires. They are outplayed. Now, she wasn't there. I assume she had nothing to do with it. But our country is so outplayed by Putin and Assad, and by the way—and by Iran. Nobody can believe how stupid our leadership is.

Well, I say they're wrong, because I'm going to create tremendous jobs. And we're bringing GDP from, really, 1 percent, which is what it is now, and if she got in, it will be less than zero. But we're bringing it from 1 percent up to 4 percent. And I actually think we can go higher than 4 percent. I think you can go to 5 percent or 6 percent. And if we do, you don't have to bother asking your question, because we have a tremendous machine. We will have created a tremendous economic machine once again. To do that, we're taking back jobs. We're not going to let our companies be raided by other countries where we lose all our jobs, we don't make our product anymore. It's very sad. But I'm going to create a—the kind of a country that we were from the standpoint of industry. We used to be there. We've given it up. We've become very, very sloppy.

We've had people that are political hacks making the biggest deals in the world, bigger than companies. You take these big companies, these trade deals are far bigger than these companies, and yet we don't use our great leaders, many of whom back me and many of whom back Hillary, I must say. But we don't use those people. Those are the people—these are the greatest negotiators in the world. We have the greatest business people in the world. We have to use them to negotiate our trade deals.

We use political hacks. We use people that get the position because they gave—they made a campaign contribution and they're dealing with China and people that are very much smarter than they are. So we have to use our great people.

But that being said, we will create an economic machine the likes of which we haven't seen in many decades. And people, Chris, will again go back to work and they'll make a lot of money. And we'll have companies that will grow and expand and start from new.

Yeah, yeah, we've heard—we've heard this before, Hillary.

We've heard this before.

Thank you, Hillary. Could I just respond?

Because I did disagree with Ronald Reagan very strongly on trade. I disagreed with him. We should have been much tougher on trade even then. I've been waiting for years. Nobody does it right.

And frankly, now we're going to do it right.

I'm cutting taxes. We're going to grow the economy. It's going to grow at a record rate of growth.

No, it's going to totally help you. And one thing we have to do: Repeal and replace the disaster known as Obamacare. It's destroying our country. It's destroying our businesses, our small business and our big businesses. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

You take a look at the kind of numbers that that will cost us in the year '17, it is a disaster. If we don't repeal and replace—now, it's probably going to die of its own weight. But Obamacare has to go. It's—the premiums are going up 60 percent, 70 percent, 80 percent. Next year they're going to go up over 100 percent.

And I'm really glad that the premiums have started—at least the people see what's happening, because she wants to keep Obamacare and she wants to make it even worse, and it can't get any worse. Bad health care at the most expensive price. We have to repeal and replace Obamacare.

Such a nasty woman.

Your husband disagrees with you.

She's raising the money from the people she wants to control. Doesn't work that way.

But when I started this campaign, I started it very strongly. It's called "Make America Great Again." We're going to make America great. We have a depleted military. It has to be helped, has to be fixed. We have the greatest

people on Earth in our military. We don't take care of our veterans. We take care of illegal immigrants, people that come into the country illegally, better than we take care of our vets. That can't happen. Our policemen and women are disrespected. We need law and order, but we need justice, too. Our inner cities are a disaster. You get shot walking to the store. They have no education. They have no jobs. I will do more for African-Americans and Latinos than she can ever do in 10 lifetimes. All she's done is talk to the African-Americans and to the Latinos, but they get the vote, and then they come back, they say, we'll see you in four years. We are going to make America strong again, and we are going to make America great again, and it has to start now. We cannot take four more years of Barack Obama, and that's what you get when you get her.

Trump_4

September 29th, 2020

Thank you very much, Chris. I will tell you very simply. We won the election. Elections have consequences. We have the Senate, we have the White House, and we have a phenomenal nominee respected by all. Top, top academic, good in every way. Good in every way. In fact, some of her biggest endorsers are very liberal people from Notre Dame and other places. So I think she's going to be fantastic. We have plenty of time. Even if we did it after the election itself. I have a lot of time after the election, as you know. So I think that she will be outstanding. She's going to be as good as anybody that has served on that court. We really feel that. We have a professor at Notre Dame, highly respected by all, said she's the single greatest student he's ever had. He's been a professor for a long time at a great school.

And we won the election and therefore we have the right to choose her, and very few people knowingly would say otherwise. And by the way, the Democrats, they wouldn't even think about not doing it. The only difference is they'd try and do it faster. There's no way they would give it up. They had Merrick Garland, but the problem is they didn't have the election so they were stopped. And probably that would happen in reverse, also. Definitely would happen in reverse. So we won the election and we have the right to do it, Chris.

Thank you, Joe.

There aren't a hundred million people with pre-existing conditions. As far as a say is concerned, the people already had their say. Okay, Justice Ginsburg said very powerfully, very strongly, at some point 10 years ago or so, she said a President and the Senate is elected for a period of time, but a President is elected for four years. We're not elected for three years. I'm not elected for three years. So we have the Senate, we have a President- During that period of time, during that period of time, we have an opening. I'm not elected for three years. I'm elected for four years. Joe, the hundred million people is totally wrong. I don't know where you got that number. The bigger problem that you have is that you're going to extinguish 180 million people with their private health care, that they're very happy this.

Well, you're certainly going to socialist. You're going to socialist medicine-

That's not what you've said and it's not what your party is saying.

Your party doesn't say it. Your party wants to go socialist medicine and socialist healthcare.

And they're going to dominate you, Joe. You know that.

Not according to Harris.

Joe, you've had 308,000 military people dying because you couldn't provide them proper healthcare in the military. So don't tell me about this.

And if you were here, it wouldn't be 200, it would be two million people because you were very late on the draw. You didn't want me to ban China, which was heavily infected. You didn't want me to ban Europe.

You would have been much later, Joe, much later.

We're talking about two million people.

You don't know what's on the ballot. Why is it on the ballot? Why is it on the ballot? It's not on the ballot.

I don't think so.

There's nothing happening there.

You don't know her view on Roe V. Wade? You don't know her view.

Because they want to give good healthcare.

Yes, I have. Of course, I have. The individual mandate.

Excuse me. I got rid of the individual mandate, which was a big chunk of Obamacare.

That is absolutely a big thing. That was the worst part of Obamacare.

Chris, that was the worst part of Obamacare.

Well, I'll ask Joe. The individual mandate was the most unpopular aspect of Obamacare.

I got rid of it. And we will protect people.

Go ahead.

Well, first of all, I guess I'm debating you, not him, but that's okay. I'm not surprised. Let me just tell you something. There's nothing symbolic. I'm cutting drug prices. I'm going with Favored Nations, which no

President has the courage to do because you're going against big pharma. Drug prices will be coming down 80 or 90%. You could have done it during your 47 year period in government, but you didn't do it. Nobody's done it. So we're cutting healthcare.

All of the things that we've done.

I'll give you an example. Insulin, it was destroying families, destroying people, the cost. I'm getting it for so cheap it's like water, you want to know the truth. So cheap. Take a look at all of the drugs that what we're doing. Prescription drug prices, we're going to allow our Governors now to go to other countries to buy drugs because when they paid just a tiny fraction of what we do.

This is big stuff.

That's not what your party says, by the way.

Joe, you agreed with Bernie Sanders, who's far left, on the manifesto, we call it. And that gives you socialized medicine.

Are you saying you didn't agree?

Not by much.

Not by much.

If Pocahontas would have left two days early you would have lost every primary.

On Super Tuesday, you got very lucky.

With what?

With what?

But you agree. Joe, you're the liar. You graduated last in your class not first in your class.

You'd be surprised. You'd be surprised. Go ahead, Joe.

Listen, you agreed with Bernie Sanders and the manifesto.

He just lost the left.

You just lost the left. You agreed with Bernie Sanders on a plan that you absolutely agreed to and under that plan, they call it socialized medicine.

Who is, Bernie?

No, I want to give them better healthcare at a much lower price, because Obamacare is no good.

I've already fixed it.

We've already fixed it to an extent. Obamacare, as you might know but probably don't, Obamacare is no good.

Obamacare is no good. We made it better and I had a choice to make very early on. We took away the individual mandate. We guaranteed pre-existing conditions, but took away the individual mandate. Listen, this is the way it is. And that destroyed ... They shouldn't even call it Obamacare, then I had a choice to make, do I let my people run it really well or badly? If I run it badly, they'll probably blame him, but they'll blame me. But more importantly, I want to help people. Okay. I said, "You've got to run it so well." And I just had a meeting with them. They said the problem is, no matter how well you run Obamacare, it's a disaster. It's too expensive. Premiums are too high, that it doesn't work. So we do want to get rid of it. Chris, we want to get rid of that and give something that's cheaper and better.

Go ahead.

Good.

Of course, we do.

Are you going to pack the court?

Are you going to pack the court?

He doesn't want to answer the question.

Why wouldn't you answer that question? You want to put a lot of new Supreme Court Justices. Radical left.

Listen, who is on your list, Joe? Who's on your list?

He's going to pack the court. He is not going to give a list.

The people understand, Joe.

47 years, you've done nothing. They're understand.

Wrong.

Wrong.

It's so wrong.

So, if we would have listened to you.

If we would've listened to you, the country would have been left wide open, millions of people would have died, not 200,000. And one person is too much. It's China's fault. It should have never happened. They stopped it from going in, but it was China's fault. And, by the way, when you talk about numbers, you don't know how many people died in China. You don't know how many people died in Russia. You don't know how many people died in India. They don't exactly give you a straight count, just so you understand. But if you look at what we've done, I closed it and you said, "He's xenophobic. He's a racist and he's xenophobic," because you didn't think I should have closed our country. Wait a minute.

You didn't think we should have closed our country because you thought it was terrible. You wouldn't have closed it for another two months. By my doing it early, in fact, Dr. Fauci said, "President Trump saved thousands of lives." Many of your Democrat Governors said, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We worked with

the Governor. Oh really, go take a look. The Governors said I did a phenomenal job. Most of them said that. In fact, people that would not be necessarily on my side said that, "President Trump did a phenomenal job." We did. We got the gowns. We got the masks. We made the ventilators. You wouldn't have made ventilators. And now we're weeks away from a vaccine. We're doing therapeutics already. Fewer people are dying when they get sick. Far fewer people are dying. We've done a great job.

The only thing I haven't done a good job, and that's because of the fake news, no matter what you say to them, they give you a bad press on it. It's just fake news. They give you good press, they give me bad press because that's the way it is, unfortunately. But let me just say something. I don't care. I've gotten used to it. But I'll tell you, Joe, you could never have done the job that we did. You don't have it in your blood. You could've never done that, Joe.

Well, you didn't do very well in Swine Flu. H1-N1, you were a disaster. Your own Chief of Staff said you were a disaster.

A far less lethal disease, by the way.

We would have lost far more people, far more people. You would have been months late. You're months behind me, Joe.

You don't trust Johnson & Johnson, Pfizer?

Well, I've spoken to the companies and we can have it a lot sooner. It's a very political thing because people like this would rather make it political than save lives.

It is a very political thing. I've spoken to Pfizer, I've spoken to all of the people that you have to speak to, Moderna, Johnson & Johnson, and others. They can go faster than that by a lot. It's become very political because the left... Or I don't know if I call them left, I don't know what I call them.

I disagree with him. No, I disagree with both of them. And he didn't say that. He said it could be there, but it could also be much sooner. I had him in my office two days ago.

Because he said it's a possibility that we'll have the answer before November 1st. It could also be after that.

Well, we're going to deliver it right away. We have the military all set up. Logistically, they're all set up. We have our military that delivers soldiers and they can do 200,000 a day. They're going to be delivering-

It's all set up.

That was said sarcastically, and you know that. That was said sarcastically.

You'll have the vaccine sooner than that.

We spoke to the scientists that are in charge-

... they will have the vaccine very soon.

Did you use the word smart? So you said you went to Delaware State, but you forgot the name of your college. You didn't go to Delaware State. You graduated either the lowest or almost the lowest in your class. Don't ever use the word smart with me. Don't ever use that word.

Because you know what? There's nothing smart about you, Joe. 47 years you've done nothing.

Let me just tell you something, Joe. If you would have had the charge of what I was put through, I had to close the greatest economy of the history of our country. And by the way, now it's being built again and it's going up fast.

Okay. It's going up fast. I look forward to talking about it.

Tell that to Nancy Pelosi.

Tell that to Nancy Pelosi, and Schumer Chuck.

You probably play more than I do, Joe.

Well, he wants to shut down this country and I want to keep it open, and we did a great thing by shutting it down-

Wait a minute, Joe. Let me shut you down for a second, Joe, just for one second. He wants to shut down the country. We just went through it. We had to, because we didn't know anything about the disease. Now we've found that elderly people with heart problems and diabetes and different problems are very, very vulnerable. We learned a lot. Young children aren't, even younger people aren't. We've learned a lot, but he wants to shut it down. More people will be hurt by continuing. If you look at Pennsylvania, if you look at certain states that have been shut down, they have Democrat governors, all, one of the reasons they shut down is because they want to keep it shut down until after the election on November 3rd.

Because it's a political thing.

Those states are not doing well that are shut down right now.

He wants to shut down the whole country.

No, I think masks are okay. You have to understand, if you look... I mean, I have a mask right here. I put a mask on when I think I need it. Tonight, as an example, everybody's had a test and you've had social distancing and all of the things that you have to, but I wear masks-

... when needed. When needed, I wear masks.

I don't wear a mask like him. Every time you see him, he's got a mask. He could be speaking 200 feet away from him and he shows up with the biggest mask I've ever seen. I will say this-

And they've also said the opposite. They've also said-

Dr. Fauci. Dr. Fauci said the opposite.

He said very strongly, "Masks are not good." Then he changed his mind. He said, "Masks are good."

I'm okay with masks. I'm not fighting masks.

Outside.

Because nobody will show up.

Well, it's true. Nobody shows up to his rallies.

Because people want to hear what I have to say. I mean-

... I'm doing my job as a president, and I'll have 25, 35,000 people show up at airports. We use airports and hangers and we have a lot of people-

Well, so far we have had no problem whatsoever. It's outside. That's a big difference according to the experts. We do them outside, we have tremendous crowds, as you see, and literally on 24 hours notice. And Joe does the circles and has three people someplace.

We've had no negative effect.

We've had no negative effect, and we've had 35, 40,000 people at these rallies.

If you could get the crowds, you would have done the same thing. But you can't. Nobody cares.

No cares.

Yes.

Much faster.

So we built the greatest economy in history. We closed it down because of the China plague. When the plague came in, we closed it down, which was very hard psychologically to do. He didn't think we should close it down and he was wrong. Again, two million people would be dead now instead of... Still, 204,000 people is too much. One person is too much. Should have never happened from China. But what happened is we closed it down and now we're reopening and we're doing record business. We had 10.4 million people in a four month period that we've put back into the workforce. That's a record the likes of which nobody's ever seen before. And he wants to close down the... He will shut it down again. He will destroy this country.

A lot of people, between drugs and alcohol and depression, when you start shutting it down, you take a look at what's happening at some of your Democrat-run states where they have these tough shutdowns. And I'm telling you it's because they don't want to open it. One of them came out last week, you saw that, "Oh, we're going to open up on November 9th." Why November 9th? Because it's after the election. They think they're hurting us by keeping them closed. They're hurting people. People know what to do. They can social distance. They can wash their hands, they can wear masks. They can do whatever they want, but they got to open these states up.

When you look at North Carolina, when you look, and these governors are under siege, Pennsylvania, Michigan, and a couple of others, you got to open these states up. It's not fair. You're talking about almost it's like being in prison. And you look at what's going on with divorce, look at what's going on with alcoholism and drugs. It's a very, very sad thing. And he'll close down the whole country. This guy will close down the whole country and destroy our country. Our country is coming back incredibly well, setting records as it does it. We don't need somebody to come in and say, "Let's shut it down."

That's wrong.

I have to respond to that.

Excuse me, he made a statement.

No, people want their schools open. They don't want to be shut down. They don't want their state shut down. They want their restaurants. I look at New York. It's so sad what's happening in New York. It's almost like a ghost town, and I'm not sure it can ever recover what they've done to New York. People want their places open. They want to get back to their lives.

They'll be careful, but they want their schools open.

I'm the one that brought back football. By the way, I brought back Big Ten football. It was me and I'm very happy to do it-

... and people of Ohio are very proud of me. And you know how I found out?

I paid millions of dollars in taxes, millions of dollars of income tax. And let me just tell you, there was a story in one of the papers that paid-

I paid \$38 million one year, I paid \$27 million one year.

You'll see it as soon as it's finished, you'll see it. You know, if you wanted to, go to the Board of Elections. There's 118 page or so report that says everything I have, every bank I have, I'm totally under leveraged because the assets are extremely good, and I built a great company.

But let me tell you-

Let me-

Millions of dollars.

Millions of dollars, yes.

Millions of dollars. And you'll get to see it. And you'll get to see it.

But let me just tell you-

Chris, let me just say something, that it was the tax laws. I don't want to pay tax. Before I came here, I was a private developer, I was a private business people. Like every other private person, unless they're stupid, they go through the laws, and that's what it is. He passed a tax bill that gave us all these privileges for depreciation and

for tax credits. We build the building and we get tax credits, like the hotel on Pennsylvania Avenue. Which by the way, was given to me by the Obama administration, if you can believe that. Now the man got fired right after that happened, but that's-

That's okay.

But why didn't you do it over the last 25 years?

Why didn't you do it over the last 25 years?

You were a Senator and

Hey, Joe, let me just tell you, Joe. In 47 months, I've done more than you've done in 47 years, Joe. We've done things that you never even thought of doing.

Including fixing the broken military that you gave me, including taking care of your debts.

He has none.

Why didn't you do it before, when you were vice president with Obama?

I got it done. And you know what happened?

Our economy boomed like it's never boomed before.

Excuse me.

They had the slowest economic recovery since 1929. It was the slowest recovery. Also, they took over something that was down here. All you had to do is turn on the lights and you pick up a lot. But they had the slowest economic recovery since 1929, and let me tell you about the stock market. When the stock market goes up, that means jobs. It also means 401ks. If you got in, if you ever became president with your ideas, you want to terminate my taxes. I'll tell you what, you'll lose. Half of the companies that have poured in here will leave. And plenty of companies that are already here, they'll leave for other places.

They will leave and you will have a depression, the likes of which you've never seen.

It wasn't blooming.

He was in booming. It was the weakest recovery since 1929.

When COVID came along.

Excuse me, Chris, wait.

Chris.

They said it would take... No, you're on number two.

Chris, Chris. They said it would take-

... a miracle to bring back manufacturing. I brought back 700,000 jobs. They brought back nothing. They gave up on manufacturing.

... standard fare.

He totally gave up on manufacturing.

Ohio had the best year it's ever had last year. Michigan had the best year they've ever had.

Many car companies came in from Germany, from Japan, went to Michigan, went to Ohio and they didn't come in with you.

China ate your lunch-

China ate your lunch, Joe. And no wonder your son goes in and he takes out billions of dollars. He takes out billions of dollars to manage. He makes millions of dollars. And also, while we're at it, why is it just out of curiosity, the mayor of Moscow's wife gave you a son three and a half million dollars?

What did he do to deserve it? What did he do with-

... to deserve \$183,000?

Oh really, he didn't get three and a half million?

Well wait, he didn't get three and a half million dollars, Joe?

He got three and a half million-

... dollars.

Oh, really?

It's a fact.

Did Burisma pay him 183,000 a month, with no experience in energy?

I think he did.

By who?

The media.

By the media, because they refuse to talk about it-

... because they're embarrassed.

So let me ask you this, Joe-

He got three and a half million dollars from Moscow.

Oh, really?

I'll fire them.

Some people don't do a good job.

Hey, let me just tell you, Joe-

Three and a half million, Joe.

Why did he deserve three and a half million from Moscow?

My family-
My family lost a fortune by coming down and helping us with governance.
Every single one of them lost a fortune-
Chris, can I be honest? It's a very important question-
He stood up-
... and the threatened Ukraine-
... with a billion dollars-
Well, and him too.
Well, that's all right, but he does plenty.
He does plenty.
Oh yeah, sure.
That's true.
So-

You did a crime bill, 1994, where you call them super predators. African-Americans are s
So you did that and they call you a super predator and I'm letting people out of jail now, that you have treated the African-American population community, you have treated the black community about as bad as anybody in this country. You did the 1990... And that's why, if you look at the polls, I'm doing better than any Republican has done in a long time, because they saw what you did. You call them super predators, and you've called them worse than that. Because you look back at your testimony over the years, you've called them a lot worse than that. As far as the church is concerned and as far as the generals are concerned, we just got the support of 250 military leaders and generals, total support. Law enforcement, almost every law enforcement group in the United States. I have Florida. I have Texas. I have Ohio. I have every... Excuse me, Portland, the sheriff just came out today and he said, "I support President Trump."uper predators and they've never forgotten it. They've never forgotten it.

So you did that and they call you a super predator and I'm letting people out of jail now, that you have treated the African-American population community, you have treated the black community about as bad as anybody in this country. You did the 1990... And that's why, if you look at the polls, I'm doing better than any Republican has done in a long time, because they saw what you did. You call them super predators, and you've called them worse than that. Because you look back at your testimony over the years, you've called them a lot worse than that. As far as the church is concerned and as far as the generals are concerned, we just got the support of 250 military leaders and generals, total support. Law enforcement, almost every law enforcement group in the United States. I have Florida. I have Texas. I have Ohio. I have every... Excuse me, Portland, the sheriff just came out today and he said, "I support President Trump."

finger, Joe, to a point where you don't want to say anything about law and order. And I'll tell you what, the people of this country want and demand law and order and you're afraid to even say it.

What is peaceful protest? When they run through the middle of the town-
... and burn down your stores and kill people all over the place-
No it's not, but you say it is.

Fine.

I ended it because it's racist. I ended it because a lot of people were complaining that they were asked to do things that were absolutely insane. That it a radical revolution that was taking place in our military, in our schools, all over the place. And you know it, and so does everybody else. And he would know it-

If you were a certain person, you had no status in life. It was sort of a reversal. And if you look at the people, we were paying people hundreds of thousands of dollars to teach very bad ideas and frankly, very sick ideas. And really, they were teaching people to hate our country And I'm not going to do that. I'm not going to allow that to happen. We have to go back to the core values of this country. They were teaching people that our country is a horrible place. It's a racist place. And they were teaching people to hate our country. And I'm not going to allow that to happen.

You just don't know.

During the Obama-Biden administration, there was tremendous division. There was hatred. You look at Ferguson, you look at, or you go to very... Many places, look at Oakland. Look what happened in Oakland. Look what happened in Baltimore. Look what happened... Frankly, it was more violent than what I'm even seeing now.

But the reason-

... is that the Democrats that run these cities-
... don't want to talk, like you, about law and order.

And you still haven't mentioned. Are you in favor of law and order?

Are you in favor of law and order?

Okay.

It went down much more in ours.

The places we had trouble were democratic run cities-

I think as a party issue, you can bring in a couple of examples but if you look at Chicago, what's going on in Chicago where a 53 people were shot and eight died shot, if you look at New York where it's going up, like

nobody's ever seen anything. The numbers are going up a 100%, 150%, 200% crime, it is crazy what's going on and he doesn't want to say law and order because he can't because he'll lose his radical left supporters and once he does that, it's over with. But if he ever got to run this country and they ran it the way he would want to run it, we would have by the way our suburbs would be gone. And you would see problems like you've never seen before.

Oh, I know suburbs so much that you.

That's not what they are talking about this. That's not what it is about. He's talking about defunding the police.

He doesn't have any law support. He has no law enforcement.

He has almost nothing. Oh, really, who do you have name one group that supports you name one group that came out and supported you. Go ahead. Think we have time.

No, no think right now.

Name one law enforcement group that came out in support of you.

There aren't any.

He's never done that.

Oh really? I sent in the US Marshalls to get the killer of a young man in the middle of the street and they shot him for three days Portland didn't do anything. I sent in the US Marshals they took care of business.

I don't know who said that.

Who?

I don't think she said that.

I don't think so.

Does it mean I have to answer his stuff.

Wait a second, you have made a statement.

I would love to end it.

I'll send in the National Guard, it would be over. That'd be no problem. But I don't want to accept the National Guard.

Sure, I'm will to do that.

I would say almost everything I see is from the left wing not from the right wing.

I'm willing to do anything. I want to see peace.

What do you want to call them? Give me a name, give me a name, go ahead who do you want me to condemn.

Proud Boys, stand back and stand by. But I'll tell you what somebody's got to do something about Antifa and the left because this is not a right wing problem this is a left wing...

Oh you got to be kidding me.

Well, then you know what, he's wrong.

Antifa is bad.

You know what, Antifa is a dangerous radical group.

And you ought to be careful of them, they'll over throw you.

Because there is never been an administration or president who has done more than I've done in a period of three and a half years. And that's despite the impeachment hoax and you so what happened today with Hillary Clinton, where it was a whole big con job. But despite going through all of these things where I had a fight, both flanks and behind me and above there has never been an administration that's done what I've done. The greatest, before COVID came in the greatest economy in history, lowest unemployment numbers, everything was good. Everything was going.

And by the way, there was unity going to happen. People were calling me for the first time in years, they were calling and they were saying it's time maybe and then what happened? We got hit. But now we're building it back up again. A rebuilding of the military, including Space Force and all of the other things. A fixing of the VA which was a mess under him, 308,000 people died because they didn't have proper health care. It was a mess. And we now got a 91% approval rating at the VA, our vets. We take care of our vets. But we've rebuilt our military. And I'll tell you something, some people say maybe the most important by the end of the first term I'll have approximately 300 Federal judges and Court of Appeals judges, 300 and hopefully three great Supreme Court judges, justices that is a record the likes of which very few people and one of the reasons I'll have so many judges because President Obama and him left me 128 judges to fill.

When you leave office, you don't leave any judges. That's like, you just don't do that. They left 128 openings and if I were a member of his party, because they have a little different philosophy, I'd say, if you left us 128 openings you can't be a good president. You can't be a good vice president but I want to thank you because it gives us almost, it'll probably be above that number. By the end of this term, 300 judges. It's a record.

You son got three and a half million dollars.

Really?

Are you talking Hunter, are you talking about Hunter.

I don't know Beau. I know Hunter. Hunter got thrown out of the military. He was thrown out dishonorably discharged.

For cocaine use. And he didn't have a job until you became vice president.

Once you became vice president he made a fortune in Ukraine, in China, in Moscow and various other places.

He made a fortune and he didn't have a job.

But why was he given tens of millions of dollars?

I know but when somebody gets three and a half million dollars from the Mayor of Moscow.

Why did he get it?

I want crystal clean water and air. I want beautiful clean air. We have now the lowest carbon... If you look at our numbers right now, we are doing phenomenally. But I haven't destroyed our businesses. Our businesses aren't put out of commission. If you look at the Paris Accord, it was a disaster from our standpoint. And people are actually very happy about what's going on because our businesses are doing well. As far as the fires are concerned, you need forest management. In addition to everything else, the forest floors are loaded up with trees, dead trees that are years old and they're like tinder and leaves and everything else. You drop a cigarette in there the whole forest burns down. You've got to have forest management.

I believe that we have to do everything we can to have immaculate air immaculate water and do whatever else we can that's good. We're planting a billion trees, the Billion Tree Project and it's very exciting for a lot of people.

I think a lot of things do, but I think to an extent, yes. I think to an extent, yes, but I also think we have to do better management of our forest. Every year I get the call. California's burning, California's burning. If that was cleaned, if that were, if you had forest management, good forest management, you wouldn't be getting those calls. In Europe, they live they're forest cities. They call forest cities. They maintain their forest. They manage their forest. I was with the head of a major country, it's a forest city. He said, "Sir, we have trees that are far more, they ignite much easier than California. There shouldn't be that problem." I spoke with the Governor about it. I'm getting along very well with the governor. But I said, "At some point you can't every year have hundreds of thousands of acres of land just burned to the ground." That's burning down because of a lack of management.

Because it was driving energy prices through the sky.

Well, not really because what's happening is the car is much less expensive and it's a much safer car and you talk it about a tiny difference. And then what would happen because of the cost of the car you would have at least double and triple the number of cars purchased. We have the old slugs out there that are 10, 12 years old. If you did that, the car would be safer. It would be much cheaper by \$3,500.

No, but you would take a lot of cars off the market because people would be able to afford a car. Now, by the way, we're going to see how that turns out. But a lot of people agree with me, many people. The car has gotten so expensive because they have computers all over the place for an extra little bit of gasoline. And I'm okay with electric cars too. I think I'm all for electric cars. I've given big incentives for electric cars but what they've done in California is just crazy.

Not true. Not true-

He's talking about the Green New Deal. And it's not 2 billion or 20 billion, as you said. It's \$100 trillion.

And rebuild the building.

It's the dumbest-

... most ridiculous where two car systems are out-

... where they want to take out the cows too.

That's not true either, right?

This is a 100 trillion-

That's more money than our country could make in 100 years

100 million dollars.

I never said that at all-

They made it up.

You make up a lot-

Wait a minute, Chris. So why didn't he do it for 47 years? You were vice president-

So why didn't you get the world... China sends up real dirt into the air. Russia does. India does. They all do.

We're supposed to be good. And by the way, he made a couple of statements. The Green New Deal is a hundred trillion dollars.

He made a statement about the military. He said I said something about the military. He and his friends made it up, and then they went with it. I never said it.

He called the military stupid bastards.

He said it on tape.

I would never say that

You're on tape-

Oh, you don't? Oh, well, that's a big statement.

You just lost the radical left.

So when I listen to Joe talking about a transition, there has been no transition from when I won. I won that election. And if you look at crooked Hillary Clinton, if you look at all of the different people, there was no transition, because they came after me trying to do a coup. They came after me spying on my campaign.

They started from the day I won, and even before I won. From the day I came down the escalator with our first lady, they were a disaster. They were a disgrace to our country, and we've caught them. We've caught them all.

We've got it all on tape. We've caught them all. And by the way, you gave the idea for the Logan Act against General Flynn. You better take a look at that, because we caught you in a sense, and President Obama was sitting in the office.

He knew about it too. So don't tell me about a free transition. As far as the ballots are concerned, it's a disaster. A solicited ballot, okay, solicited, is okay. You're soliciting. You're asking. They send it back. You send it back. I did that. If you have an unsolicited... They're sending millions of ballots all over the country. There's fraud. They found them in creeks. They found some, just happened to have the name Trump just the other day in a wastepaper basket. They're being sent all over the place. They sent two in a Democrat area. They sent out a thousand ballots. Everybody got two ballots. This is going to be a fraud like you've never seen. The other thing, it's nice. On November 3rd, you're watching, and you see who won the election. And I think we're going to do well because people are really happy with the job we've done.

But you know what? We won't know. We might not know for months because these ballots are going to be all over. Take a look at what happened in Manhattan. Take a look at what happened in New Jersey. Take a look at what happened in Virginia and other places. They're not losing 2%, 1%, which by the way is too much. An election could be won or lost with that. They're losing 30 and 40%. It's a fraud, and it's a shame. And can you imagine where they say, "You have to have your ballot in by November 10th." November 10th. That's seven days after the election, in theory, should have been announced. We have major states with that-

... all run by Democrats-

All run by Democrats.

It's a rigged election.

Yeah. I think I'm counting on them to look at the ballots, definitely. I hope we don't need them, in terms of the election itself. But for the ballots, I think so, because what's happening is incredible. I read today where at least 1% of the ballots for 2016 were invalidated. They take them. We don't like them. We don't like them. They throw them out-

... left and right.

What you do is you go and vote. You do a solicited ballot, and that's okay-

You go and vote. You go and vote-

You either do, Chris, a solicited ballot, where you're sending it in, they're sending it back and you're sending. They have mailmen with lots of it. Did you see what's going on? Take a look at West Virginia, mailman selling the ballots. They're being sold. They're being dumped in rivers. This is a horrible thing for our country.

This is not going to end well.

This is not going to end well-

You're wrong. You're wrong. I love counting the votes.

Chris, he's so wrong when he makes a statement like that-

Excuse me

You know it can't be done. You know it can't, and already, there's been fraud

Could be months-

I'm urging my supporters to go in to the polls and watch very carefully, because that's what has to happen. I am urging them to do it. As you know, today there was a big problem. In Philadelphia, they went in to watch. They're called poll watchers, a very safe, very nice thing. They were thrown out. They weren't allowed to watch. You know why? Because bad things happen in Philadelphia. Bad things. And I am urging my people. I hope it's going to be a fair election. If it's a fair election-

... I am 100% on board. But if I see tens of thousands of ballots being manipulated, I can't go along with that.

And I'll tell you why-

... from a common sense-

I'll tell you what it means-

It means you have a fraudulent election. You're sending out 80 million ballots-

They're not equipped... These people aren't equipped to handle it, number one. Number two, they cheat. They cheat. Hey, they found ballots in a wastepaper basket three days ago, and they all had the name military ballots. There were military. They all had the name Trump on them.

You think that's good?

It's already been established. Take a look at Carolyn Maloney's race-

I want to see an honest ballot cut-

I want to see an honest ballot count.

And I think he does too-

Trump_5

October 22nd, 2020

How are you doing? How are you?

So as you know, 2.2 million people modeled out, were expected to die. We closed up the greatest economy in the world in order to fight this horrible disease that came from China. It's a worldwide pandemic. It's all over the world. You see the spikes in Europe and many other places right now. If you notice, the mortality rate is down 85%. The excess mortality rate is way down and much lower than almost any other country. And we're fighting it and we're fighting it hard. There is a spike. There was a spike in Florida and it's now gone.

There was a very big spike in Texas. It's now gone. There was a very big spike in Arizona. It's now gone. And there was some spikes and surges and other places, they will soon be gone. We have a vaccine that's coming. It's ready. It's going to be announced within weeks. And it's going to be delivered. We have Operation Warp Speed, which is the military is going to distribute the vaccine.

I can tell you from personal experience, I was in the hospital. I had it and I got better. And I will tell you that I had something that they gave me, a therapeutic, I guess they would call it. Some people could say it was a cure, but I was in for a short period of time. And I got better very fast or I wouldn't be here tonight. And now they say I'm immune. Whether it's four months or a lifetime, nobody's been able to say that, but I'm immune. More and more people are getting better. We have a problem that's a worldwide problem. This is a worldwide problem, but I've been congratulated by the heads of many countries on what we've been able to do. If you take a look at what we've done in terms of goggles and masks and gowns and everything else, and in particular ventilators we're now making ventilators all over the world, thousands and thousands a month distributing them all over the world. It will go away. And as I say, we're rounding the turn. We're rounding the corner. It's going away.

No, it's not a guarantee, but it will be by the end of the year. But I think it has a good chance. There are two companies, I think within a matter of weeks and it will be distributed very quickly.

Johnson & Johnson is doing very well. Moderna is doing very well. Pfizer is doing very well and we have numerous others. Then we also have others that we're working on very closely with other countries, in particular Europe.

No, I think my timeline is going to be more accurate. I don't know that they're counting on the military the way I do, but we have our generals lined up, one in particular that's the head of logistics and this is a very easy distribution for him. He's ready to go. As soon as we have the vaccine and we expect to have a 100 million vials. As soon as we have the vaccine, he's ready to go.

I don't think we're going to have a dark winter at all. We're opening up our country. We've learned and studied and understand the disease, which we didn't at the beginning. When I closed and banned China from coming in heavily infected and then ultimately Europe, but China was in January. Months later, he was saying I was xenophobic. I did it too soon. Now he's saying, "Oh, I should have moved quicker," but he didn't move quicker. He was months behind me, many months behind me.

And frankly, he ran the H1N1 swine flu and it was a total disaster. Far less lethal, but it was a total disaster. Had that had this kind of numbers, 700,000 people would be dead right now, but it was a far less lethal disease. Look, his own person who ran that for him, who, as you know, was his chief of staff said, "It was catastrophic. It was horrible. We didn't know what we were doing." Now he comes up and he tells us how to do this.

Also, everything that he said about the way every single move that he said we should make, that's what we've done. We've done all of it. But he was way behind us.

I didn't say over soon. I say we're learning to live with it. We have no choice. We can't lock ourselves up in a basement like Joe does. He has the ability to lock himself up. I don't know. He's obviously made a lot of money someplace, but he has this thing about living in a basement. People can't do that. By the way I as the president couldn't do that. I'd love to put myself in the basement or in a beautiful room in the White House and go away for a year and a half until it disappears. I can't do that.

And Kirsten, every meeting I had, every meeting I had and I'd meet a lot of families, including gold star families and military families. Every meeting I had and I had to meet them, I had to. It would be horrible to have canceled everything. I said, "This is dangerous and you catch it." And I caught it. I learned a lot. I learned a lot. Great doctors, great hospitals. And now I recovered. 99.9 of young people recover. 99% of people recover. We have to recover-

99% of people recover. We have to recover. We can't close up our nation. We have to open our school and we can't close up our nation, or you're not going to have a nation.

Excuse me. I take full responsibility. It's not my fault that it came here. It's China's fault. And you know what? It's not Joe's fault that it came here either. It's China's fault. They kept it from going into the rest of China for the most part, but they didn't keep it from coming out to the world, including Europe and ourselves.

Look, perhaps just to finish this, I was kidding on that, but just to finish this, when I closed he said I shouldn't have closed. And that went on for months. Nancy Pelosi said the same thing. She was dancing on the streets in Chinatown, in San Francisco. But when I closed, he said, "This is a terrible thing, you xenophobic." I think he called me racist even, because I was closing it to China. Now he says I should have closed it earlier. Joe, it doesn't.

You certainly did. You certainly did.

He thought I shouldn't have closed the border, that's obvious.

I think we have to respond, if I might.

Thank you, and I appreciate that. Look, all he does is talk about shut downs. But forget about him. His Democrat Governors, Cuomo in New York, you look at what's going on in California, you look at Pennsylvania, North Carolina, Democrats, Democrats all, they're shut down so tight and they're dying. They're dying. And he supports all these people. All he talks about is shut downs. No, we're not going to shut down. And we have to open our schools. And it's like, as an example, I have a young son, he also tested positive. By the time I spoke to the doctor the second time, he was fine. It just went away. Young people, I guess, it's their immune system.

I want to open the schools. The transmittal rate to the teachers is very small. But I want to open the schools. We have to open our country. We're not going to have a country. You can't do this. We can't keep this country closed. This is a massive country with a massive economy. People are losing their jobs. They're committing suicide. There's depression, alcohol, drugs at a level that nobody's ever seen before. There's abuse, tremendous abuse. We have to open our country. I've said it often, the cure cannot be worse than the problem itself, and that's what's happening. And he wants to close down. He'll close down the country if one person in our massive bureaucracy says we should close it down.

By the way, I will say this, If you go and look at what's happened to New York, it's a ghost town. It's a ghost town. And when you talk about plexiglass, these are restaurants that had dying. These are businesses with no money. Putting up plexiglass is unbelievably expensive, and it's not the answer. I mean, you're going to sit there in a cubicle wrapped around with plastic. These are businesses that are dying, Joe. You can't do that to people. You just can't. Take a look at New York and what's happened to my wonderful city. For so many years, I loved it. It was vibrant. It's dying. Everyone's leaving New York.

Kristen, New York has lost more than 40,000 people, 11,000 people in nursing homes.

When you say spike, take a look at what's happening in Pennsylvania where they've had it closed. Take a look at what's happening with your friend in Michigan, where her husband's the only one allowed to do anything. It's been like a prison. Now, it was just ruled unconstitutional. Take a look at North Carolina, they're having spikes and they've been closed, and they're getting killed financially. We can't let that happen, Joe. You can't let that happen. We have to open up. And we understand the disease. We have to protect our seniors. We have to protect our elderly. We have to protect especially our seniors with heart problems and diabetes problems. And we will protect. We have the best testing in the world by far. That's why we have so many cases.

I'm listening to all of them, including Anthony. I get along very well with Anthony.

... think to all of them, including Anthony. I get along very well with Anthony, but he did say, "Don't wear masks." He did say, as you know, "This is not going to be a problem." I think he's a Democrat, but that's okay. He said, "This is not going to be a problem. We are not going to have a problem at all." When Joe says that I said, Anthony Fauci said, and others, and many others. And I'm not knocking him, nobody knew, nobody knew what this thing was. Nobody knew where it was coming from, what it was. We've learned a lot. But Anthony said "Don't wear masks," now he wants to wear masks. Anthony also said, if you look back, exact words, here's his exact words. "This is no problem. This is going to go away soon." So he's allowed to make mistakes. He happens to be a good person.

Well, this is what I-

I don't know. Somebody went through Wall Street. You're the one that takes all the money from Wall Street. I don't take it.

Joe, you have raised a lot of money, tremendous amounts of money. And every time you raise money deals are made, Joe. I could raise so much more money. As President, and as somebody that knows most of those people, I could call the heads of Wall Street, the heads of every company in America. I would blow away every record. But I don't want to do that because it puts me in a bad position. And then you bring up Wall Street? You shouldn't be bringing up Wall Street, because you're the one that takes the money from Wall Street, not me. I could blow away your records like you wouldn't believe. We don't need money. We have plenty of money. In fact, we beat Hillary Clinton with a tiny fraction of the money that she was able to

Don't tell me about

Well, let me respond to the first part, as Joe answered. Joe got \$3.5 million from Russia and it came through Putin, because he was very friendly with the former mayor of Moscow and it was the mayor of Moscow's wife. And you got \$3.5 million. Your family got \$3.5 million. And someday you're going to have to explain, why did you get three and a half? I never got any money from Russia. I don't get money from Russia.

Now, about your thing last night. I knew all about that. And through John — who is John Ratcliffe, who is fantastic, DNI — he said the one thing that's common to both of them.

They both want you to lose because there has been nobody tougher to Russia between the sanctions, nobody tougher than me on Russia, between the sanctions, between all of what I've done with NATO. I've got the NATO countries to put up an extra \$130 billion going to \$420 billion a year. That's to guard against Russia. I sold, while he was selling pillows and sheets, I sold tank busters to Ukraine. There has been nobody tougher on Russia than Donald Trump.

And I'll tell you, they were so bad. They took over the submarine port, you remember that very well, during your term, during you and Barack Obama. They took over a big part of what should have been Ukraine. You handed it to them. But you were getting a lot of money from Russia. They were paying you a lot of money, and they probably still are. But now, with what came out today, it's even worse. All of the emails, the emails, the horrible

emails of the kind of money that you were raking in, you and your family. And Joe, you were vice-president when some of this was happening, and it should have never happened. And I think you owe an explanation to the American people. Why is it, somebody just had a news conference a little while ago who was essentially supposed to work with you and your family, but what he said was damning. And regardless of me, I think you have to clean it up and talk to the American people. Maybe you can do it right now.

First of all, I called my accountants, underwrote it, I'm going to release them as soon as we can. I want to do it. And it'll show how successful, how great this company is. But much more importantly than that, people were saying \$750. I asked them a week ago, I said, "What did I pay?" They said, "Sir, you prepaid tens of millions of dollars." I prepaid my tax, over the last number of years, tens of millions of dollars, I prepaid, because at some point, they think it's an estimate. They think I may have to pay tax. So I already prepaid it. Nobody told me that. Nobody told you that.

Excuse me. And it wasn't written. Whenever they write this, they keep talking about \$750, which I think is a filing fee, but let me just tell you, I prepaid millions and millions of dollars in taxes, number one.

Number two, I don't make money from China. You do. I don't make money from Ukraine. You do. I don't make money from Russia. You made \$3.5 million, Joe, and your son gave you, they even have a statement that we have to give 10% to the big man. You're the big man, I think. I don't know, maybe you're not, but you're the big man, I think. Your son said we have to give 10% to the big men. Joe, what's that all about? It's terrible.

As soon as the auditors finish. I get treated worse than the tea party got treated, because I have a lot of people in there-

... deep down in the IRS, they treat me horribly. We made a deal, it was all settled until I decide to run for president. I get treated very badly by the IRS, very unfairly, but we had a deal all done. As soon as we're completed with the deal, I want to release it, but I have paid millions and millions of dollars and it's worse than paying. I paid in advance. It's called prepaying your taxes. I paid

Everybody knows.

So...

I was put through a phony witch hunt for three years. It started before I even got elected. They spied on my campaign. No president should ever have to go through what I went through. Let me just say this, Mueller and 18 angry Democrats and FBI agents all over the place spent \$48 million. They went through everything I had, including my tax returns, and they found absolutely no collusion and nothing wrong. \$48 million. I guarantee you, if I spent \$1 million on you, Joe, I could find plenty wrong because the kind of things-

... that you've done and the kind of monies that your family has taken, I mean, your brother made money in Iraq-

... millions of dollars. Your other brother made a fortune, and it's all through you, Joe. And they say you get some of it. And you do live very well, you have houses all over the place. You live very well.

But could I just one thing?

His son didn't have a job for a long time, was, sadly, no longer in the military service, I won't get into that, and he didn't have a job. As soon as he became vice-president, Burisma, not the best reputation in the world, I hear they paid him \$183,000 a month, listen to this, \$183,000, and they gave him a \$3 million upfront payment, and he had no energy experience. That's 100% dishonest.

I have many bank accounts and they're all listed and they're all over the place. I mean, I was a businessman doing business. The bank account you're referring to, which is, everybody knows about it, it's listed, the bank account was in 2013. That's what it was. It was opened. It was closed in 2015, I believe. And then I decided, because I was going to do... I was thinking about doing a deal in China, like millions of other people, I was thinking about it and I decided I'm not going to do it, didn't like it, I decided not to do it, had an account open and I closed it.

Excuse me. And then, unlike him where he's vice-president and he does business, I then decided to run for president after that. That was before. So I closed it before I even ran for president, let alone became president, big difference. He is the vice-president of the United States and his son, his brother, and his other brother are getting rich. They're like a vacuum cleaner. They're sucking up money

No, no, no.

Excuse me. No, I have to...

Excuse me. No, I have to respond to that.

His son walked out with a billion and a half dollars from China to ...

... after spending 10 minutes in office and being in Air Force Two. Number one. Number two, there's a very strong email talking about your family wanting to make \$10 million a year for introductions.

No, but wait a minute.

First of all, China is paying. They're paying billions and billions of dollars. I just gave \$28 billion.

I just gave \$28 billion to our farmers.

It's what?

No, no. You know who the taxpayer is? It's called China.

China pays 28 billion, and you know what they did to pay it, Joe? They devalued their currency and they also paid up, and you know got the money? Our farmers, our great farmers, because they were targeted. You never

charged them anything. Also, I charged them 25% on dumped steel, because they were killing our steel industry. We were not going to have a steel industry.

And now we have a steel industry.

That is a typical statement.

Excuse me. Just for one second, please.

That's a typical political statement. Let's get off this China thing, and then he looks, "The family around the table, everything." Just a typical politician when I see that. I'm not a typical politician.

That's why I got elected. Let's get off the subject of China. Let's talk about sitting around the table. Come on, Joe. You could do better.

No.

So when I met with Barack Obama, we sat in the White House, right at the beginning, had a great conversation. Was supposed to be 15 minutes and it was well over an hour. He said, "The biggest problem we have is North Korea." He indicated we will be in a war with North Korea. Guess what? It would be a nuclear war. And he does have plenty of nuclear capability. In the meantime, I have a very good relationship with him. Different kind of a guy, but he probably thinks the same thing about me. We have a different kind of a relationship. We have a very good relationship and there's no war. And about two months ago, he broke into a certain area. They said, "Oh, there's going to be trouble." I said, "No, they're not, because he's not going to do that." And I was right. Look, instead of being in a war where millions of people, Seoul is 25 miles away, millions and millions, 32 million people. Millions of people would be dead right now. We don't have a war and I have a good relationship.

Kristen.

They tried to meet with him. He wouldn't do it. He didn't like Obama. He didn't like him. He wouldn't do it.

I know for a fact. They tried. We wouldn't do it. And that's okay. You know what? North Korea, we're not in a war. We have a good relationship. People don't understand. Having a good relationship with leaders of other countries is a good thing.

And it didn't happen.

Excuse me. He left me a mess. Kristen.

They left me a mess. North Korea was a mess, and in fact, if you remember the first two or three months. It was a very dangerous period in my first three months before we worked things out a little bit.

There was a very day. They left us a mess, and Obama would be, I think, the first to say it, was the single biggest problem he thought that our country

First of all, I've already done something that nobody thought was possible. Through the legislature, I terminated the individual mandate. That is the worst part of Obamacare, as we call it. The individual mandate where you have to pay a fortune for the privilege of not having to pay for bad health insurance, I terminated. It's gone. Now, it's in court, because Obamacare is no good. But then I made a decision, run it as well as you can, to my people, great people, run it as well as you can. I could have gone the other route and made everybody very unhappy. They ran it. Premiums are down. Everything's down. Here's the problem. No matter how well you run it, it's no good. What we'd like to do is terminate it. We have the individual mandate done. I don't know that it's going to work. If we don't win, we will have to run it and we'll have Obamacare, but it'll be better run. But it no longer is Obamacare, because without the individual mandate, it's much different.

Pre-existing conditions will always stay. What I would like to do is a much better healthcare, much better. We'll always protect people with pre-existing. So I'd like to terminate Obamacare, come up with a brand new, beautiful healthcare. The Democrats will do it, because there'll be tremendous pressure on them. And we might even have the House by that time. And I think we're going to win the House. You'll see, but I think we're going to win the House. But come up with a better healthcare, always protecting people with pre-existing conditions. And one thing very important, we have 180 million people out there that have great private healthcare. Far more than we're talking about with Obamacare. Joe Biden is going to terminate all of those policies. These are people that love their healthcare. People that have been successful, middle-income people, been successful. They have 180 million plans, 180 million people, families. Under what he wants to do, which will basically be socialized medicine, he won't even have a choice, they want to terminate 180 million plans. We have done an incredible job at healthcare, and we're going to do even better. Just you watch.

Excuse me. He was there-

... for 47 years. He didn't do it. He was now there as vice president for eight years. And it's not like it was 25 years ago. It was three and three quarters... It was just a little while ago, right? Less than four years ago. He didn't do anything. He didn't do it. He wants socialized medicine. And it's not that he wants it. His vice president, she is more liberal than Bernie Sanders and wants it even more. Bernie Sanders wants it. The Democrats want it. You're going to have socialized medicine, just like you want it with fracking. "We're not going to have fracking. We're going to stop fracking. We're going to stop fracking." Then he goes to Pennsylvania after he gets a nomination, where he got very lucky to get it. And he goes to Pennsylvania, and he says, "Oh, we're going to have fracking." And you never ask that question. And by the way, so far, I respect very much the way you're handling this, I have to say.

But somebody should ask the question.

He goes for a year, there will be no fracking.

There will be no petroleum-
No, no. But that's a big question.
It's the same thing with socialized medicine.
Kristen, when he says-
When he says public option, he's talking about socialized medicine and healthcare. When he talks about a public option, he's talking about destroying your Medicare, totally destroying-
... and destroying your Social Security. And this whole country will come down. Bernie Sanders tried it in his state.
He tried it in his state. His governor was a very liberal governor. They wanted to make it work.
It was impossible to work.
It doesn't work.
He tried to get rid of-
He tried to hurt Social Security years ago. Years ago. Go back and look at the records. He tried to hurt Social Security years ago. One thing. But this is the guy-
... that when they announced last week-
They say the stock market will boom if I'm elected. If he's elected, the stock market will crash.
The biggest analysts are saying that.
401(k)s. Kristen, 401(k)s are through the roof.
People's stock are through the roof.
And he doesn't come from Scranton. He lived there for a short period of time before he even knew it.
And he left. And the people of Pennsylvania will show you that.
They understand.
Because Nancy Pelosi doesn't want to approve it. I do.
I do. But I still have to get, unfortunately... That's one of the reasons I think we're going to take over the House, because of her. Nancy Pelosi doesn't want to approve anything because she'd love to have some victories on a date called November 3rd. Nancy Pelosi does not want to approve it. We are ready, willing, and able to do something. Don't forget, we've already approved three plans. And it's gone through, including the Democrats, in all fairness. This one, she doesn't want. It's near the election. Because she thinks it helps her politically. I think it hurts her politically.
If we made a deal, the Republicans will pass it.
The bill that was passed in the House was a bailout of badly run, high crime, Democrat, all run by Democrat cities and states. It was a way of getting a lot of money, billions and billions of dollars, to these guys. It was also a way of getting a lot of money from our people's pockets to people that come into our country illegally. We were going to take care of everything for them. And I'd love to do that. I'd love to help them. But what that does, everybody all over the world will start pouring into our country. We can't do it. This was a way of taking care of them. This was a way of spending on things that had nothing to do with COVID, as per your question. But it was really a big bailout for badly run Democrat cities and states.
Excuse me. One thing very quickly. He said we have to help our small businesses by raising the minimum wage. That's not helping. I think it should be a state option. Alabama is different than New York. New York is different from Vermont. Every state is different. It should be a state option.
It's very important. We have to help our small businesses.
How are you helping your small businesses when you're forcing wages? What's going to happen, and what's been proven to happen, is when you do that, these small businesses fire many of their employees.
Say it. Say it.
What I really like, and I would consider it to an extent-
But what I really like... In a second administration. But not to a level that's going to put all these businesses out of business. It should be a state option. Look, I've lived-
... in different places. I know different places. They're all different. Some places, \$ 15 is not so bad. In other places, other states, \$15 would be ruining.
Children are brought here by coyotes and lots of bad people, cartels...
and lots of bad people, cartels, and they're brought here and they used to use them to get into our country. We now have as strong a border as we've ever had. We're over 400 miles of brand new wall. You see the numbers. And we let people in, but they have to come in legally and they come in through
But let me just tell you. Let me just tell you. They built cages. They used to say I built the cages, and then they had a picture in a certain newspaper, and it was the picture of these horrible cages and they said, "Look at these cages. President Trump built them." And then it was determined they were built in 2014. That was him. They built cages.
Yes. We're working on it very... We're trying very hard. But a lot of these kids come out without the parents. They come over through cartels and through coyotes and through gangs.
Kristen, they did it. We changed the policy. They did it. We changed.
They built the cages. Who built the cages, Joe?
Who built the cages, Joe?

Kristen, I will say this. They went down. We brought reporters, everything. They are so well taken care of. They're in facilities that were so clean.

They have gotten such good... But just ask one question. Who built the cages? I'd love you to ask him that. Who built the cages, Joe?

Kristen, he had eight years to do what he said he was going to do. And I've changed. Without having a specific, we got rid of catch and release. We got rid of a lot of horrible things that they put in and that they lived with. But he had eight years he was Vice President. He did nothing except build cages to keep children in.

So important. It just shows that he has no understanding of immigration, of the laws. Catch and release is a disaster. A murderer would come in. A rapist would come in. A very bad person would come in. We would take their name. We have to release them into our country. And then you say they come back. Less than 1% of the people come back. We have to send ICE out and Border Patrol out to find them. We would say, "Come back in two years, three years. We're going to give you a court case. You did Perry Mason. We're going to give you a court case." When you say they come back, they don't come back, Joe. They never come back. Only the really... I hate to say this, but those with the lowest IQ, they might come back, but there are very, very few.

Well, check it out. They don't come back.

But we don't have to worry about it, because they terminated it. So we don't have to worry about it anymore, Joe. Go ahead.

Yes, I do. And again, he's been in government 47 years, he never did a thing, except in 1994, when he did such harm to the black community, and they were called ... and he called them superpredators. And he said that, he said it, superpredators. And they never lived that down. 1994, your crime bill, the superpredators. Nobody has done more for the black community than Donald Trump. And if you look, with the exception of Abraham Lincoln, possible exception, but the exception of Abraham Lincoln, nobody has done what I've done. Criminal justice reform, Obama and Joe didn't do it. I don't even think they tried because they had no chance at doing it. They might've wanted to do it. But if you had to see the arms I had to twist to get that done, it was not a pretty picture. And everybody knows it, including some very liberal people that cried in my office. They cried in the Oval Office.

Two weeks later, they're out saying, "Gee, we have to defeat him." Criminal justice reform, prison reform, Opportunity Zones with Tim Scott, a great Senator from South Carolina. He came in with this incredible idea for Opportunity Zones. It's one of the most successful programs. People don't talk about it. Tremendous investment is being made, biggest beneficiary, the black and Hispanic communities. And then Historically Black Colleges and Universities, after three years of coming to the office, I love some of those guys, they were great. They came into the office and I said, "What are you doing?" After three years, I said, "Why do you keep coming back?" Because we have no funding." I said, "You don't have to come back every year." "We have to come back."

Because President Obama would never give them long-term funding and I did. 10 year long-term funding and I gave them more money than they asked for because I said, "I think you need more." And I said, "The only bad part about this is I may never see you again." Because I got very friendly with them and they like me and I like them. But I saved Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

But why didn't he do it four years ago? Why didn't you do that four years ago? Even less than that. Why didn't you when you vice president? You keep talking about all these things you're going to do, and you're going to do this, but you were there just a short time ago and you guys did nothing.

You know Joe, I ran because of you. I ran because of Barack Obama, because you did a poor job. If I thought you did a good job, I would've never run. I would've never run. I ran because of you. I'm looking at you now, you're a politician, I ran because of you.

Excuse me-

If this stuff is true about Russia, Ukraine, China, other countries, Iraq. If this is true, then he's a corrupt politician.

So don't give me the stuff about how you're this innocent baby. Joe, that calling you a corrupt politician-

They're calling it the laptop from hell.

Excuse me, the laptop from hell.

You mean the laptop is now another Russia, Russia, Russia hoax? You got to be kidding me-

This is where he's going. The laptop is Russia, Russia, Russia?

You have to be kidding, here we go again with the Russia. Boy, oh, boy.

Can't believe that one.

Well, you have to understand the first time I ever heard of Black Lives Matter, they were chanting, "Pigs in a blanket," talking about police, pigs, pigs, talking about our police. "Pigs in a blanket, fry them like bacon." I said, "That's a horrible thing." And they were marching down the street. And that was my first glimpse of Black Lives Matter, I thought it was a terrible thing. As far as my relationships with all people, I think I have great relationships with all people. I am the least racist person in this room.

I don't know. I mean, I don't know what to say. I got criminal justice reform done and prison reform and Opportunity Zones-

... got criminal justice reform done, and prison reform, and Opportunity Zones, I took care of Black colleges and universities, I don't know what to say, they can say anything, I mean, they can say anything. It's a very... Makes

me sad, because I am the least racist person, I can't even see the audience because it's so dark, but I don't care who's in the audience, I'm the least racist person in this room.

No, he made a reference to Abraham Lincoln, where did that come in? I mean- ... where did that.... No.

I said, "Not since Abraham Lincoln has anybody done what I've done for the Black community."

I didn't say, "I'm Abraham Lincoln," I said, "Not since Abraham Lincoln has anybody done what I've done for the Black community." Now, you have done nothing other than the Crime Bill, which put- Tens of thousands of Black men, mostly, in jail.

And you know what? They remember it because if you look at what's happening with the voting right now, they remember that you treated them very, very badly, just take a look at what's happening out there.

But, why didn't he get it done? See, it's all talk, no action with these politicians, why didn't he get it? "That's what I'm going to do when I become president." You were vice president along with Obama as your president, your leader, for eight years, why didn't you get it done? You had eight years to get it done, now you're saying you're going to get it done because you're all talking and no action, Joe.

You didn't get anything done.

You got nothing done.

I just have-

... one question, why didn't you do it in the eight years, a short time ago? Why didn't you do it? You just said, "I'm going to do that, I'm going to do this." You put tens of thousands of mostly Black young men in prison, now you're saying you're going to get... You're going to undo that, why didn't you get it done? You had eight years with Obama. You know why, Joe? Because you're all talk and no action.

Well, you got to talk them into it, Joe, sometimes you got to talk them into it.

... like I did with criminal justice reform, I had to talk Democrats into it.

So, we have the trillion trees program, we have so many different programs, I do love the environment, but what I want is that cleanest crystal clear water, the cleanest air. We have the best lowest number in carbon emissions, which is a big standard that I noticed Obama goes with all the time, not Joe, I haven't heard Joe use the term because I'm not sure he knows what it represents or means, but I have heard Obama use it. And we have the best carbon emission numbers that we've had in 35 years under this administration, we are working so well with industry, but here's what we can't do. Look at China, how filthy it is, look at Russia, look at India, it's filthy, the air is filthy. The [Paris Accord, I took us out because we were going to have to spend trillions of dollars and we were treated very unfairly.

When they put us in there, they did us a great disservice, they were going to take away our businesses. I will not sacrifice tens of millions of jobs, thousands and thousands of companies because of the Paris Accord, it was so unfair. China doesn't kick in until 2030, Russia goes back to a low standard, and we kicked in right away, it would have been... It would have destroyed our businesses. So, you ready? We have done an incredible job environmentally, we have the cleanest air, the cleanest water, and the best carbon emission standards that we've seen in many, many years.

And we haven't destroyed our industries.

They came out and said very strongly \$6,500 will be taken away from families under his plan, that his plan is an economic disaster. If you look at what he wants to do, if you look at his plan, his-

... his environmental plan, do you know developed it? AOC plus three, they know nothing about the climate. I mean, she's got a good line of stuff, but she knows nothing about the climate and they're all hopping through hoops for AOC plus three. Look, their real plan cost a hundred trillion dollars. If we had the best year in the history of our country for a hundred years, we would not even come close to a number like that. When he says buildings, they want to take buildings down because they want to make bigger windows into smaller windows. As far as they're concerned, if you had no window, it would be a lovely thing.

This is the craziest plan that anybody has ever seen and this wasn't done by smart people. This wasn't done by anybody. Frankly, I don't even know how it can be good politically. They want to spend a hundred trillion dollars. That's their real number. He's trying to say it was six. It's a hundred trillion dollars. They want to knock down buildings and build new buildings with little, tiny, small windows and many other things-

And many other things. And many other things.

It is crazy.

You'll destroy our country.

Excuse me.

We are energy independent for first time. We don't need all of these countries that we had to fight war over because we needed their energy. We are energy independent. I know more about wind than you do. It's extremely expensive. Kills all the birds. It's very intermittent. It's got a lot of problems and they happen to make the windmills in both Germany and China and the fumes coming up, if you're a believer in carbon emission, the fumes coming up to make these massive windmills is more than anything that we're talking about with natural gas, which is very clear.

One other thing, solar-

I love solar, but solar doesn't quite have it yet. It's not powerful yet to really run our big, beautiful factories that we need to compete with the world.

It's all a pipe dream, but you know what we'll do? We're going to have the greatest economy in the world, but if you want to kill the economy, get rid of your oil industry you want. And what about fracking?

Now we have to ask him about fracking.

You said it on tape.

I'll put it on.

Excuse me. He was against fracking. He said it. I will show that to you tomorrow.

I am against fracking. Until he got the nomination, he went to Pennsylvania. Then he said, "But you know what Pennsylvania?" He'll be against it very soon because his party is totally against it.

The families that we're talking about are employed heavily and they are making a lot of money, more money than they've ever made. If you look at the kind of numbers that we've produced for Hispanic, for Black, for Asian, it's nine times greater the percentage gain than it was under in three years than it was under eight years of the two of them to put it nicely, nine times more.

Now somebody lives, I have not heard the numbers or the statistics that you're saying, but they're making a tremendous amount of money. Economically, we saved it and I saved it again a number of months ago, when oil was crashing because of the pandemic. We saved it.

Say what you want to bet relationship. We got Saudi Arabia, Mexico and Russia to cut back, way back. We saved our oil industry and now it's very vibrant again and everybody has very inexpensive gasoline. Remember that.

Would he close down the oil industry?

Would you close down the oil industry?

Oh, that's a big statement.

That's a big statement.

Oh, I see. Okay.

That's a big statement.

Yeah.

We actually give it to solar and wind. That's maybe the biggest statement. In terms of business, that's the biggest statement.

Because basically what he's saying is-

... he is going to destroy the oil industry. Will you remember that Texas? Will you remember that Pennsylvania, Oklahoma?

Remember that Pennsylvania, Oklahoma, is-
Ohio.

Is he going to get China to do it?

Is he going to get China to do it?

We have to make our country totally successful, as it was prior to the plague coming in from China. Now we're rebuilding it and we're doing record numbers, 11.4 million jobs in a short period of time, et cetera. But, I will tell you, go back.

Before the plague came in, just before, I was getting calls from people that were not normally people that would call me. They wanted to get together. We had the best Black unemployment numbers in the history of our country. Hispanic, women, Asian, people with diplomas, with no diplomas, MIT graduates; number one in the class, everybody had the best numbers. And you know what? The other side wanted to get together. They wanted to unify.

Success is going to bring us together. We are on the road to success. But I'm cutting taxes, and he wants to raise everybody's taxes and he wants to put new regulations on everything. He will kill it. If he gets in, you will have a Depression, the likes of which you've never seen. Your 401(k)s will go to hell, and it'll be a very, very sad day for this country.

Trump_6

October 15th, 2020

I'm feeling great, I don't know about you. How is everyone feeling?
It's great to be back in my home state, Florida, to make my official return to the campaign trail.
My goal is to fight for you and fight for your family.
That was very well stated, I have to say. Good job.
Thank you, thank you.

Nothing whatsoever, I'm great, I feel good. I was in North Carolina today and did a big rally with tremendous turnout, and I just feel really good. Florida, Pennsylvania, were- They said, "Let's go to the hospital." I said, "That's okay. I'm going to respond to what you say." And we went over to Walter Reed, where you have

tremendous professionals. They gave me Regeneron and Remdeceiver both. And all I know is I felt good the following day, I felt really good. No, but they said the lungs are a little bit different, a little bit perhaps infected, and I don't know. I mean, I didn't do too much asking. I really felt good. I didn't have much of a problem with the lungs. I did have a little bit of a temperature. Obviously, I felt there was something missing, and then I tested, I tested positive. Yeah, and there shouldn't be. Well, I test quite a bit, and I can tell you that before the debate, which I thought it was a very good debate, and I felt fantastically, I had no problems before. I don't know, I don't even remember. I test all the time. But I can tell you this, after the debate, I guess a day or so, I think it was Thursday evening, maybe even late Thursday evening, I tested positive. That's when I first found out about it. Yeah.

I had no problem. Again, the doctors do it. I don't ask them. I test all the time. And they- If you ask as the doctor, they'll give you a perfect answer. But they take a test and I leave and I go about my business.

I probably did, and I took a test the day before and the day before, and I was always in great shape, and I was in great shape for the debate. And it was only after the debate, a period of time after the debate that I said, "That's interesting." And they took a test and it tested positive. No. No, but I take a lot of tests. Possibly I did, possibly I didn't. But the doctor has very accurate information and it's not only that doctor, it's many doctors. The one thing, if you're President, you have a lot of doctors you're surrounded by. But I was in great shape for the debate. And sometime after the debate, I tested positive, then that's when they decided to, let's go.

Well, they do a lot of testing in the White House, they test everybody including me, but they test everybody. And something happened. But as far as the mask is concerned, I'm good with masks. I'm okay with masks. I tell people, wear a mask. But just the other day, they came out with a statement that 85% of the people that wear masks catch it. So this is a very- That's what I heard, and that's what I saw. And regardless, but everybody's tested and they're tested often. And I also knew that, hey, I'm President. I have to see people. I can't be in a basement. I can't be in a room. I can't be... I have to be out. I can, but people with masks are catching it all the time. I mean, if you look at the Governor of Virginia, he was known for a mask. If you look at Thom Tillis, a great guy, he always had a mask, and they caught it. Yeah.

Yes, I know this. Well, I mean, he has to say that. I think it's great, he's a friend of mine. He's a good guy. And wrong or not wrong, you have to understand, as President, I can't be locked in a room someplace for the next year and just stay and do nothing. And every time I go into a crowd, I was with the parents of our fallen heroes. These people are the most incredible people. And they came up to me and they would hug me, and they would touch me, and I'm not to not let them do it, to be honest with you. There was, exactly right. We had a gold star event with the most incredible people you've ever seen. And I could have chosen not to talk to them, or to keep everybody away. And you know what? I don't think that's probably where it was caught, but maybe it was. No, I don't know where it came from, and you don't know where it came from, and the doctors don't know where it came from. But as the President, I have to be out there. I also know- I know this.

I mean, let's see, Kamala. She's got people now, people have it, and I'm not blaming her. I'm not saying, "Oh, she did a terrible thing." As President, I have to be out there. I can't be in a basement. I can't be locked in a very beautiful room someplace in the White House. And I want to see the gold star families, and I want to see everybody. And I also say to people all the time, it's risky doing it. It is risky doing it. But many people are catching it. Many people are getting this disease that was sent to us by China, and it shouldn't have been allowed to happen. But many people are getting this. And I mean, nobody's being blamed. Everybody is working hard to get this thing out of our country, get it out of the world. Look at what's going on in Europe, massive spikes. They've done a very good job, but now you take a look today at the UK, you take a look at Spain and France and Italy. There's tremendous spikes. Well, I have thing right here that will tell you exactly the opposite. The UK is up 2500%, because I knew you'd be doing this. I know you very well. The UK is up 2500%. The EU is up 722%. And the United States is down 21%. Excess mortality.

Excess mortality, we're a winner on the excess mortality. And what we've done has been amazing. And we have done an amazing job. And it's rounding the corner and we have the vaccines coming, and we have the therapies coming. And I'll tell you what, one thing. When I got it, I had a choice. Do nothing, or use some of the things

that we're looking at, like in this case, Regeneron. and Eli Lilly makes something that's supposed to be incredible. And I think that maybe I wouldn't be doing this discussion with you right now. We have therapies now and cures, maybe you can use the word cure, but we have therapies that are absolutely incredible, Savannah. I believe we're rounding the corner, yes. Right, right. That's right. Yeah.

The cure can not be worse than the problem itself. We did the right thing. We were expected to lose 2,200,000 people, and maybe more than that. We're at 210,000 people. One person is too much, it should have never happened because of China. It happened because of China. And you have to get that and understand that. But it shouldn't have happened. But we were expected to lose, if you look at the original charts from original doctors who are respected by everybody, 2,200,000 people. We saved 2 million people.

I don't know, let me tell you what is happening. I left North Carolina, which I love. I left Pennsylvania. We won a big case in Michigan because that governor has a lockdown where nobody but her husband can do anything. He can go boating and do whatever he wants, but nobody else can. The fact is we're winning all these cases because it's unconstitutional what they're doing. And I think they're doing it for political reasons. But the fact is the cure, you can't let this continue to go on with the lockdowns. And I believe that on November 4th, you're going to have a lot of these governors. Look at what's happening to New York. New York is a mess. They lost almost 40,000 people. They have a lockdown like you've never seen. Now they're open, it's like a ghost town. And Savannah, it's very important. People are leaving New York by the thousands, and you're going to have a hard time ever building it up again. So that cure, that so called cure that you talk about, it can't be worse than the problem. The problem is a bad problem.

... than the problem. The problem is a bad problem. Okay, fine. Oh, you always do this. No, you always do this. You've done this to me, and everybody- I denounce white supremacy. Okay?

I've denounced white supremacy, for years, but you always do it. You always start off with the question. You didn't ask Joe Biden, whether or not he denounces Antifa. I watched him on the same basic show with Lester Holt, and he was asking questions like Biden was a child. So, are you ready? Are you... Wait. Are you listening? I denounce white supremacy. What's your next question? Hesitant? Here we go again. Every time... In fact, my people came, "I'm sure they'll ask you the white supremacy question." I denounce white supremacy. And frankly, you want to know something? I denounce Antifa, and I denounce these people on the left that are burning down our cities, that are run by Democrats who don't know what they're doing- So, I know Yeah.

I know nothing about QAnon. I know very little. You told me, but what you tell me, doesn't necessarily make it fact. I hate to say that. I know nothing about it. I do know they are very much against pedophilia. They fight it very hard. But I know nothing about it. If you'd like me to... study the subject. I'll tell you what I do know about. I know about Antifa, and I know about the radical left, and I know how violent they are and how vicious they are. And I know how they are burning down cities run by Democrats, not run by Republicans. He may be right.

Can I be honest? He may be right. I just don't know about QAnon. I don't know. No, I don't know. I don't know. You tell me all about it. Let's waste the whole show. You start off with white supremacy. I denounce it. You start off with something else. Let's go. Keep asking me these questions. But let me just... let me just tell you. What I do hear about it, is they are very strongly against pedophilia. And I agree with that. I mean, I do agree with that... and I agree with it very strongly. I have no idea. I know nothing about them. No, I don't know that. And neither do you, know that. Why aren't you asking me about Antifa? Why aren't you asking me about the radical left? Why aren't you asking Joe Biden questions about, why doesn't he condemn Antifa? Why does he say it doesn't exist?

Antifa, no, excuse me. That's so cute. Antifa exists. They're vicious, they're violent. They kill people, and

they're burning down our cities. And they happen to be radical left. I know nothing about it, can I [crosstalk 00:20:36]- That was a retweet. That was an opinion of somebody- ... and that was a retweet. I'll put it out there. People can decide for themselves. I don't take a position. No, no. No, no. That was a retweet. And I do a lot of retweets. And frankly, because the media is so fake, and so corrupt, if I didn't have social media... I don't call it Twitter, I call it social media. I wouldn't be able to get the word out. And the word is- ... and you know what the word is? The word is very simple. We're building our country, stronger and better than it's ever been before. And that's what's happening. And everybody knows it. You know what else the word is? We're winning in a lot of states. We're winning in a lot of States. You're going to see that. Sure, they can. And do you know what? Win or lose, that's the way I want it to be. But when I see thousands of ballots, right? Unsolicited ballots, being given out by the millions, and thousands of them are dumped in dumpsters. And when you see ballots with the name Trump, military ballots, from our great military. And they're dumped in garbage cans- No, no, it's happening every day. Oh, really? Well, then he's not doing a very good job. All you have to do is pick up the papers every day. 50,000 in Ohio, the great state of Ohio. 50,000 in another location, I think North Carolina. 500,000 applications in Virginia. No, no, there's a tremendous problem. But let me just tell you, they talk about the peaceful transfer, right? They spied on my campaign and they got caught. And they spied heavily, on my campaign. And they tried to take down a duly elected sitting president. And then, they talk about, "Will you accept a peaceful transfer?" And the answer is, yes, I will. But I want it to be an honest election. And so does everybody else. When I see thousands of ballots dumped in a garbage can, and they happen to have my name on it? I'm not happy about that. Could I ask you, how can you say that? How can you say that? You do read newspapers? You do watch the news? I know you read the news, but do you watch it? Because, every day, they're talking about ballots that are corrupt, that are fraudulent. Sure. Sure, sure. But you can win a race... Take a look at me. You can win a race by 1%. I'm not, I don't want that to happen. You know what? I don't want that to happen. Savannah. I want it to be clean. And I want... I really feel we're going to win, but I want this to be clean. But it's sort of ironic that you, and them, talk about the peaceful transfer when I spent three and a half years fighting off these maniacs. And now, it turns out, everything's there. That they were the ones that dealt with Russia, and it's too bad. Peaceful transfer, I absolutely want that. But ideally, I don't want to transfer, because I want to win. Sure. How are you? Thank you very much, it's beautiful. As what? Well, I did put it in very early, as you know, Joe Biden was two months behind me, and he called me xenophobic and racist and everything else, because I put it in. And it turned out that I was 100% right. I also put it on Europe, very early, because I saw there was a lot of infection in Europe. And it's sort of an amazing question. And I appreciate the question, and respect the question, but the news doesn't get out the right answer. Because I put on a travel ban far earlier than Dr. Fauci thought it was necessary. Who I like. Far earlier than the scientists... I was actually the only one that wanted to put it on. And I did it, actually against the advice of a lot of people, including Nancy Pelosi who had no clue what she was doing. And, Biden. When I put on the travel ban... You know, I put it on in January. The end of January. When I put on the travel ban Joe Biden, and others, said, "This is ridiculous. You don't do that." Well, Dr. Fauci said, I saved thousands and thousands of lives. I was early, I was extremely early, when I put on the travel ban. I read that, but no, he didn't. I read it... I read it, someplace. Maybe Woodward said it, or something. But no, he did not say that. But, I knew it was a big threat. At the same time, I don't want to panic this country. I don't want to go out and say, "Everybody's going to die. Everybody's going to-" Okay? No, there's not a middle ground. No, no. No. There's not a middle ground. You have to be safe. You have to be vigilant, and you have to be smart.

Okay.

Good.

We'll talk you out of it.

Miami.

Right.

Right.

Right.

So, it's happening. We just set a record, 11.4 million jobs. We are going to have a phenomenal third quarter, which will be announced on November 1st, just prior to the big November 3rd day, where I think you're going to see a red wave. But we're going to have a tremendous announcement. I believe. I mean, we're going to find out, but GDP is going through the roof. Jobs, real estate, houses. So many things are happening. So, people were saying, we're going to have a 42% unemployment. Look, this was a thing that came into our country and it happened a hundred, more than a hundred years ago, and it happened now. They were talking about a 42% unemployment rate.

It came out, it just came out... at 7.8% unemployment, and people can't even believe it. Our economy is going to be... Next year, if we don't have somebody that raises taxes and quadruples taxes, which they want to do, and it kills everything. Our economy is going to be phenomenal, next year. We're going to have a phenomenal... And, I'll tell you, Savannah. We had the greatest economy in the history of our country last year, including the state of Florida, where we are now. In Pennsylvania, in North Carolina, in Ohio, every place. We had the greatest economy we ever had. We had to close it down, we saved two million lives. We're opening it up. We have a V-shape and it's coming back. It's coming back very fast. One other thing, we really helped the hospitals. We've sent billions and billions of dollars to the hospitals. In addition, hundreds of millions of masks and gowns. And we went into the ventilator business, because this country was not equipped with ventilators. And I'm not blaming anybody for it. But we're now making thousands of ventilators a month, and we have all we can use. We're sending them all over the world, because the world needs them. So, they've worked very hard and really very, very effectively. Thank you. Great question. No, because I was okay with the masks. I was good with it, but I've heard many different stories on masks. I had, being president, you have people, they bring meals, they bring this, they... And I had an instance recently, where a very wonderful person is bringing me a meal, and he's playing with his mask. And he's touching his mask, all over the place.

And then he's bringing a plate in, and I'm saying, "Well, I don't know if that's so good." I mean, the good news, I didn't eat it. Okay? I decided not to eat it. This was a month ago. But I... Look, look, you have, on the masks, you have two stories. You have a story where they want, a story where they don't want. I am all for it. Some. No.

No, the

And then, you have other people that disagree. Scott Atkins, if you look at Scott, Dr. Scott. He's from, great guy, Stanford. He will tell you that, he disagrees with you.

Oh, I don't know. Look, he's an expert. He's one of the great experts of the world. I'm all for it.

By the way-

I never said, "Don't wear them."

Savannah, University of Washington. And then, you have other places, say different things. You have a lot of...

Hey. Dr. Fauci said, "Don't wear a mask," right?

Oh, I don't know. Then he changed his mind. But then, you have a report coming out two days ago, that 85% of the people wearing masks catch it.

Savannah. We're on the same side. I say, wear the mask. I'm fine with it.

I have no problem. We're on the same side.

Thank you.

Good. So we got rid of the individual mandate on Obamacare, which was the worst part of Obamacare, and now you could actually say it's not Obamacare because that's how big it was, where you had to pay a fortune for the privilege of not having to pay for bad health insurance, so we got rid of that. That was a big, big thing. And by doing that, and we will always have... By the way, we're always protecting people with pre-existing conditions, and I can't say that more strongly, but we've been able to bring healthcare costs way down. Now, I took over Obamacare, got rid of the individual mandate, made it good, managed it much better. Remember, they had the \$5 billion website disaster, and all of the problems they had. The problem with Obamacare, it's not good. We'd like to terminate it, and we want a much less expensive healthcare that's a much better healthcare, and that's where we're aiming. And if we can do that, and we have a very good chance of doing it, but we've also brought down the price of Obamacare. The problem with Obamacare, it basically is never going to be great, and I want to give great healthcare. So important. And thank you very much.

It is a big issue for me too.

That's right. That's right.

In order to replace it with a much better healthcare at a much lower price. And always, under all circumstances, we are going to protect the Republicans. And maybe I changed the party a lot over the last three years, but we will protect people with preexisting conditions. And Savannah, what I want to do, get rid of the terrible Obamacare. I've already done it to a large extent because as you know, the individual mandate is gone. That was the worst part. No, no. We have done. That's right. I'm sorry, but if you look, we had both houses and what did we do? We got rid of the individual mandate. That went through the legislature. Look, look. We should be on the same side. I wanted very simple. I'm going to put it very simple. We would like to terminate it, and we would like to replace it with something that's much less expensive and much better. We will always protect people with preexisting conditions. And here's the thing- If we don't succeed, we are running the remnants of whatever's left because we took it apart. We are running the remnants of whatever's left much better than the previous administration, which ran it very badly, but we'd like to have new healthcare much better and much less expensive. Well, we've actually passed three packages, and we're on our fourth, and I agree with him 100%. He should vote for me. The problem you have is Nancy Pelosi. She couldn't care less about the worker. She couldn't care less about our people. And we should have a stimulus, and I want a stimulus. The Republicans will approve a stimulus. The problem is she doesn't want to do it because she thinks it's bad for her election. The fact is, she's wrong because people know she's in our way, she's not approving it, she doesn't appreciate our people, and she doesn't appreciate, at all, our workers. Nancy Pelosi, we are ready to sign and pass stimulus, but she's got to approve it. That's right. That's right. Did you ever hear a word called negotiation when negotiating? Okay. I'm negotiating- You know what? And you know who I'm negotiating against? Nancy Pelosi, because she doesn't want to give them money. We should have stimulus. This was not our people's fault. This was China's fault. And she's penalizing our people. I'm ready to sign a big, beautiful stimulus. You saw the other day, I said, "Go big or go home." Right? I want it to be big. I want it to be bold. I want the money to go directly to the people. They'll go. Yeah, they'll go. They'll go. They're going to be very active- I know, because I haven't asked them to because I can't get through Nancy Pelosi. If Nancy Pelosi and I, through my representatives or directly, I don't care, if we agree to something, the Republicans will agree to it. How are you? Nice to see you. Thank you. It's a great question. We've created more jobs than this country has ever created. We were up to 160 million jobs. We were never even close to that number. We were just hitting 160 million jobs, companies are pouring into our nation because of the tax rate, and if Biden comes in and raises taxes on everybody, including middle income taxes, which he wants to do, you will blow this thing, and you'll end up with a depression, the likes of which you've never had. That's what's going to happen. We have something that's really good. The reason we're coming back so strong is because we built a very strong foundation. Companies are moving in. Car companies are moving into Michigan, into Ohio, into South Carolina, and North Carolina just today, so what's happening is, they're coming in because we reduced the taxes. Our taxes, our corporate taxes were the highest in the world, and now they're among the lower taxes. They're not the lowest, but they're among the lowest. And what that means, is jobs, but also we're doing a very big, and we've done a very big, middle income tax package. So if we get in, we're going to do the middle income tax package, but it's a great question. And if he comes along and raises rates, all those companies that are coming in, they will leave the U.S. so fast your head will spin. We can't let that happen. Thank you. Okay, first of all, let me answer. What they did is illegal, number one. Also, the numbers are all wrong, with the numbers they released. And just so you understand, when you have a lot of real estate, I have real estate, you know a lot of it. Okay? Right down the road, Doral, big stuff, great stuff. When I decided to run, I'm very underlevered, fortunately, but I'm very underlevered. I have a very, very small percentage of debt compared. In fact, some of it, I did as favors to institutions that wanted to loan me money. \$400 million compared to the assets that I have, all of these great properties all over the world, and frankly, The Bank of America building in San Francisco. I don't love what's happening to San Francisco. 1290 Avenue of the Americas, one of the biggest office buildings. What I'm saying is that, it's a tiny percentage of my net worth. And you'll see that soon because we're doing things. We've given, I think it's 108 or 112 pages of financial detail to elections, and we have to file as the president, as any politician, you have to file. Nobody ever looks at that. When they do, they see how incredible a company is, but more importantly, they see where this debt is. No, I don't owe Russia money. I owe a very, very small... It's called mortgages. People have a house, they put a

mortgage.

Not that I know of, but I will probably, because it's so easy to solve, and if you'd like to do, I will let you know who I owe, whatever small amount of money. I want to say two things. Number one, it's a very small amount of money. Number two, it's very straight. It's very, very straight, but it's a tiny percentage of the worth. Did you ever hear the expression underlevered? I am extremely underlevered. As you know, I'm under audit. It turned out that I am under audit. But they actually... Excuse me. No, no. But you accused me of not being under audit previously. And so did other people at NBC. And I am under audit. So that one's solved. That's good. I am under audit. No person in their right mind would release, prior to working out the deal with the IRS. And I'll go a step further. I'm treated very badly by the IRS. They treat me very, very badly. You have people in there from previous administrations that treat me very badly, but we're under audit. It's very routine, in many ways, but we're under audit. They like to change the game, change the rules, do everything. You saw what they did with the tea party people. You saw what they did with the religious group.

No, except common sense, and intelligence, and having lawyers that say... Because I would love to release them, and as soon as we come to a conclusion, I will release them, and very gladly, but if you go to elections, and if you take a look, you'll see 112, I think it's 112, it talks about the income, which is rather massive. It talks about all of the properties. They have them listed. You can never learn more, but you know what happened? People went there. All the reporters went. There was a feeding frenzy. This was originally, when I filed it. And I filed it every year. I update it every year. My son is here. They run the company. I don't run the company. Yeah, because that's a statutory number. It's a statutory. I think it's a filing number. You pay 750, it's a filing or a filing fee. No, I don't know. I can tell you this. If they have my tax returns, as you know, they have to go to jail. It's illegal, but their numbers were wrong, but let me tell you what else. I don't owe money to any of these sinister people. This has been going on for years now. Russia, Russia, Russia. It turned out to be a hoax, and it turned out to be that Hillary Clinton and the Democrats were dealing with Russia, not me. It's a whole hoax. So I would not mind at all saying who it is, but it's a very small... When you look at vast properties like I have, and they're big, and they're beautiful, and they're well located. When you look at that, the amount of money, \$400 million is a peanut. It's extremely underlevered. And it's levered with normal banks. Not a big deal. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Adam.

So when I was elected, and when a president is elected, they're elected for a period of four years. And Justice Ginsburg said it best. I think, talking about president Obama having to do with somebody else, that the president is put there for four years, not for three years. So during this fourth year, it happened to come up, unfortunately, because I had great respect for Justice Ginsburg. But a vacancy happened to come up, and we picked somebody that's outstanding. She has been an absolute star, and I'm extremely proud of it. But again, plenty of time. There's plenty of time. We're going to do it before the election, but we also have much time after the election. But there's no reason to wait, because it's almost unanimous, it seems to me, certainly within the Republican party. And frankly, most of the Democrats within closed rooms, I guarantee you that. This is an outstanding person, and I'm using my fourth term. And if you look at it and if you put the shoe on the other foot, if they had this, they would do it 100%. So there's been 29 times when this has happened. All 29 times a president has done exactly what I've done. So I have a lot of respect, by the way, for I have a lot of respect for Judge Garland. I want to tell you that. But I'll tell you, the whole ball game changed when I saw the way they treated Justice Kavanaugh. I have never seen any human being, and I'm not just talking about Supreme Court... I have never seen a human being treated so badly with false accusations and everything else. I have never seen anything like it. And you know what the truth is, Savannah? Like it or not, the ball game changed a lot. There has never been anybody treated so badly as, now Justice Kavanaugh. Well, I think she'll have to make that decision. I don't think she has any conflict at all. A Supreme Court judge does not have... They can make their own decision. They actually have additional power to make that decision. It would be totally up to her. I would think that she would be able to rule either for me or against me, being I don't see any conflict whatsoever. We have an election coming up. I think it's the most important election in the history of our country. If for any chance, and it probably won't... And I hope it doesn't ever get to the Supreme Court. But if it did, I would think that she would rule one way or the other. I would think so. I have no idea. Because believe it or not, I never asked her about it. I never talked about it. I didn't talk about any of the obvious things that you could talk about. And I think a lot of people in my position might. But in speaking to a lot of very brilliant people and people that do this for a living, they say it's better not to talk. So I talked to her about life. I talked to her about the fact, "Would you like to do this? Are you willing to do this?" Because it's a tremendous

burden. The answer was, "Yes." She's unbelievably well-qualified, but I never spoke to her about these various questions.

Thank you very much. Well, again, I'm not ruling on this. And Roe v. Wade is something that a lot of people would say, obviously, you're going to speak to somebody. Also two other great Justices, Justice Gorsuch, and Justice Kavanaugh... I never spoke to them about Roe v. Wade. I never spoke to them about election laws. I never spoke to them about anything. And I've done the right thing from a moral standpoint. I don't even know from a legal standpoint, but it was the right thing. I think, depending on what happens with Roe v. Wade, I think that perhaps it could get sent down to the states, and the states would decide. I also think perhaps nothing will happen. I have not talked to her about it. I think it would be inappropriate to talk to her about it. And some people would say, "You can talk to about it." I just think it would be inappropriate. I would like to see a brilliant jurist, a brilliant person who has done this in great depth and has actually skirted this issue for a long time, make a decision. And that's why I chose her. I think that she's going to make a great decision. I did not tell her what decision to make. And I think it would be inappropriate to say right now, because I don't want to do anything to influence her. I want her to get approved, and then I want her to go by the law. And I know she's going to make a great decision for our country, along with the other two people I put there. Many of them would. Perhaps most of them would. I am telling you, I don't want to do anything to influence anything right now. I don't want to go out tomorrow and say, "Oh, he's trying to give her a signal." Because I didn't speak to her about it. I've done the right thing in so doing. How she's going to rule, you're going to find out perhaps. Or you might not find out. It may never get there. It may never get there. We'll see what happens.

Hi, Cindy. Thank you. Thank you very much.

Right. I fully understand the question, and I saw everything that you saw over the summer. And it was a terrible thing, a terrible thing to watch. We have a Senator named Tim Scott from South Carolina. He came up with a bill that should have been approved. It was great. It was a bill that was strong in terms of law enforcement, and strong in terms of enforcing the proper thing, and doing the proper thing by law enforcement. And the Democrats just wouldn't go for it. They wouldn't go for it at all. And I don't know why, because it was a really great bill. But I do have to say this. And some people don't like it when I say it, but a lot of people agree. I have done more for the African American community than any president. With the exception of Abraham Lincoln. Criminal justice reform, prison reform, historically Black colleges and universities. I got them funded. They were on a year to year basis. They could have been put out of business. As soon as our country had a little bad year, they would have said, "I'm sorry, we're not going to fund you." I got them 10 year funding and financing. And more than they even asked for. I became very friendly with a lot of the heads. But we've done more... And of course, opportunity zones. But criminal justice reform, everybody said it could not be done. President Obama and Biden never even tried to do it. They never even tried. But I say that, and I say it often. I'll say it loud, and I'm very proud of it. And I have a great relationship because of what I've done with the African-American community. I'm very proud of it. Thank you. Thank you very much. Got you. Thank you. Right. Yeah.

DACA is somewhat different than Dreamers. You understand that, and you understand it better than anybody, probably, in this room. Where do you come from, by the way, originally? Where? That's very good. Okay. So we are going to take care of DACA. We're going to take care of Dreamer. It's working right now. We're negotiating different aspects of immigration and immigration law. We've built now, over 400 miles of border wall, southern border. Mexico is working very closely with us. We have the strongest border we've ever had. We want people to come into our country. They have to come in legally. But we are working very hard on the DACA program. And you will be, I think, very happy over the course of the next year. Because I feel the same way as you do about it. Thank you. Thank you very much. Well, what happens is because of the pandemic, much changed on the immigration front. Mexico is heavily infected, as you know. And we've made it very, very difficult to come in because of the pandemic, and other reasons, and crime. But we have a very strong border right now, and we have to keep it that way. But we want people to come into our country, but they have to come in through a merit system, and they have to come in legally. And people are very, very happy with it. You haven't heard any complaints about that. But what happened is because of the pandemic, we have to be extra cautious. It's very happy. The fact is, we got rid of catch and release, which is a disaster. You catch somebody. They could be a murderer. That could be a rapist, and we're supposed to release them into our country. These are the laws that I inherited. We ended that program. Now, I think you're going to see something very, very good. The whole immigration... If you look at what's going on, people used to pour into our country. And especially during the pandemic, I think even you, Savannah, will be very impressed with what we've done. Sure.

That's right.
Because I've done a great job. We have the strongest economy in the world. We closed it up. We are coming around the corner. The vaccines are coming out soon, and our economy is strong. We are at a level with jobs like we've never been before. We've rebuilt our military. We've rebuilt our borders. We had no borders. We had no nothing. We've rebuilt so much. We've given you the greatest tax cut in the history of our country. Greatest regulation cut, equally as important. And we created new levels of jobs that nobody thought was possible. And next year is going to be better than ever before.
Thank you very much.

Pence_1

October 4th, 2020

Well, first off, thank you, Elaine, and thank you to — thank you to Norwood University for their wonderful hospitality and the Commission on Presidential Debates. It's deeply humbling for me to be here, to be surrounded by my — my wonderful family.

And, Senator Kaine, it's an honor to be here with you, as well. And I just — I also want to say — I want to say thanks to everyone that's looking in tonight, who understands what an enormously important time this is in the life of our nation.

For the last seven-and-a-half years, we've seen America's place in the world weakened. We've seen an economy stifled by more taxes, more regulation, a war on coal, and a failing health care reform come to be known as Obamacare, and the American people know that we need to make a change. And so I want to thank all of you for being — being with us tonight.

I also want to thank Donald Trump for making that call and inviting us to be a part of this ticket. I have to tell you, I'm a — I'm a small-town boy from a place not too different from Farmville. I grew up with a cornfield in my backyard. My grandfather had immigrated to this country when he was about my son's age. My mom and dad built a — everything that matters in a small town in Southern Indiana. They built a family and — and a good name and a business. And they raised a family. And I dreamed some day of representing my home town in Washington, D.C., but I — honestly, Elaine, I never imagined — never imagined I'd have the opportunity to be governor of the state that I love, let alone be sitting at a table like this in this kind of a position.

So to answer your question, I would say I — I would hope that if — if the responsibility ever fell to me in this role, that I would meet it with the way that I'm going to meet the responsibility should I be elected vice president of the United States. And that's to bring a lifetime of experience, a lifetime growing up in a small town, a lifetime where I've served in the Congress of the United States, where — where I've led a state that works in the great state of Indiana, and whatever other responsibilities might follow from this, I — I would hope and, frankly, I would pray to be able to meet that moment with that — that lifetime of experience.

Well, let me — let me say first and foremost that, Senator, you and Hillary Clinton would know a lot about an insult-driven campaign. It really is remarkable. At a time when literally, in the wake of Hillary Clinton's tenure as secretary of state, where she was the architect of the Obama administration's foreign policy, we see entire portions of the world, particularly the wider Middle East, literally spinning out of control. I mean, the situation we're watching hour by hour in Syria today is the result of the failed foreign policy and the weak foreign policy that Hillary Clinton helped lead in this administration and create. The newly emboldened — the aggression of Russia, whether it was in Ukraine or now their heavy-handed approach...
their heavy-handed approach.

Well...

But in the midst — Elaine, thank you. Thank you. Thank you, Senator, I'll...

Well, Senator, I must have hit a...[crosstalk]...I must have hit a nerve here.

Because at a time of great challenge in the life of this nation, where we've weakened America's place in the world, stifled America's economy, the campaign of Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine has been an avalanche of insults.

Look, to get to your question about trustworthiness, Donald Trump has built a business through hard times and through good times. He's brought an extraordinary business acumen. He's employed tens of thousands of people in this country.

But there's a — there's a reason why people question the trustworthiness of Hillary Clinton. And that's because they're paying attention. I mean, the reality is, when she was secretary of state, Senator, come on. She had a Clinton Foundation accepting contributions from foreign governments.

Senator, I think I'm still on my time.

Well, let me interrupt — let me interrupt you and finish my sentence, if I can.

The Clinton Foundation accepted foreign contributions from foreign governments and foreign donors while she was secretary of state.
She had a private server...
that was discovered...
keep that pay to play process out of the reach of the public.
Do you?
Yes.
Eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program?
Right and...
And Iraq has been overrun by ISIS, because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate...
Hillary Clinton — Hillary Clinton — Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement...
And so we removed — we removed all of our...
troops from Iraq, and ISIS was able to be conjured up in that vacuum.
and overrun vast areas of Iraq.
It was a failure of the secretary of state...
I think the fact that — that under this past administration of which Hillary Clinton was a part, we've almost doubled the national debt is atrocious. I mean, I'm very proud of the fact that — I come from a state that works. The state of Indiana has balanced budgets. We cut taxes, we've made record investments in education and in infrastructure, and I still finish my term with \$2 billion in the bank.
That's a little bit different than when Senator Kaine was governor here in Virginia. He actually — he actually tried to raise taxes by about \$4 billion. He left his state about \$2 billion in the hole. In the state of Indiana, we've cut unemployment in half; unemployment doubled when he was governor.
But I think he's a very fitting running mate for Hillary Clinton, because in the wake of a season where American families are struggling in this economy under the weight of higher taxes and Obamacare and the war on coal and the stifling avalanche of regulation coming out of this administration, Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want more of the same. It really is remarkable that they actually are advocating a trillion dollars in tax increases, which I get that. You tried to raise taxes here in Virginia and were unsuccessful.
But a trillion dollars in tax increases, more regulation, more of the same war on coal, and more of Obamacare that now even former President Bill Clinton calls Obamacare a crazy plan. But Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to build on Obamacare. They want to expand it into a single-payer program. And for all the world, Hillary Clinton just thinks Obamacare is a good start.
Look, Donald Trump and I have a plan to get this economy moving again just the way that it worked in the 1980s, just the way it worked in the 1960s, and that is by lowering taxes across the board for working families, small businesses and family farms, ending the war on coal that is hurting jobs and hurting this economy even here in Virginia, repealing Obamacare lock, stock, and barrel, and repealing all of the executive orders that Barack Obama has signed that are stifling economic growth in this economy.
We can get America moving again. Put on top of that the kind of trade deals that'll put the American worker first, and you've got a prescription for real growth. And when you get the economy growing, Elaine, that's when you can deal with the national debt. When we get back to 3.5 percent to 4 percent growth with Donald Trump's plan will do, then we're going to have the resources to meet our nation's needs at home and abroad, and we're going to have the ability to bring down the national debt.
Well, first, let me say, I appreciated the "you're hired," "you're fired" thing, Senator. You use that a whole lot. And I think your running mate used a lot of pre-done lines.
Look, what — what you all just heard out there is more taxes, \$2 trillion in more spending, more deficits, more debt, more government. And if you think that's all working, then you look at the other side of the table. I mean, the truth of the matter is, the policies of this administration, which Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine want to continue, have run this economy into a ditch. We're in the...
slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression.
There are millions more people living in poverty today than the day that Barack Obama with Hillary Clinton at his side...
stepped into the Oval Office.
You — honestly, Senator, you can roll out the numbers and the sunny side, but I got to tell you, people in Scranton know different. People in Fort Wayne, Indiana, know different. I mean, this economy is struggling. The answer to this economy is not more taxes.
It's not more spending...
Absolutely I will.
Well, this is probably the difference between Donald Trump and Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine. And, I mean, Hillary Clinton and Senator Kaine — God bless you for it, career public servants, that's great — Donald Trump is a businessman, not a career politician. He actually built a business.
Those tax returns that were — that came out publicly this week show that he faced some pretty tough times 20 years ago. But like virtually every other business, including the New York Times not too long ago, he used

what's called net operating loss. We have a tax code, Senator, that actually is designed to encourage entrepreneurship in this country.

Well, we're answering the question about — about a business thing, is he...

His tax returns — his tax returns showed he went through a very difficult time, but he used the tax code just the way it's supposed to be used. And he did it brilliantly.

He created a runway — because he's created a business that's worth billions of dollars today.

And with regard to paying taxes, this whole riff about not paying taxes and people saying he didn't pay taxes for years, Donald Trump has created tens of thousands of jobs. And he's paid payroll taxes, sales taxes, property taxes...

The only issue on taxes — Hillary Clinton is going to raise taxes, and Donald Trump and I are going to cut them. And he will.

He hasn't broken his promise. He said he's...

Senator, do you take all the deductions that you're entitled to?

I do.

Elaine, I have to respond to this.

I'll be — I'll be very respectful.

Look, Donald Trump has filed over 100 pages of financial disclosure, which is what the law requires. The American people can review that. And he's going — Senator, he's going to release his tax returns when the audit is over...

They're going to raise your taxes. We're going to cut your taxes.

Well, thanks, Elaine. There they go again. OK...

All Donald Trump — all Donald Trump and I have said about Social Security is we're going to meet our obligations to our seniors. That's it.

We've said we're going to meet the obligations of Medicare. That's what this campaign is really about, Senator. And I get, this is — this is the old scare tactic that they roll out...

And I get all of that. I just, look...

There's a question that you asked a little bit earlier that I want to go back to.

I have to go back to.

Well, look, I — you're running with Hillary Clinton, who wants to raise taxes by \$1 trillion, increase spending by \$2 trillion, and you say you're going to keep the promises of Social Security. Donald Trump and I are going to cut taxes. We're going to — we're going to — we're going to...

reform government programs so we can meet the obligations of Social Security and Medicare.

Stay on the path that your party has us on, we're going to be in a — in a mountain range of debt. And we're going to face hard choices and...

Three hundred and five economists said your plan is bad for the economy.

You know, my uncle was a cop, a career cop, on the beat in downtown Chicago. He was my hero when I was growing up. And we'd go up to visit my dad's family in Chicago. My three brothers and I would marvel at my uncle when he would come out in his uniform, sidearm at his side.

Police officers are the best of us. And the men and women, white, African-American, Asian, Latino, Hispanic, they put their lives on the line every single day. And let me say, at the risk of agreeing with you, community policing is a great idea. It's worked in the Hoosier state. And we fully support that.

Donald Trump and I are going to make sure that law enforcement have the resources and the tools to be able to really restore law and order to the cities and communities in this nation. It's probably — probably why the 330,000 members of the Fraternal Order of Police endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States of America, because they see his commitment to them. They see his commitment to law and order.

But they also — they also hear the bad mouthing, the bad mouthing that comes from people that seize upon tragedy in the wake of police action shootings as — as a reason to — to use a broad brush to accuse law enforcement of — of implicit bias or institutional racism. And that really has got to stop.

I mean, when an African-American police officer in Charlotte named Brentley Vinson, an all-star football player who went to Liberty University here in the state, came home, followed his dad into law enforcement, joined the force in Charlotte, joined the force in Charlotte in 2014, was involved in a police action shooting that claimed the life of Keith — Keith Lamont Scott, it was a tragedy. I mean, I — we — we mourn with those who mourn. We — we grieve with those who grieve. And we're saddened at the loss of life.

But Hillary Clinton actually referred to that moment as an example of implicit bias in the police force, where — where she used — when she was asked in the debate a week ago whether there was implicit bias in law enforcement, her only answer was that there's implicit bias in everyone in the United States. I just think...

I just think what we ought to do is we ought to stop seizing on these moments of tragedy. We ought to assure the public that we'll have a full and complete and transparent investigation whenever there's a loss of life because of police action. But, Senator, please, you know, enough of this seeking every opportunity to demean law enforcement broadly by making the accusation of implicit bias every time tragedy occurs.

I'm not afraid to bring that up.

We need criminal justice reform.

Indiana has passed criminal justice reform.

But that's not what you're talking about.

Senator, when African-American police officers involved in a police action shooting involving an African-American, why would Hillary Clinton accuse that African-American police officer of implicit bias?

I did not make that statement. I...

Well, I have the deepest respect for Senator Scott, and he's a close friend. And what I would say is that we — we need to adopt criminal justice reform nationally. I — I signed criminal justice reform in the state of Indiana, Senator, and we're very proud of it.

I worked when I was in Congress on the second chance act. We have got to do a better job recognizing and correcting the errors in the system that do reflect on institutional bias in criminal justice. But what — what — what Donald Trump and I are saying is let's not have the reflex of assuming the worst of men and women in law enforcement. We truly do believe that law enforcement is not a force for racism or division in our country...

Law enforcement in this country is a force for good. They are the — they truly are people that put their lives on the line every single day. But I would — I would suggest to you, what we need to do is assert a stronger leadership at the national level to support law enforcement. You just heard Senator Kaine reject stop-and-frisk. Well, I would suggest to you that the families that live in our inner cities that are besieged by crime...

Donald Trump's laid out a plan to end illegal immigration once and for all in this country. We've been talking it to death for 20 years. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to continue the policies of open borders, amnesty, catch and release, sanctuary cities, all the things that are driving — that are driving wages down in this country, Senator, and also too often with criminal aliens in the country, it's bringing heartbreak.

But I — Donald Trump has a plan that he laid out in Arizona, that will deal systemically with illegal immigration, beginning with border security, internal enforcement. It's probably why for the first time in the history of Immigration and Customs Enforcement their union actually endorsed Donald Trump as the next president of the United States, because they know they need help to enforce the laws of this country.

And Donald Trump has laid out a priority to remove criminal aliens, remove people that have overstayed their visas. And — and once we have accomplished all of that, which will — which will strengthen our economy, strengthen the rule of law in the country and make our communities safer once the criminal aliens are out, then we'll deal with those that remain.

But I have to tell you, I just — I was listening to the avalanche of insults coming out of Senator Kaine a minute ago.

It's my time, Senator.

Thanks. I forgive you. He says ours is an insult-driven campaign. Did you all just hear that? Ours is an insult-driven campaign?

I mean, to be honest with you, if Donald Trump had said all of the things that you've said he said in the way you said he said them, he still wouldn't have a fraction of the insults that Hillary Clinton leveled when she said that half of our supporters were a basket of deplorables. It's — she said they were irredeemable, they were not American.

I mean, it's extraordinary. And then she labeled one after another "ism" on millions of Americans who believe that we can have a stronger America at home and abroad, who believe we can get this economy moving again, who believe that we can end illegal immigration once and for all. So, Senator, this — this insult-driven campaign, I mean...

That's small potatoes compared to Hillary Clinton...

calling half of Donald Trump's supporters a basket of deplorables.

She said she shouldn't have said half.

Yeah. Oh...

She apologized for saying "half."

That's nonsense. That's nonsense.

Senator, we have a deportation force. It's called Immigrations and Customs Enforcement. And the union for Immigrations and Customs Enforcement for the first time in their history endorsed Donald Trump to be the next president of the United States of America.

Senator, that's — that's nonsense. Look, what you just heard is they have a plan for open borders, amnesty. That's...[crosstalk]

They call it comprehensive immigration reform — they call it comprehensive immigration reform on Capitol Hill. We all know the routine. It's amnesty. And you heard one of the last things he mentioned was border security.

That's how Washington always plays it.

They always say we're going to do this, we're going to do that, we'll eventually get the border... Ronald Reagan said a nation without borders is not a nation. Donald Trump is committed to restoring the borders of this nation and securing our nation, enforcing our laws.

Well, I think Donald Trump laid out a series of priorities that doesn't ends with border security. It begins with border security. And after we secure the border, not only build a wall, but beneath the ground and in the air, we do internal enforcement.

But he said the focus has to be on criminal aliens. We just — we just had a conversation about law enforcement. We just had a conversation about the — the violence that's besetting our cities. The reality is that there's heartbreak and tragedy that has struck American families because people that came into this country illegally are now involved in criminal enterprise and activity. And we don't have the resources or the will to deport them systematically.

Donald Trump has said we're going to move those people out, people who've overstayed their visas. We're going to enforce the law of this country. We're going to strengthen Immigrations and Customs Enforcements with more resources and more personnel to be able to do that. And then Donald Trump has made it clear, once we've done all of those things, that we're going to reform the immigration system that we have...

where people can come into this country.

That's the order that you should do it. Border security, removing criminal aliens, upholding with law, and then — but then, Senator, I'll work you when you go back to the Senate, I promise you, we'll work with you to reform the immigration system.

He's talking about criminal aliens.

Oh, please. Come on.

Did you work on that one a long time? Because that had a lot of really creative lines in it.

Well, look, I can defend — I — I — I can — I can make very clear to the American people, after traveling millions of miles as our secretary of state, after being the architect of the foreign policy of this administration, America is less safe today than it was the day that Barack Obama became president of the United States. It's absolutely inarguable.

We've weakened America's place in the world. It's been a combination of factors, but mostly it's been a lack of leadership. I mean, I will give you — and I was in Washington, D.C., on 9/11. I saw the clouds of smoke rise from the Pentagon.

I know you were. We all lived through that day as a nation. It was heartbreaking. And I want to give this president credit for bringing Osama bin Laden to justice.

But the truth is, Osama bin Laden led Al Qaida. Our primary threat today is ISIS. And because Hillary Clinton failed to renegotiate a status of forces agreement that would have allowed some American combat troops to remain in Iraq and secure the hard fought gains the American soldier had won by 2009, ISIS was able to be literally conjured up out of the desert, and it's overrun vast areas that the American soldier had won in Operation Iraqi Freedom.

My heart breaks for the likes of Lance Cpl. Scott Zubowski. He fell in Fallujah in 2005. He fought hard through some of the most difficult days in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and he paid the ultimate sacrifice to defend our freedom and secure that nation. And that nation was secured in 2009.

But because Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama failed to provide a status of forces agreement and leave sufficient troops in there, we are back at war. The president just ordered more troops on the ground. We are back at war in Iraq. And Scott Zubowski, whose mom would always come to Memorial Day events in Newcastle, Indiana, to see me, and I'd always give her a hug and tell her we're never going to forget her son and we never will, Scott Zubowski and the sacrifices the American soldier made were squandered in Iraq because this administration created a vacuum in which ISIS was able to grow.

And a reference to the Iranian deal, the Iranian deal that Hillary Clinton initiated, \$150 billion to the radical mullahs in Iran.

You didn't stop the nuclear weapons program.

You essentially...

guaranteed that Iran will someday become a nuclear power, because there's no limitations once the period of time of the treaty comes off.

Well, I think it's — I think it's a great question, Elaine, but it really does begin with us reforming our immigration system and putting the interests, particularly the safety and security of the American people, first.

I mean, Donald Trump has called for extreme vetting for people coming into this country so that we don't bring people into the United States who are hostile to our Bill of Rights freedoms, who are hostile to the American way life.

But also, Donald Trump and I are committed to suspending the Syrian refugee program and programs and immigration from areas of the world that have been compromised by terrorism. Hillary Clinton and Tim Kaine want to increase the Syrian refugee program by 500...[crosstalk]

Yeah, and so — but first, you know, let's make sure we're putting the safety and security of the American people first instead of Hillary Clinton expanding the Syrian refugee program...

That's not — that's absolutely false.

The Seventh Circuit...

That's absolutely false.

Absolutely...

Right. Right.

And those judges — those judges said...

Elaine, to your point, those judges said it was because there wasn't any evidence yet that — that ISIS had infiltrated the United States. Well, Germany just arrested three Syrian refugees that were connected to ISIS.

But, look, if you're going to be critical of me on that, that's fair game. I will tell you, after two Syrian refugees were involved in the attack in Paris that is called Paris' 9/11, as governor of the state of Indiana, I have no higher priority than the safety and security of the people of my state.

So you bet I suspended that program.

And I stand by that decision. And if I'm vice president of the United States or Donald Trump is president, we're going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

But the problem with that...

Elaine, the director of the FBI, our homeland security, said we can't know for certain who these people are coming from Syria.

So — the FBI...

The FBI and homeland security said we can't know for certain. You've got to err on the side of the safety and security of the American people, Senator. I understand the... the U.N. wants us to expand the Syrian refugee program... We're going to put the safety and security of the American people first.

That's not his plan. Kaine: Well, he said NATO is obsolete. And, look, if you put aside — push aside your alliances, who you're going to share intelligence with? Hillary Clinton is the secretary of state who knows how to build alliances. She built the sanctions regime around the world that stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. And that's what an intelligence surge means. Better skill and capacity, but also better alliances.

Can I speak about the cybersecurity surge at all?

First, Donald Trump just spoke about this issue this week. We have got to bring together the best resources of this country to understand that cyber warfare is the new warfare of the asymmetrical enemies that we face in this country. And I look forward if I'm privileged to be in this role of working with you in the Senate to make sure that we resource that effort.

We have an intelligence, sir. But I will also tell you that it's important in this moment to remember that Hillary Clinton had a private server in her home that had classified information on it... about drone strikes, e-mails from the president of the United States of America were on there. Her private server was subject to being hacked by foreign... We could put cybersecurity first if we just make sure the next secretary of state doesn't have a private server. If your son or my son handled classified information the way Hillary Clinton did... they'd be court martialed.

Absolutely true.

It's absolutely true.

The United States of America needs to begin to exercise strong leadership to protect the vulnerable citizens and over 100,000 children in Aleppo. Hillary Clinton's top priority when she became secretary of state was the Russian reset, the Russian reset. After the Russian reset, the Russians invaded Ukraine and took over Crimea. And the small and bullying leader of Russia is now dictating terms to the United States to the point where all the United States of America — the greatest nation on Earth — just withdraws from talks about a cease-fire while Vladimir Putin puts a missile defense system in Syria while he marshals the forces and begins — look, we have got to begin to lean into this with strong, broad-shouldered American leadership. It begins by rebuilding our military. And the Russians and the Chinese have been making enormous investments in the military. We have the smallest Navy since 1916. We have the lowest number of troops since the end of the Second World War. We've got to work with the Congress, and Donald Trump will, to rebuild our military and project American strength in the world.

But about Aleppo and about Syria, I truly do believe that what America ought to do right now is immediately establish safe zones, so that families and vulnerable families with children can move out of those areas, work with our Arab partners, real time, right now, to make that happen.

And secondly, I just have to tell you that the provocations by Russia need to be met with American strength. And if Russia chooses to be involved and continue, I should say, to be involved in this barbaric attack on civilians in Aleppo, the United States of America should be prepared to use military force to strike military targets of the Assad regime to prevent them from this humanitarian crisis that is taking place in Aleppo.

There's a broad range of other things that we ought to do, as well. We ought to deploy a missile defense shield to the Czech Republic and Poland which Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama pulled back on out of not wanting to offend the Russians back in 2009.

We've just got to have American strength on the world stage. When Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, the Russians and other countries in the world will know they're dealing with a strong American president.

Well, that offended me.

Well, first and foremost, Donald Trump supports our troops. Donald Trump supports our veterans. Donald Trump has paid all the taxes that he's — do you not take deductions? How does that work? Honestly, Senator. Honestly, Senator.

I understand why you want to change — I understand why you want to change the subject.

I understand why you want to change the subject. And let me be very clear on this Russian thing. The larger question here...

What we're dealing with is the — you know, there's an old proverb that says the Russian bear never dies, it just hibernates. And the truth of the matter is, the weak and feckless foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama has awakened an aggression in Russia that first appeared a few years ago with their move in Georgia, now their move into Crimea, now their move into the wider Middle East.

And all the while, all we do is fold our arms and say we're not having talks anymore. To answer your question, we just need American strength. We need to — we need to marshal the resources of our allies in the region, and in the immediate, we need to act and act now to get people out of harm's way.

The — the safe zones would have to be — as the senator said, there's already a framework for this that's been recognized by the international community. The United States of America needs to be prepared to work with our allies in the region to create a route for safe passage and then to protect people in those areas, including with a no-fly zone.

But, look, this is very tough stuff. I served on the Foreign Affairs Committee for a decade. I traveled in and out of that region for 10 years. I saw what the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom. And to see the weak and feckless leadership that Hillary Clinton was the architect of and the foreign policy of the Obama administration...

is deeply troubling to me. That will all change the day Donald Trump becomes president of the United States.

You didn't.

I just did.

And come on. Senator. Senator, that was even beneath you and Hillary Clinton. And that — that's pretty low.

Senator, the...

Ronald Reagan also said nuclear war should never be fought because it can never be won. And the United States of America needs to make investments in modernizing our nuclear force for both deterrence...

and assurance to our allies. But let me go back to this Iran thing. I mean, he keeps saying that they prevented — that Hillary Clinton started the deal with the Iranians prevented Iran from getting a nuclear weapon.

Well, that's not what — that's not what Israel thinks.

You wouldn't necessarily know that.

I know you boycotted Prime Minister Netanyahu's speech when he came before the Congress.

You boycotted the speech. The point is, what this Iran — so-called Iran deal did was essentially guarantee — I mean, when I was in Congress, I fought hard on a bipartisan basis with Republican and Democrat members to move forward the toughest sanctions, it — literally in the history of the United States, against Iran.

We were bringing them to heel, but the goal was always that we would only lift the sanctions if Iran permanently renounced their nuclear ambitions.

They have not — Elaine, let me finish a sentence. They have not renounced their nuclear ambitions. And when the deal's period runs out, there's no limitation on them obtaining weapons. That...

and the fact that they got \$1.7 billion in a ransom payment...

is astonishing to the American people.

Well, let's — no, no, don't put words in my mouth.

He's going...

No, I'm — look...

I'm very, very happy to defend Donald Trump. If he wants to take these one at a time, I'll take them one at a time.

Don't put words in my mouth. Well, he never said that, Senator.

Most of the stuff you've said, he's never said.

No, we haven't.

Oh, that's nonsense.

He knew that.

But what's it got to do with Russia?

No, he hasn't said that.

Well, thanks. I'm just trying to keep up with the insult-driven campaign on the other side of the table.

Yeah.

I'm happy to defend him, Senator. Don't put words in my mouth that I'm not defending him.

I'm happy to defend him. Most of what you said is completely false, and the American people know that.

This isn't the old days where you can just say stuff and people believe it.

Look, this is the alternative universe of Washington, D.C., versus reality. Hillary Clinton said her number-one priority was a reset with Russia. That reset resulted in the invasion of Ukraine, after they'd infiltrated with what are called little green men, Russian soldiers that were dressing up like Ukrainian dissidents, and then they moved all the way into Crimea, took over the Crimean Peninsula. Donald Trump knew that happened. He basically was saying it's not going to happen again. The truth of the matter is that what you have in the rise of aggressive Russia, which has had — increased its influence in Iran, that's now — now because of this deal is on a pathway

in the future to obtain a nuclear — the leading state sponsor of terror in the world in Iran now has a closer working relationship with Russia because of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama's foreign policy and \$150 billion and sanctions all being lifted.

And then, of course, Syria, I mean, it really is extraordinary that — Syria is imploding. You just asked a very thoughtful question about the disaster in Aleppo. ISIS is headquartered in Raqqa. It is — ISIS from Raqqa has overrun vast areas that at great sacrifice the American soldier won in Operation Iraqi Freedom, and yet Senator Kaine still sits here, loyal soldier — I get all that — in saying that the foreign policy of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama somehow made the world more secure. I mean, it really is astonishing that on the day...

on the day that Iran released four American hostages...

we delivered \$400 million in cash as a ransom payment for Americans held by the radical mullahs in Tehran.

Strength. Plain and simple.

Donald Trump — that's nonsense. Donald Trump is a strong leader...

who is going to lead with American strength.

We're going to rebuild our military. And let me — let me — this whole Putin thing. Look, America is stronger than Russia. Our economy is 16 times larger than the Russian economy. America's political system is superior to the crony, corrupt capitalist system in Russia in every way.

When Donald Trump and I observe that, as I've said in Syria, in Iran, in Ukraine, that the small and bullying leader of Russia has been stronger on the world stage than this administration, that's stating painful facts. That's not an endorsement of Vladimir Putin. That's an indictment of the weak and feckless leadership...

of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama.

That is absolutely inaccurate.

He said he's stronger — he's been stronger on the world stage.

You just said better.

Yeah, here we go. This is the grade school thing again?

Right, this is grade school.

Yeah.

Right.

Right.

Well, first, we need to — we need to make a commitment to rebuild our military, including modernizing our nuclear forces. And we also need — we also need an effective American diplomacy that will marshal the resources of nations in the Asian Pacific Rim to put pressure on North Korea, on Kim Jong-un, to abandon his nuclear ambitions. It has to remain the policy of the United States of America the denuclearization of the Korean Peninsula, plain and simple.

And when Donald Trump is president of the United States, we're — we're not going to have the — the kind of posture in the world that has Russia invading Crimea and Ukraine, that has the Chinese building new islands in the South China Sea, that has literally the world, including North Korea, flouting American power. We're going to — we're going to go back to the days of peace through strength.

But I have to tell you that — that all this talk about tax returns — and I get it, you know, you want to keep bringing that up. It must have — must have...

done well in some focus group. But here — Hillary Clinton and her husband set up a private foundation called the Clinton Foundation. While she was secretary of state, the Clinton Foundation accepted tens of millions of dollars from foreign governments and foreign donors.

Now, you all need to know out there, this is basic stuff. Foreign donors, and certainly foreign governments, cannot participate in the American political process. They cannot make financial contributions. But the Clintons figured out a way to create a foundation where foreign governments and foreign donors could donate millions of dollars. And then we found, thanks to the good work of the Associated Press, that more than half of her private meetings when she was secretary of state were given to major donors of the Clinton Foundation. When you talk about all these — all these baseless rumors about Russia and the rest, Hillary Clinton — you asked the trustworthy question at the very beginning — the reason...

the reason the American people don't trust Hillary Clinton is because they are looking at the pay to play politics that she operated with the Clinton Foundation through a private server...

while she's secretary of state.

And they're saying enough is enough.

The Trump Foundation is a non-profit.

Well, thank you. Thank you. The Trump Foundation is a private family foundation. They give virtually every cent in the Trump Foundation to charitable causes.

Less than ten cents on the dollar in the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

It has been a platform for the Clintons to travel the world, to have staff. But honestly, Senator, we would know a lot more about it if Hillary Clinton would just turn over the 33,000 e-mails...

that she refused to turn over in her private server...

and we'd have a much better picture of what the Clinton Foundation was about.

Well, it's a wonderful question. And my Christian faith is at the very heart of who I am. I was also raised in a wonderful family of faith. It was a church on Sunday morning and grace before dinner.

But my Christian faith became real for me when I made a personal decision for Christ when I was a freshman in college. And I've tried to live that out however imperfectly every day of my life since. And with my wife at my side, we've followed a calling into public service, where we've — we've tried to — we've tried to keep faith with the values that we cherish.

And with regard to when I struggle, I appreciate, and — and — and — I have a great deal of respect for Senator Kaine's sincere faith. I truly do.

But for me, I would tell you that for me the sanctity of life proceeds out of the belief that — that ancient principle that — where God says before you were formed in the womb, I knew you, and so for my first time in public life, I sought to stand with great compassion for the sanctity of life.

The state of Indiana has also sought to make sure that we expand alternatives in health care counseling for women, non-abortion alternatives. I'm also very pleased at the fact we're well on our way in Indiana to becoming the most pro-adoption state in America. I think if you're going to be pro-life, you should — you should be pro-adoption.

But what I can't understand is with Hillary Clinton and now Senator Kaine at her side is to support a practice like partial-birth abortion. I mean, to hold to the view — and I know Senator Kaine, you hold pro-life views personally — but the very idea that a child that is almost born into the world could still have their life taken from them is just anathema to me.

And I cannot — I can't conscience about — about a party that supports that. Or that — I know you've historically opposed taxpayer funding of abortion. But Hillary Clinton wants to — wants to repeal the longstanding provision in the law where we said we wouldn't use taxpayer dollars to fund abortion.

So for me, my faith informs my life. I try and spend a little time on my knees every day. But it all for me begins with cherishing the dignity, the worth, the value of every human life.

No, it's really not. Donald Trump and I would never support legislation that punished women who made the heartbreaking choice to end a pregnancy.

We just never would.

Well, look, it's — look, he's not a polished politician like you and Hillary Clinton. And so...

You know, things don't always come out exactly the way he means them.

But I'm telling you what the policy of our administration would be.

Yeah.

I'm telling you...

Senator, you've whipped out that Mexican thing again. He — look...

There are criminal aliens in this country, Tim, who have come into this country illegally who are perpetrating violence and taking American lives.

He also said and many of them are good people. You keep leaving that out of your quote. And if you want me to go there, I'll go there.

But here's — there is a choice, and it is a choice on life. I couldn't be more proud to be standing with Donald Trump, who's standing for the right to life. It's a principle that — Senator Kaine — and I'm very gentle about this, because I really do respect you — it's a principle that you embrace.

And I have appreciated the fact that you've supported the Hyde amendment, which bans the use of taxpayer funding for abortion, in the past, but that's not Hillary Clinton's view. People need to understand, we can come together as a nation. We can create a culture of life. More and more young people today are embracing life because we know we are — we're better for it. We can — like Mother Teresa said at that famous national prayer breakfast...

bring the — let's welcome the children into our world. There are so many families around the country who can't have children. We could improve adoption...

so that families that can't have children can adopt more readily those children from crisis pregnancies.

Because there are...

Because there is — a society can be judged by how it deals with its most vulnerable, the aged, the infirm, the disabled, and the unborn. I believe it with all my heart. And I couldn't be more proud to be standing with a pro-life candidate in Donald Trump.

Well, thank you, Elaine, and thanks for a great discussion...

tonight. Thank you, Senator.

This is a very challenging time in the life of our nation. Weakened America's place in the world after the leadership of Hillary Clinton and Barack Obama on the world stage has been followed by an economy that is truly struggling, stifled by an avalanche of more taxes, more regulation, Obamacare, the war on coal, and the kind of trade deals that have put American workers in the back seat. I think the best way that we can bring people together is through change in Washington, D.C.

You know, I served in Washington, D.C., for 12 years in the Congress of the United States. And I served with many Republicans and Democrats, men and women of goodwill. The potential is there to really change the direction of this country, but it's going to take leadership to do it.

The American people want to see our nation standing tall on the world stage again. They want to see us supporting our military, rebuilding our military, commanding the respect of the world, and they want to see the American economy off to the races again. They want to see an American comeback. And Donald Trump's entire career has been about building. It's been about — it's going through hardship just like a businessperson does and finding a way through smarts and ingenuity and resilience to fight forward and — when Donald Trump becomes president of the United States, we're going to have a stronger America. When you hear him say he wants to make America great again, when we do that, I truly do believe the American people are going to be standing taller. They're going to see that real change can happen after decades of just talking about it. And when that happens, the American people are going to stand tall, stand together, and we'll have the kind of unity that's been missing for way too long.

Pence_2

October 7th, 2020

Susan, thank you. And I want to thank the Commission and the University of Utah for hosting this event. And Senator Harris, it's a privilege to be on the stage with you. And our nation has gone through a very challenging time this year. But I want the American people to know that from the very first day, President Donald Trump has put the health of America first. Before there were more than five cases in the United States, all people who had returned from China, President Donald Trump did what no other American president had ever done. And that was, he suspended all travel from China, the second largest economy in the world. Now, Senator Joe Biden opposed that decision. He said it was xenophobic and hysterical. But I can tell you having led the white house coronavirus task force that that decision alone by President Trump bought us invaluable time to stand up the greatest national mobilization since World War Two.

And I believe it saved hundreds of thousands of American lives. Because with that time, we were able to reinvent testing. More than 115 million tests had been done to date. We were able to see to the delivery of billions of supplies, so our doctors and nurses had the resources support they needed. And we began, really, before the month of February we started to develop a vaccine and to develop medicines and therapeutics that have been saving lives all along the way. And under President Trump's leadership, Operation Warp Speed, we believe we'll have literally tens of millions of doses of a vaccine before the end of this year. The reality is, when you look at the Biden plan, it reads an awful lot like what President Trump, and I, and our task force has been doing every step of the way. And quite frankly, when I look at their plan that talks about advancing testing, creating new PPE, developing a vaccine, it looks a little bit like plagiarism, which is something Joe Biden knows a little bit about. And I think the American people know that this is a president who has put the health-
... of America first. And the American people, I believe with my heart, can be proud-
... of the sacrifices they have made. It's saved countless American lives-

Susan, I have to weigh in here-

I have to weigh in.

There's not a day gone by that I haven't thought of every American family that's lost a loved one. And I want all of you to know that you'll always be in our hearts and in our prayers. But when you say what the American people have done over these last eight months, hasn't worked, that's a great disservice to the sacrifices the American people have made-

But the reality... If I may finish, Senator. The reality is Dr. Fauci said everything that he told the president in the Oval Office, the president told the American. Now President Trump, I will tell you, has boundless confidence in the American people, and he always spoke with confidence that we'd get through this together. But when you say it hasn't worked... When Dr. Fauci, and Dr. Birx, and our medical experts came to us in the second week of March, they said, if the president didn't take the unprecedented step of shutting down roughly half of the American economy, that we could lose 2.2 million Americans. That's the reality.

They also said to us, if we did everything right, Susan, we could still lose more than 200,000 Americans.

One life lost is too many, Susan. But the American people, I believe, deserve credit for the sacrifices that they have made, putting the health of their family and their neighbors first, our doctors, our nurses, our first responders.

And I'm going to speak up on behalf of what the American people have done.

Well, the American people have demonstrated over the last eight months, that when given the facts, they're willing to put the health of their families and their neighbors and people they don't even know first. President Trump and I have great confidence in the American people and their ability to take that information and put it into practice. In the height of the epidemic when we were losing a heartbreaking number of 2,500 Americans a day, we surged resources to New Jersey and New York and New Orleans and Detroit. We told the American people what needed to be done, and the American people made the sacrifices. When the outbreak in the Sun Belt happened this summer, again, Americans stepped forward. But the reality is the work of the President of the

United States goes on. A vacancy on the Supreme Court of the United States has come upon us, and the President introduced Judge Amy Coney Barrett.

If I may say, that Rose Garden event, been a great deal of speculation about it. My wife, Karen and I were there and honored to be there. Many of the people who were at that event, Susan, actually were tested for Coronavirus, and it was an outdoor event, which all of our scientists regularly and routinely advise. The difference here is President Trump and I trust the American people to make choices in the best interest of their health. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris consistently talk about mandates, and not just mandates with the Coronavirus, but a government takeover of healthcare, the Green New Deal, all government control. We're about freedom and respecting the freedom of the American people.

Which we've always done.

Susan, we talked about this.

Well, Susan, thank you. Although, I would like to go back.

Well, thank you, but I would like to go back because the reality is that we're going to have a vaccine, Senator, in record time. In unheard of time, in less than a year. We have five companies in phase three clinical trials. And we're right now producing tens of millions of doses. So the fact that you continue to undermine public confidence in a vaccine, if the vaccine emerges during the Trump administration, I think is unconscionable. And Senator, I just ask you, stop playing politics with people's lives. The reality is that we will have a vaccine, we believe, before the end of this year. And it will have the capacity to save countless American lives. And your continuous undermining of confidence in a vaccine is just, it's unacceptable. And let me also say, the reality is, when you talk about failure in this administration, we actually do know what failure looks like in a pandemic.

It was 2009. The Swine flu arrived in the United States. Thankfully, it ended up not being as lethal as the Coronavirus. But before the end of the year, when Joe Biden was Vice President of the United States, not seven and a half million people contracted the Swine flu, 60 million Americans contracted the Swine flu. If the Swine flu had been as lethal as the Coronavirus in 2009 when Joe Biden was Vice President, we would have lost 2 million American lives. His own chief of staff, Ron Klain would say last year that it was pure luck that they did, "Everything possible wrong." And we learned from that. They left the strategic national stockpile empty. They left an empty and hollow plan, but we still learn from it, and I think the American people, I'm going to say again, can be proud of what we have done. And Senator, please stop undermining confidence in a vaccine.

Well, Susan, thank you. And let me say on behalf of the President and the First Lady, how moved we've all been by the outpouring of prayers and concern for the President. And I do believe it's emblematic of the prayers and the concern that have ushered forth for every American impacted by the Coronavirus. But the care of the President received at Walter Reed Hospital, the White House doctors was exceptional. And the transparency that they practiced all along the way will continue. The American people have a right to know about-

... they will continue. The American people have a right to know about the health and well-being of their president, and we'll continue to do that. But I'm just extremely grateful and was more than a little moved by the broad and bipartisan support. And Senator, I want to thank you and Joe Biden for your expressions and genuine concern. And I also want to congratulate you, as I did on that phone call, on the historic nature of your nomination.

I never expected to be on this stage four years ago, so I know the feeling, but the reality is we've got an election before the American people in the midst of this challenging year and the stakes have never been higher, but I think the choice has never been here.

Susan, Susan-

Well, look, I respect the fact that Joe Biden spent 47 years in public life. I respect your public service as well.

The American people have a president who was a businessman, he's a job creator. Who's paid tens of millions of dollars in taxes, payroll taxes, property taxes. He's created tens of thousands of American jobs. And the President said those public reports are not accurate. And the President's also released literally stacks of financial disclosures the American people can review just as the law allows. But the distinction here is that Joe Biden, 47 years in public service compared to President Donald Trump, who brought all of that experience four years ago- ... and turned this economy around by cutting taxes, rolling back regulations- ... unleashing American energy, fighting for free and fair trade. And all of that's on the line- ... if Joe Biden and Kamala Harris are elected.

When President Trump and I took office, America had gone through the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression. It was when Joe Biden was vice president, they tried to tax and spend, and regulate, and bail our way back to a growing economy. President Trump cut taxes across the board. Despite what Senator Harris says, the average American family of four had \$2,000 in savings in taxes. And with the rise in wages that occurred, most predominantly for blue collar, hardworking Americans, the average household income for a family of four increased by \$4,000 following President Trump's tax cuts. But America, you just heard Senator Harris tell you, on day one, Joe Biden's going to raise your taxes. It's really remarkable to think-

I mean, right after a time where we're going through a pandemic that lost 22 million jobs at the height, we've already added back 11.6 million jobs because we had a president who cut taxes, rolled back regulation, unleashed American energy, fought for free and fair trade and secured four trillion dollars from the Congress of the United States to give direct payments to families, save 50 million jobs through the Paycheck Protection

Program. We literally have spared no expense to help the American people and the American worker through this. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris want to raise taxes. They want to bury our economy under a two trillion dollar Green New Deal, which you were one of the original co-sponsors of in the United States Senate. They want to abolish the American comeback is on the ballot with four more years of growth and opportunity.

... and four more years of president Donald Trump, 2021-

... is going to be the biggest economic year in the history of this country.

He said he's going to repeal the Trump tax cuts.

The important is you said the truth. Joe Biden has said it twice in the debate last week that he's going to repeal the Trump tax cuts. That was tax cuts that gave the average working family \$2,000 in a tax break every single year-

Senator, that's the math.

Is he the only going to repeal part of the Trump tax cuts?

Please.

Susan, please

Well. I hope we have a chance to talk about healthcare because Obamacare was a disaster, and the American people remember it well. And President Trump and I have a plan to improve healthcare and protect preexisting conditions for every American. But look, Senator Harris, you're entitled to your own opinion, but you're not entitled to your own facts. You yourself said on multiple occasions when you were running for president, that you would ban fracking. Joe Biden looked at a supporter in the eye and pointed and said, "I guarantee, I guarantee that we will abolish fossil fuels."

They have a \$2 trillion version of the Green New Deal, Susan, that your newspaper, USA Today, said really wasn't that very different from the original Green New Deal. More taxes, more regulation, banning fracking, abolishing fossil fuel, crushing American energy and economic surrender to China is a prescription for economic decline. President Trump and I will keep America growing, the V-shape recovery that's underway right now will continue with four more years of President Donald Trump

Thank you, Susan. Well, first, I'm very proud of our record on the environment, on conservation. According to all of the best estimates, our air and land are cleaner than any time ever recorded. Our water is among the cleanest in the world. And just a little while ago, the president signed the Outdoors Act. It's the largest investment in our public lands and public parks in 100 years. So President Trump has made a commitment to conservation and to the environment.

Now with regard to climate change, the climate is changing, but the issue is what's the cause and what do we do about it? President Trump has made it clear that we're going to continue to listen to the science. Now Joe Biden and Kamala Harris would put us back in the Paris Climate Accord. They'd impose the Green New Deal, which would crush American energy, would increase the energy costs of American families in their homes, and literally would crush American jobs.

And President Trump and I believe that the progress that we have made in a cleaner environment has been happening precisely because we have a strong, free market economy. What's remarkable is the United States has reduced CO2 more than the countries that are still in the Paris Climate Accord, but we've done it through innovation. And we've done it through natural gas and fracking, which Senator, the American people can go look at the record. I know Joe Biden says otherwise now, as you do, but the both of you repeatedly committed to abolishing fossil fuel and banning of fracking.

And so by creating the kind of American innovation, we're actually steering toward a stronger and better environment. With regard to wildfires, President Trump and I believe that forest management has to be front and center. And even Governor Gavin Newsom from your state has agreed, we've got to work on forest management. And with regard to hurricanes, the National Oceanic Administration tells us that actually as difficult as they are, there are no more hurricanes today than there were 100 years ago-

... but many of the climate alarmists-

... use hurricanes and wildfires to try and sell the goods of a Green New Deal. And President Trump and I are going to always put-

... American jobs and American workers first.

As I said, Susan, the climate is changing. We'll follow the science. But once again, Senator Harris is denying the fact that they're going to raise taxes on every American. Joe Biden said twice in the debate last week, that on day one, he was going to repeal the Trump tax cuts. Those tax cuts delivered \$2,000 in tax relief to the average family of four across America. And with regard to banning fracking, I just recommend that people look at the record. You yourself said repeatedly that you would ban fracking. You were the first Senate co-sponsor of the Green New Deal. And while Joe Biden denied the green new deal, Susan, thank you for pointing out. The Green New Deal is on their campaign website.

And as USA TODAY said, it's essentially the same plan as you co-sponsored with AOC when she submitted it in the Senate. And you just heard the Senator say that she's going to resubmit America to the Paris climate accord. Look, the American people have always cherished our environment and will continue to cherish it. We've made great progress reducing CO2 emissions through American innovation and the development of natural gas

through fracking. We don't need a massive \$2 trillion Green New Deal that would impose all new mandates on American businesses and American families.

Joe Biden wants us to retrofit-

Four million business-

Buildings. It makes no sense. It will cost jobs. President Trump

He's going to put America first. He's going to put jobs first and we're going to take care of our environment and follow the science.

Well, I'd love to respond. Look, lost the trade war with China? Joe Biden never fought it. Joe Biden has been a cheerleader for communist China over the last several decades. And again, Senator Harris, you're entitled to your opinion. You're not entitled to your own facts. When Joe Biden was vice-president, we lost 200,000 manufacturing jobs. And president Obama said they were never coming back. He said, we needed a magic wand to bring them back. In our first three years after we cut taxes-

Roll back regulation, unleashed American energy. This administration saw 500,000 manufacturing-

Jobs created, and that's exactly the kind of growth we're going to continue to see as we bring our nation through- This pandemic.

A Green New Deal-

You're passing new mandates, your Paris Climate Accord. It's going to kill jobs this time, just like it killed jobs-

Thank you, Susan. Well, before I leave that, let me speak to voting records if I can. Everybody knows that NAFTA costs literally thousands of American factories to close. We saw automotive jobs go South of the border. President Trump fought to renegotiate NAFTA. In the United States, Mexico and Canada the agreement is now the law of the land. American people deserve to know Senator Kamala Harris was one of only 10 members of the Senate to vote against the USMCA. It was a huge win for American auto workers. It was a huge win for American farmers, especially dairy in the upper Midwest. But Senator you said it didn't go far enough on climate change, you put your radical environmental agenda ahead of American auto workers and a head of American jobs. I think the American people deserve to know that it's probably why Newsweek magazine said that Kamala Harris was the most liberal member of the United States Senate in 2019, more liberal than Bernie Sanders, more liberal than any of the others in the United States Senate.

So now with regard to China, Susan first and foremost, China is to blame for the coronavirus and President Trump is not happy about it. He's made that very clear, made it clear again today that China and the world health organization did not play straight with the American people. They did not let our personnel into China to get information on the Coronavirus until the middle of February. Fortunately, President Trump in dealing with China from the outset of this administration, standing up to China that had been taking advantage of America for decades in the wake of Joe Biden's cheerleading for China. President Trump made that decision before the end of January to suspend all travel from China. And again, the American people deserve to know Joe Biden opposed President Trump's decision to suspend all travel from China. He said it was hysterical. He said it was-

The President Trump has stood up-

To China. We're going to continue to stand strong.

We want to improve the relationship, but we're going to level the playing field and we're going to hold China accountable-

for what they did to America with the coronavirus.

Not true.

Thank you. Well, President Trump kept his word when we moved the American embassy to Jerusalem, the capital of the state of Israel. When Joe Biden was vice president, they promised to do that and they never did. We stood strong with our allies, but we've been demanding. NATO is now contributing more to our common defense than ever before thanks to President Trump's leadership. We've strengthened our alliances across the Asia Pacific, and we've stood strong against those who would do us harm. When President Trump came into office, ISIS had captured an area of the middle East, the size of Pennsylvania, but President Trump unleashed the American military and our armed forces destroy the ISIS caliphate and took down their leader, al-Baghdadi without one American casualty. Al-Baghdadi was responsible for the death of thousands, but notably America's hearts today are with the family of Kayla Mueller. Her parents, which are here with us tonight in Salt Lake City. Today, two of the ISIS killers responsible for Kayla Mueller's murder were brought to justice in the United States.

Jihadi John was killed on the battlefield along with the other beetle. The reality is that when Joe Biden was vice president, we had an opportunity to save Kayla Mueller. Breaks my heart to reflect on it, but the military came into the oval office, presented a plan, they said they knew where Kayla was. Baghdadi had held her for 18 months, abused or mercilessly before they killed her, but when Joe Biden was Vice President they hesitated for a month, and when armed forces finally went in, it was clear she'd been moved two days earlier. And her family says with a heart that broke the heart of every American, that if president Donald Trump had been president, they believe Kayla would be alive today.

So, if we destroy the ISIS caliphate and you talk about re-entering the Iran nuclear deal. I mean the last administration transferred \$1.8 billion to the leading state sponsor of terrorism.

President Donald Trump got us out of the deal-

... And when Qassem Soleimani was traveling to Baghdad-

... To do harm to Americans, President Donald Trump took him out-
... And America is safer, our allies are safer and the American people know president Donald Trump will never take action

I really have to respond to that. She has-

Well, I've got to have more than that. Look-

Slanders against President Donald Trump regarding men and women of our armed forces are absurd.

My son is in captain in the United States Marine Corps. My son-in-law's deployed in the United States Navy. I can assure all of you with sons and daughters serving in our military, President Donald Trump, not only respects, but reveres all of those who serve in our armed forces and any suggestion, otherwise is ridiculous. Let me also say the American people deserve to know-

... Joe Biden

Go right ahead.

Well, thank you for the question, but I'll use a little bit of my time to respond to that very important issue before. The American people deserve to know Qassem Soleimani, the Iranian general was responsible for the death of hundreds of American service members. When the opportunity came, we saw him headed to Baghdad to kill more Americans. President Trump didn't hesitate and Qassem Soleimani is gone, but you deserve to know the Joe Biden and Kamala Harris actually criticized the decision to take out Qassem Soleimani. It's really inexplicably, but with regard to Joe Biden, it's explainable because history records a Joe Biden actually opposed the raid against a Osama bin Ladin. It's absolutely essential that we have a commander in chief who will not hesitate to act to protect American lives and to protect American service members, and that's what you have in President Donald Trump.

Now with regard to the Supreme court-

... become Justice Amy Coney Barrett, and she's a brilliant woman and she will bring a lifetime of experience and a sizeable American family to the Supreme court of the United States, and our hope is in the hearing next week, unlike Justice Kavanaugh received with treatment from you and others, that we hope she gets a fair hearing. And we particularly hope that we don't see the kind of attacks on her Christian faith that we saw before. I mean, the Democrat chairman of the Judiciary Committee before, when Judge Barrett was being confirmed for the court of appeals, expressed concern that the dogma of her faith lived loudly and her, and Dick Durbin of Illinois said that it was a concern. Senator, I know one of our judicial nominees you actually attacked, because they were a member of the Catholic Knights of Columbus. Just because the Knights of Columbus holds pro-life views-

... And. So, my hope is that when the hearing takes place that-

... That Judge Amy Coney Barrett will be respectfully voted and confirmed into the Supreme court of the United States.

Well, thank you, Susan, but let me just say, addressing your very first question. I couldn't be more proud to serve as vice president to a president who stands without apology for the sanctity of human life. I'm pro-life. I don't apologize for it, and this is another one of those cases where there's such a dramatic contrast. Joe Biden and Kamala Harris support taxpayer funding of abortion all the way up to the moment of birth. Late term abortion. They want to increase funding to Planned Parenthood of America. For our part, I would never presume how Judge Amy Coney Barrett would rule on the Supreme Court of the United States, but we'll continue to stand strong for the right to life. When you speak about the Supreme Court, though, I think the American people really deserve an answer, Senator Harris. Are you and Joe Biden going to pack the court if Judge Amy Coney Barrett is confirmed? I mean, there've been 29 vacancies on the Supreme Court during presidential election years from George Washington to Barack Obama.

Presidents have nominated in all 29 cases, but your party is actually openly advocating, adding seats to the Supreme court, which has had nine seats for 150 years if you don't get your way. This is a classic case of if you can't win by the rules, you're going to change the rules. Now you've refused to answer the question. Joe Biden has refused to answer the question-

No, you've refused to answer the question. Joe Biden has refused to answer the question. So I think the American people would really like to know if Judge Amy Coney Barrett is confirmed at the Supreme Court of the United States. Are you and Joe Biden, if somehow you win this election, going to pack the Supreme Court to get your way?

No, I'd like you to answer the question.

People, Susan, are voting right now. They'd like to know if you and Joe Biden are going to pack the Supreme Court if you don't get your way in this nomination.

You, once again, gave a non-answer. Joe Biden gave a non-answer.

You know the people deserve a straight answer, and if you haven't figured it out yet, the straight answer is they are going to pack the Supreme Court if they somehow win this election. Men and women, I got to tell you people across this country, if you cherish our Supreme Court, if you cherish the separation of powers, you need to reject the Biden Harris ticket come November the third, reelect President Donald Trump, and we'll stand by that separation powers in a nine seats Supreme Court.

Please.

I just want the record to reflect she never answered the question. Maybe in the next debate Joe Biden will answer the question, but I think the American people know the answer.

Well, our heart breaks for the loss of any innocent American life and the family of Breonna Taylor has our sympathies. But I trust our justice system, a grand jury that refuse the evidence. And it really is remarkable that as a former prosecutor, you would assume that an impaneled grand jury looking at all the evidence, got it wrong. But you're entitled to your opinion, Senator. I think, and with regard to George Floyd, there's no excuse for what happened to George Floyd. Justice will be served, but there's also no excuse for the rioting and looting that followed. I mean, it really is astonishing. Flora Westbrook is with us here tonight in Salt Lake city. Just a few weeks ago, I stood at what used to be her salon, it was burned to the ground by rioters and looters. And Flora is still trying to put her life back together.

And I must tell you, this presumption that you hear consistently from Joe Biden and Kamala Harris, that America is systemically racist, and that as Joe Biden said that he believes that law enforcement has an implicit bias against minorities is a great insult to the men and women who serve in law enforcement. And I want everyone to know who puts on the uniform of law enforcement every day, President Trump and I stand with you. And it is remarkable that when Senator Tim Scott tried to pass a police reform bill, brought together a group of Republicans and Democrats, Senator Harris, you got up and walked out of the room and then you filibustered Senator Tim Scott's bill on the Senate floor that would have provided new accountability, new repeat resources. We don't have to choose between supporting law enforcement, proving public safety and supporting our African-American neighbors and all of our minorities. Under President Trump's leadership- We'll always stand with law enforcement and we'll do what we've done-

From day one, it is improve the lives of African-Americans, record unemployment, record investments in education.

We'll fight for school choice for all of

Not. Not true.

Thank you, Susan. I appreciate that very much. I think this is one of the things that makes people dislike the media so much in this country, Susan, is that you selectively edit just like Senator Harris did, comments that President Trump and I and others on our side made. I mean, Senator Harris conveniently admitted after the President made comments about people on either side of the debate over monuments, he condemned the KKK, neo-Nazis and white supremacists and has done so repeatedly. You're concerned that he doesn't condemn neo-Nazis. President Trump has Jewish grandchildren. His daughter and son-in-law are Jewish. This is a President who respects and cherishes all of the American people.

But you talk about having personally prosecuted. I'm glad you brought up your record, Senator.

I really need to make this point. When you were DA in San Francisco, when you left office, African-Americans were 19 times more likely to be prosecuted for minor drug offenses than whites and Hispanics. When you were Attorney General of California, you increased the disproportionate incarceration of blacks in California. You did nothing on criminal justice reform in California. You didn't lift a finger to pass the first step back on Capitol Hill. I mean, the reality is your record speaks for itself.

President Trump and I have fought for criminal justice before-

We fought for educational choice and opportunities for African-Americans and all of our members.

And we'll do it for four more years.

Well, Susan, first and foremost, I think we're going to win this election. Because while Joe Biden and Kamala Harris rattle off a long litany of the establishment in Washington, DC and establishment that Joe Biden's been a part of for 47 years, president Donald Trump has as launched a movement of everyday Americans from every walk of life. And I have every confidence that the same Americans that delivered that historic victory in 2016, they see this president's record where we rebuild our military. We revived our economy through tax cuts and rolling back regulation, fighting for fair trade, unleashing American energy. We appointed conservatives to our federal courts at every level. And we stood with the men and women of law enforcement every single day. And I think that movement of Americans has only grown stronger in the last four years.

But when you talk about accepting the outcome of the election, I must tell you. Senator, your party has spent the last three and a half years trying to overturn the results of the last election. It's amazing. When Joe Biden was vice president of the United States, the FBI actually spied on president Trump and my campaign. I mean, there were documents released this week that the CIA actually made a referral to the FBI, documenting that those allegations were coming from the Hillary Clinton campaign. And of course, we've all seen the avalanche, what you put the country through for the better part of three years, until it was found that there was no obstruction, no collusion, case closed. And then Senator Harris, you and your colleagues in the Congress tried to impeach the president of the United States over a phone call. And now Hillary Clinton has actually said to Joe Biden that, in her words, under no circumstances, should he concede the election.

So let me just say, I think we're going to win this election. President Trump and I are fighting every day in courthouses to prevent Joe Biden and Kamala Harris from changing the rules and creating this universal mail in voting that'll create a massive opportunity for voter fraud. And we have a free and fair election. We know we're going to have confidence in it. And I believe in all my heart that president Donald Trump is going to be reelected for four more years.

Brecklin, it's a wonderful question. And let me just commend you for taking an interest in public life. I started following the news when I was very young. And in America, we believe in a free and open exchange of debate. And we celebrate that. It's how we've created literally the freest and most prosperous nation in the history of the world. I would tell you that, don't assume that what you're seeing on your local news networks is synonymous with the American people.

I look at the relationship between Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, the late justice who we just lost from the Supreme Court, and the late justice Antonin Scalia. They were on polar opposites on the Supreme Court of the United States. One very liberal one, very conservative. But what's been learned since her passing was the two of them and their families were the very closest of friends. Here in America, we can disagree. We can debate vigorously as Senator Harris and I have on this stage tonight. But when the debate is over, we come together as Americans. And that's what people do, in big cities and small towns all across this country. So I just want to encourage you, Brecklin. I want to tell you that we're going to work every day to have government as good as our people, and the American people each and every day. Love a good debate. We love a good argument. But we always come together and are always there for one another in times of need. And we've especially learned that through the difficulties of this year.

Clinton_1

September 26th, 2016

How are you, Donald?

Well, thank you, Lester, and thanks to Hofstra for hosting us.

The central question in this election is really what kind of country we want to be and what kind of future we'll build together. Today is my granddaughter's second birthday, so I think about this a lot. First, we have to build an economy that works for everyone, not just those at the top. That means we need new jobs, good jobs, with rising incomes.

I want us to invest in you. I want us to invest in your future. That means jobs in infrastructure, in advanced manufacturing, innovation and technology, clean, renewable energy, and small business, because most of the new jobs will come from small business. We also have to make the economy fairer. That starts with raising the national minimum wage and also guarantee, finally, equal pay for women's work.

I also want to see more companies do profit-sharing. If you help create the profits, you should be able to share in them, not just the executives at the top.

And I want us to do more to support people who are struggling to balance family and work. I've heard from so many of you about the difficult choices you face and the stresses that you're under. So let's have paid family leave, earned sick days. Let's be sure we have affordable child care and debt-free college.

How are we going to do it? We're going to do it by having the wealthy pay their fair share and close the corporate loopholes.

Finally, we tonight are on the stage together, Donald Trump and I. Donald, it's good to be with you. We're going to have a debate where we are talking about the important issues facing our country. You have to judge us, who can shoulder the immense, awesome responsibilities of the presidency, who can put into action the plans that will make your life better. I hope that I will be able to earn your vote on November 8th.

Well, I think that trade is an important issue. Of course, we are 5 percent of the world's population; we have to trade with the other 95 percent. And we need to have smart, fair trade deals.

We also, though, need to have a tax system that rewards work and not just financial transactions. And the kind of plan that Donald has put forth would be trickle-down economics all over again. In fact, it would be the most extreme version, the biggest tax cuts for the top percent of the people in this country than we've ever had.

I call it trumped-up trickle-down, because that's exactly what it would be. That is not how we grow the economy. We just have a different view about what's best for growing the economy, how we make investments that will actually produce jobs and rising incomes.

I think we come at it from somewhat different perspectives. I understand that. You know, Donald was very fortunate in his life, and that's all to his benefit. He started his business with \$14 million, borrowed from his father, and he really believes that the more you help wealthy people, the better off we'll be and that everything will work out from there.

I don't buy that. I have a different experience. My father was a small-businessman. He worked really hard. He printed drapery fabrics on long tables, where he pulled out those fabrics and he went down with a silkscreen and dumped the paint in and took the squeegee and kept going.

And so what I believe is the more we can do for the middle class, the more we can invest in you, your education, your skills, your future, the better we will be off and the better we'll grow. That's the kind of economy I want us to see again.

Well, let's stop for a second and remember where we were eight years ago. We had the worst financial crisis, the Great Recession, the worst since the 1930s. That was in large part because of tax policies that slashed taxes on the wealthy, failed to invest in the middle class, took their eyes off of Wall Street, and created a perfect storm.

In fact, Donald was one of the people who rooted for the housing crisis. He said, back in 2006, "Gee, I hope it does collapse, because then I can go in and buy some and make some money." Well, it did collapse.

Nine million people—nine million people lost their jobs. Five million people lost their homes. And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out.

Now, we have come back from that abyss. And it has not been easy. So we're now on the precipice of having a potentially much better economy, but the last thing we need to do is to go back to the policies that failed us in the first place.

Independent experts have looked at what I've proposed and looked at what Donald's proposed, and basically they've said this, that if his tax plan, which would blow up the debt by over \$5 trillion and would in some instances disadvantage middle-class families compared to the wealthy, were to go into effect, we would lose 3.5 million jobs and maybe have another recession.

They've looked at my plans and they've said, OK, if we can do this, and I intend to get it done, we will have 10 million more new jobs, because we will be making investments where we can grow the economy. Take clean energy. Some country is going to be the clean-energy superpower of the 21st century. Donald thinks that climate change is a hoax perpetrated by the Chinese. I think it's real.

I think science is real.

And I think it's important that we grip this and deal with it, both at home and abroad. And here's what we can do. We can deploy a half a billion more solar panels. We can have enough clean energy to power every home. We can build a new modern electric grid. That's a lot of jobs; that's a lot of new economic activity.

So I've tried to be very specific about what we can and should do, and I am determined that we're going to get the economy really moving again, building on the progress we've made over the last eight years, but never going back to what got us in trouble in the first place.

Well, actually...

Well, actually, I have thought about this quite a bit.

And I have—well, not quite that long. I think my husband did a pretty good job in the 1990s. I think a lot about what worked and how we can make it work again...

million new jobs, a balanced budget...

Incomes went up for everybody. Manufacturing jobs went up also in the 1990s, if we're actually going to look at the facts.

When I was in the Senate, I had a number of trade deals that came before me, and I held them all to the same test. Will they create jobs in America? Will they raise incomes in America? And are they good for our national security? Some of them I voted for. The biggest one, a multinational one known as CAFTA, I voted against. And because I hold the same standards as I look at all of these trade deals.

But let's not assume that trade is the only challenge we have in the economy. I think it is a part of it, and I've said what I'm going to do. I'm going to have a special prosecutor. We're going to enforce the trade deals we have, and we're going to hold people accountable.

When I was secretary of state, we actually increased American exports globally 30 percent. We increased them to China 50 percent. So I know how to really work to get new jobs and to get exports that helped to create more new jobs.

Well, I've been a senator, Donald...

And I have been a secretary of state...

And I have done a lot...

Well, that's your opinion. That is your opinion.

Well, that is just not accurate. I was against it once it was finally negotiated and the terms were laid out. I wrote about that in...

No.

Well, Donald, I know you live in your own reality, but that is not the facts. The facts are—I did say I hoped it would be a good deal, but when it was negotiated...

which I was not responsible for, I concluded it wasn't. I wrote about that in my book...

before you even announced.

Look, there are differences...

There are...

There are different views about what's good for our country, our economy, and our leadership in the world. And I think it's important to look at what we need to do to get the economy going again. That's why I said new jobs with rising incomes, investments, not in more tax cuts that would add \$5 trillion to the debt.

But in—oh, but I do.

In fact, I have written a book about it. It's called "Stronger Together." You can pick it up tomorrow at a bookstore...

or at an airport near you.

But it's because I see this—we need to have strong growth, fair growth, sustained growth. We also have to look at how we help families balance the responsibilities at home and the responsibilities at business.

So we have a very robust set of plans. And people have looked at both of our plans, have concluded that mine would create 10 million jobs and yours would lose us 3.5 million jobs, and explode the debt which would have a recession.

That can't—that can't be left to stand.

I kind of assumed that there would be a lot of these charges and claims, and so...

So we have taken the home page of my website, HillaryClinton.com, and we've turned it into a fact-checker. So if you want to see in real-time what the facts are, please go and take a look. Because what I have proposed... would not add a penny to the debt, and your plans would add \$5 trillion to the debt. What I have proposed would cut regulations and streamline them for small businesses. What I have proposed would be paid for by raising taxes on the wealthy, because they have made all the gains in the economy. And I think it's time that the wealthy and corporations paid their fair share to support this country.

Well, at least I have a plan to fight ISIS.

No, we're not. No, we're not.

That's a—that's—go to the—please, fact checkers, get to work.

I have a feeling that by, the end of this evening, I'm going to be blamed for everything that's ever happened.

Why not? Yeah, why not?

You know, just join the debate by saying more crazy things. Now, let me say this, it is absolutely the case...

Yeah, well, let's start the clock again, Lester. We've looked at your tax proposals. I don't see changes in the corporate tax rates or the kinds of proposals you're referring to that would cause the repatriation, bringing back of money that's stranded overseas. I happen to support that.

I happen to—I happen to support that in a way that will actually work to our benefit. But when I look at what you have proposed, you have what is called now the Trump loophole, because it would so advantage you and the business you do. You've proposed an approach that has a...

\$4 billion tax benefit for your family. And when you look at what you are proposing...

it is...

as I said, trumped-up trickle-down. Trickle-down did not work. It got us into the mess we were in, in 2008 and 2009. Slashing taxes on the wealthy hasn't worked.

And a lot of really smart, wealthy people know that. And they are saying, hey, we need to do more to make the contributions we should be making to rebuild the middle class.

I don't think top-down works in America. I think building the middle class, investing in the middle class, making college debt-free so more young people can get their education, helping people refinance their—their debt from college at a lower rate. Those are the kinds of things that will really boost the economy. Broad-based, inclusive growth is what we need in America, not more advantages for people at the very top.

Well, I think you've just seen another example of bait-and-switch here. For 40 years, everyone running for president has released their tax returns. You can go and see nearly, I think, 39, 40 years of our tax returns, but everyone has done it. We know the IRS has made clear there is no prohibition on releasing it when you're under audit.

So you've got to ask yourself, why won't he release his tax returns? And I think there may be a couple of reasons. First, maybe he's not as rich as he says he is. Second, maybe he's not as charitable as he claims to be.

Third, we don't know all of his business dealings, but we have been told through investigative reporting that he owes about \$650 million to Wall Street and foreign banks. Or maybe he doesn't want the American people, all of you watching tonight, to know that he's paid nothing in federal taxes, because the only years that anybody's ever seen were a couple of years when he had to turn them over to state authorities when he was trying to get a casino license, and they showed he didn't pay any federal income tax.

So if he's paid zero, that means zero for troops, zero for vets, zero for schools or health. And I think probably he's not all that enthusiastic about having the rest of our country see what the real reasons are, because it must be something really important, even terrible, that he's trying to hide.

And the financial disclosure statements, they don't give you the tax rate. They don't give you all the details that tax returns would. And it just seems to me that this is something that the American people deserve to see. And I have no reason to believe that he's ever going to release his tax returns, because there's something he's hiding.

And we'll guess. We'll keep guessing at what it might be that he's hiding. But I think the question is, were he ever to get near the White House, what would be those conflicts? Who does he owe money to? Well, he owes you the answers to that, and he should provide them.

I do. You know, I made a mistake using a private e-mail.

And if I had to do it over again, I would, obviously, do it differently. But I'm not going to make any excuses. It was a mistake, and I take responsibility for that.

And maybe because you haven't paid any federal income tax for a lot of years. [applause]

And the other thing I think is important...

is if your—if your main claim to be president of the United States is your business, then I think we should talk about that. You know, your campaign manager said that you built a lot of businesses on the backs of little guys.

And, indeed, I have met a lot of the people who were stiffed by you and your businesses, Donald. I've met dishwashers, painters, architects, glass installers, marble installers, drapery installers, like my dad was, who you refused to pay when they finished the work that you asked them to do.

We have an architect in the audience who designed one of your clubhouses at one of your golf courses. It's a beautiful facility. It immediately was put to use. And you wouldn't pay what the man needed to be paid, what he was charging you to do...

Well, to...

Do the thousands of people that you have stiffed over the course of your business not deserve some kind of apology from someone who has taken their labor, taken the goods that they produced, and then refused to pay them?

I can only say that I'm certainly relieved that my late father never did business with you. He provided a good middle-class life for us, but the people he worked for, he expected the bargain to be kept on both sides.

And when we talk about your business, you've taken business bankruptcy six times. There are a lot of great businesspeople that have never taken bankruptcy once. You call yourself the King of Debt. You talk about leverage. You even at one time suggested that you would try to negotiate down the national debt of the United States.

Well, sometimes there's not a direct transfer of skills from business to government, but sometimes what happened in business would be really bad for government.

And we need to be very clear about that.

Well, you're right. Race remains a significant challenge in our country. Unfortunately, race still determines too much, often determines where people live, determines what kind of education in their public schools they can get, and, yes, it determines how they're treated in the criminal justice system. We've just seen those two tragic examples in both Tulsa and Charlotte.

And we've got to do several things at the same time. We have to restore trust between communities and the police. We have to work to make sure that our police are using the best training, the best techniques, that they're well prepared to use force only when necessary. Everyone should be respected by the law, and everyone should respect the law.

Right now, that's not the case in a lot of our neighborhoods. So I have, ever since the first day of my campaign, called for criminal justice reform. I've laid out a platform that I think would begin to remedy some of the problems we have in the criminal justice system.

But we also have to recognize, in addition to the challenges that we face with policing, there are so many good, brave police officers who equally want reform. So we have to bring communities together in order to begin working on that as a mutual goal. And we've got to get guns out of the hands of people who should not have them.

The gun epidemic is the leading cause of death of young African-American men, more than the next nine causes put together. So we have to do two things, as I said. We have to restore trust. We have to work with the police. We have to make sure they respect the communities and the communities respect them. And we have to tackle the plague of gun violence, which is a big contributor to a lot of the problems that we're seeing today.

Well, I've heard—I've heard Donald say this at his rallies, and it's really unfortunate that he paints such a dire negative picture of black communities in our country.

You know, the vibrancy of the black church, the black businesses that employ so many people, the opportunities that so many families are working to provide for their kids. There's a lot that we should be proud of and we should be supporting and lifting up.

But we do always have to make sure we keep people safe. There are the right ways of doing it, and then there are ways that are ineffective. Stop-and-frisk was found to be unconstitutional and, in part, because it was ineffective. It did not do what it needed to do.

Now, I believe in community policing. And, in fact, violent crime is one-half of what it was in 1991. Property crime is down 40 percent. We just don't want to see it creep back up. We've had 25 years of very good cooperation.

But there were some problems, some unintended consequences. Too many young African-American and Latino men ended up in jail for nonviolent offenses. And it's just a fact that if you're a young African-American man and you do the same thing as a young white man, you are more likely to be arrested, charged, convicted, and incarcerated. So we've got to address the systemic racism in our criminal justice system. We cannot just say law and order. We have to say—we have to come forward with a plan that is going to divert people from the criminal justice system, deal with mandatory minimum sentences, which have put too many people away for too long for doing too little.

We need to have more second chance programs. I'm glad that we're ending private prisons in the federal system; I want to see them ended in the state system. You shouldn't have a profit motivation to fill prison cells with young Americans. So there are some positive ways we can work on this.

And I believe strongly that commonsense gun safety measures would assist us. Right now—and this is something Donald has supported, along with the gun lobby—right now, we've got too many military-style

weapons on the streets. In a lot of places, our police are outgunned. We need comprehensive background checks, and we need to keep guns out of the hands of those who will do harm.

And we finally need to pass a prohibition on anyone who's on the terrorist watch list from being able to buy a gun in our country. If you're too dangerous to fly, you are too dangerous to buy a gun. So there are things we can do, and we ought to do it in a bipartisan way.

Lester, I think implicit bias is a problem for everyone, not just police. I think, unfortunately, too many of us in our great country jump to conclusions about each other. And therefore, I think we need all of us to be asking hard questions about, you know, why am I feeling this way?

But when it comes to policing, since it can have literally fatal consequences, I have said, in my first budget, we would put money into that budget to help us deal with implicit bias by retraining a lot of our police officers.

I've met with a group of very distinguished, experienced police chiefs a few weeks ago. They admit it's an issue. They've got a lot of concerns. Mental health is one of the biggest concerns, because now police are having to handle a lot of really difficult mental health problems on the street.

They want support, they want more training, they want more assistance. And I think the federal government could be in a position where we would offer and provide that.

Well, it's also fair to say, if we're going to talk about mayors, that under the current mayor, crime has continued to drop, including murders. So there is...

No, I'm not.

New York—New York has done an excellent job. And I give credit—I give credit across the board going back two mayors, two police chiefs, because it has worked. And other communities need to come together to do what will work, as well.

Look, one murder is too many. But it is important that we learn about what has been effective. And not go to things that sound good that really did not have the kind of impact that we would want. Who disagrees with keeping neighborhoods safe?

But let's also add, no one should disagree about respecting the rights of young men who live in those neighborhoods. And so we need to do a better job of working, again, with the communities, faith communities, business communities, as well as the police to try to deal with this problem.

Well, I—I do think...

I think—I think—I think Donald just criticized me for preparing for this debate. And, yes, I did. And you know what else I prepared for? I prepared to be president. And I think that's a good thing.

Well, just listen to what you heard.

And clearly, as Donald just admitted, he knew he was going to stand on this debate stage, and Lester Holt was going to be asking us questions, so he tried to put the whole racist birther lie to bed.

But it can't be dismissed that easily. He has really started his political activity based on this racist lie that our first black president was not an American citizen. There was absolutely no evidence for it, but he persisted, he persisted year after year, because some of his supporters, people that he was trying to bring into his fold, apparently believed it or wanted to believe it.

But, remember, Donald started his career back in 1973 being sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination because he would not rent apartments in one of his developments to African-Americans, and he made sure that the people who worked for him understood that was the policy. He actually was sued twice by the Justice Department.

So he has a long record of engaging in racist behavior. And the birther lie was a very hurtful one. You know, Barack Obama is a man of great dignity. And I could tell how much it bothered him and annoyed him that this was being touted and used against him.

But I like to remember what Michelle Obama said in her amazing speech at our Democratic National Convention: When they go low, we go high. And Barack Obama went high, despite Donald Trump's best efforts to bring him down.

Well, I think cyber security, cyber warfare will be one of the biggest challenges facing the next president, because clearly we're facing at this point two different kinds of adversaries. There are the independent hacking groups that do it mostly for commercial reasons to try to steal information that they then can use to make money. But increasingly, we are seeing cyber attacks coming from states, organs of states. The most recent and troubling of these has been Russia. There's no doubt now that Russia has used cyber attacks against all kinds of organizations in our country, and I am deeply concerned about this. I know Donald's very praiseworthy of Vladimir Putin, but Putin is playing a really...

...tough, long game here. And one of the things he's done is to let loose cyber attackers to hack into government files, to hack into personal files, hack into the Democratic National Committee. And we recently have learned that, you know, that this is one of their preferred methods of trying to wreak havoc and collect information. We need to make it very clear—whether it's Russia, China, Iran or anybody else—the United States has much greater capacity. And we are not going to sit idly by and permit state actors to go after our information, our private-sector information or our public-sector information.

And we're going to have to make it clear that we don't want to use the kinds of tools that we have. We don't want to engage in a different kind of warfare. But we will defend the citizens of this country.

And the Russians need to understand that. I think they've been treating it as almost a probing, how far would we go, how much would we do. And that's why I was so—I was so shocked when Donald publicly invited Putin to hack into Americans. That is just unacceptable. It's one of the reasons why 50 national security officials who served in Republican administrations—in administrations...

have said that Donald is unfit to be the commander-in-chief. It's comments like that that really worry people who understand the threats that we face.

Well, I think there are a number of issues that we should be addressing. I have put forth a plan to defeat ISIS. It does involve going after them online. I think we need to do much more with our tech companies to prevent ISIS and their operatives from being able to use the Internet to radicalize, even direct people in our country and Europe and elsewhere.

But we also have to intensify our air strikes against ISIS and eventually support our Arab and Kurdish partners to be able to actually take out ISIS in Raqqa, end their claim of being a Caliphate.

We're making progress. Our military is assisting in Iraq. And we're hoping that within the year we'll be able to push ISIS out of Iraq and then, you know, really squeeze them in Syria.

But we have to be cognizant of the fact that they've had foreign fighters coming to volunteer for them, foreign money, foreign weapons, so we have to make this the top priority.

And I would also do everything possible to take out their leadership. I was involved in a number of efforts to take out Al Qaeda leadership when I was secretary of state, including, of course, taking out bin Laden. And I think we need to go after Baghdadi, as well, make that one of our organizing principles. Because we've got to defeat ISIS, and we've got to do everything we can to disrupt their propaganda efforts online.

Well, I hope the fact-checkers are turning up the volume and really working hard. Donald supported the invasion of Iraq.

That is absolutely proved over and over again.

He actually advocated for the actions we took in Libya and urged that Gadhafi be taken out, after actually doing some business with him one time.

But the larger point—and he says this constantly—is George W. Bush made the agreement about when American troops would leave Iraq, not Barack Obama.

And the only way that American troops could have stayed in Iraq is to get an agreement from the then-Iraqi government that would have protected our troops, and the Iraqi government would not give that.

But let's talk about the question you asked, Lester. The question you asked is, what do we do here in the United States? That's the most important part of this. How do we prevent attacks? How do we protect our people?

And I think we've got to have an intelligence surge, where we are looking for every scrap of information. I was so proud of law enforcement in New York, in Minnesota, in New Jersey. You know, they responded so quickly, so professionally to the attacks that occurred by Rahami. And they brought him down. And we may find out more information because he is still alive, which may prove to be an intelligence benefit.

So we've got to do everything we can to vacuum up intelligence from Europe, from the Middle East. That means we've got to work more closely with our allies, and that's something that Donald has been very dismissive of.

We're working with NATO, the longest military alliance in the history of the world, to really turn our attention to terrorism. We're working with our friends in the Middle East, many of which, as you know, are Muslim majority nations. Donald has consistently insulted Muslims abroad, Muslims at home, when we need to be cooperating with Muslim nations and with the American Muslim community.

They're on the front lines. They can provide information to us that we might not get anywhere else. They need to have close working cooperation with law enforcement in these communities, not be alienated and pushed away as some of Donald's rhetoric, unfortunately, has led to.

Lester, we've covered...

We've covered this ground.

Whew, OK.

Let's talk about two important issues that were briefly mentioned by Donald, first, NATO. You know, NATO as a military alliance has something called Article 5, and basically it says this: An attack on one is an attack on all. And you know the only time it's ever been invoked? After 9/11, when the 28 nations of NATO said that they would go to Afghanistan with us to fight terrorism, something that they still are doing by our side.

With respect to Iran, when I became secretary of state, Iran was weeks away from having enough nuclear material to form a bomb. They had mastered the nuclear fuel cycle under the Bush administration. They had built covert facilities. They had stocked them with centrifuges that were whirling away.

And we had sanctioned them. I voted for every sanction against Iran when I was in the Senate, but it wasn't enough. So I spent a year-and-a-half putting together a coalition that included Russia and China to impose the toughest sanctions on Iran.

And we did drive them to the negotiating table. And my successor, John Kerry, and President Obama got a deal that put a lid on Iran's nuclear program without firing a single shot. That's diplomacy. That's coalition-building. That's working with other nations.

The other day, I saw Donald saying that there were some Iranian sailors on a ship in the waters off of Iran, and they were taunting American sailors who were on a nearby ship. He said, you know, if they taunted our sailors, I'd blow them out of the water and start another war. That's not good judgment.

That is not the right temperament to be commander-in-chief, to be taunted. And the worst part...

of what we heard Donald say has been about nuclear weapons. He has said repeatedly that he didn't care if other nations got nuclear weapons, Japan, South Korea, even Saudi Arabia. It has been the policy of the United States, Democrats and Republicans, to do everything we could to reduce the proliferation of nuclear weapons. He even said, well, you know, if there were nuclear war in East Asia, well, you know, that's fine...

have a good time, folks.

And, in fact, his cavalier attitude about nuclear weapons is so deeply troubling. That is the number-one threat we face in the world. And it becomes particularly threatening if terrorists ever get their hands on any nuclear material. So a man who can be provoked by a tweet should not have his fingers anywhere near the nuclear codes, as far as I think anyone with any sense about this should be concerned.

It's a good one, though. It well describes the problem.

Well, let me—let me start by saying, words matter. Words matter when you run for president. And they really matter when you are president. And I want to reassure our allies in Japan and South Korea and elsewhere that we have mutual defense treaties and we will honor them.

It is essential that America's word be good. And so I know that this campaign has caused some questioning and some worries on the part of many leaders across the globe. I've talked with a number of them. But I want to—on behalf of myself, and I think on behalf of a majority of the American people, say that, you know, our word is good.

It's also important that we look at the entire global situation. There's no doubt that we have other problems with Iran. But personally, I'd rather deal with the other problems having put that lid on their nuclear program than still to be facing that.

And Donald never tells you what he would do. Would he have started a war? Would he have bombed Iran? If he's going to criticize a deal that has been very successful in giving us access to Iranian facilities that we never had before, then he should tell us what his alternative would be. But it's like his plan to defeat ISIS. He says it's a secret plan, but the only secret is that he has no plan.

So we need to be more precise in how we talk about these issues. People around the world follow our presidential campaigns so closely, trying to get hints about what we will do. Can they rely on us? Are we going to lead the world with strength and in accordance with our values? That's what I intend to do. I intend to be a leader of our country that people can count on, both here at home and around the world, to make decisions that will further peace and prosperity, but also stand up to bullies, whether they're abroad or at home.

We cannot let those who would try to destabilize the world to interfere with American interests and security...

to be given any opportunities at all.

Well, as soon as he travels to 112 countries and negotiates a peace deal, a cease-fire, a release of dissidents, an opening of new opportunities in nations around the world, or even spends 11 hours testifying in front of a congressional committee, he can talk to me about stamina. [applause]

Well, one thing. One thing, Lester.

You know, he tried to switch from looks to stamina. But this is a man who has called women pigs, slobs and dogs, and someone who has said pregnancy is an inconvenience to employers, who has said...

. women don't deserve equal pay unless they do as good a job as men.

And one of the worst things he said was about a woman in a beauty contest. He loves beauty contests, supporting them and hanging around them. And he called this woman "Miss Piggy." Then he called her "Miss Housekeeping," because she was Latina. Donald, she has a name.

Her name is Alicia Machado.

And she has become a U.S. citizen, and you can bet...

she's going to vote this November.

Well, I support our democracy. And sometimes you win, sometimes you lose. But I certainly will support the outcome of this election.

And I know Donald's trying very hard to plant doubts about it, but I hope the people out there understand: This election's really up to you. It's not about us so much as it is about you and your families and the kind of country and future you want. So I sure hope you will get out and vote as though your future depended on it, because I think it does.

Clinton_2

October 9th, 2016

Well, thank you. Are you a teacher? Yes, I think that that's a very good question, because I've heard from lots of teachers and parents about some of their concerns about some of the things that are being said and done in this campaign.

And I think it is very important for us to make clear to our children that our country really is great because we're good. And we are going to respect one another, lift each other up. We are going to be looking for ways to celebrate our diversity, and we are going to try to reach out to every boy and girl, as well as every adult, to bring them in to working on behalf of our country.

I have a very positive and optimistic view about what we can do together. That's why the slogan of my campaign is "Stronger Together," because I think if we work together, if we overcome the divisiveness that sometimes sets Americans against one another, and instead we make some big goals—and I've set forth some big goals, getting the economy to work for everyone, not just those at the top, making sure that we have the best education system from preschool through college and making it affordable, and so much else.

If we set those goals and we go together to try to achieve them, there's nothing in my opinion that America can't do. So that's why I hope that we will come together in this campaign. Obviously, I'm hoping to earn your vote, I'm hoping to be elected in November, and I can promise you, I will work with every American.

I want to be the president for all Americans, regardless of your political beliefs, where you come from, what you look like, your religion. I want us to heal our country and bring it together because that's, I think, the best way for us to get the future that our children and our grandchildren deserve.

Well, like everyone else, I've spent a lot of time thinking over the last 48 hours about what we heard and saw. You know, with prior Republican nominees for president, I disagreed with them on politics, policies, principles, but I never questioned their fitness to serve.

Donald Trump is different. I said starting back in June that he was not fit to be president and commander-in-chief. And many Republicans and independents have said the same thing. What we all saw and heard on Friday was Donald talking about women, what he thinks about women, what he does to women. And he has said that the video doesn't represent who he is.

But I think it's clear to anyone who heard it that it represents exactly who he is. Because we've seen this throughout the campaign. We have seen him insult women. We've seen him rate women on their appearance, ranking them from one to ten. We've seen him embarrass women on TV and on Twitter. We saw him after the first debate spend nearly a week denigrating a former Miss Universe in the harshest, most personal terms.

So, yes, this is who Donald Trump is. But it's not only women, and it's not only this video that raises questions about his fitness to be our president, because he has also targeted immigrants, African-Americans, Latinos, people with disabilities, POWs, Muslims, and so many others.

So this is who Donald Trump is. And the question for us, the question our country must answer is that this is not who we are. That's why—to go back to your question—I want to send a message—we all should—to every boy and girl and, indeed, to the entire world that America already is great, but we are great because we are good, and we will respect one another, and we will work with one another, and we will celebrate our diversity.

These are very important values to me, because this is the America that I know and love. And I can pledge to you tonight that this is the America that I will serve if I'm so fortunate enough to become your president.

Well, first, let me start by saying that so much of what he's just said is not right, but he gets to run his campaign any way he chooses. He gets to decide what he wants to talk about. Instead of answering people's questions, talking about our agenda, laying out the plans that we have that we think can make a better life and a better country, that's his choice.

When I hear something like that, I am reminded of what my friend, Michelle Obama, advised us all: When they go low, you go high.

And, look, if this were just about one video, maybe what he's saying tonight would be understandable, but everyone can draw their own conclusions at this point about whether or not the man in the video or the man on the stage respects women. But he never apologizes for anything to anyone.

He never apologized to Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the Gold Star family whose son, Captain Khan, died in the line of duty in Iraq. And Donald insulted and attacked them for weeks over their religion.

He never apologized to the distinguished federal judge who was born in Indiana, but Donald said he couldn't be trusted to be a judge because his parents were, quote, "Mexican."

He never apologized to the reporter that he mimicked and mocked on national television and our children were watching. And he never apologized for the racist lie that President Obama was not born in the United States of America. He owes the president an apology, he owes our country an apology, and he needs to take responsibility for his actions and his words.

because everything he just said is absolutely false, but I'm not surprised.

In the first debate...

I told people that it would be impossible to be fact-checking Donald all the time. I'd never get to talk about anything I want to do and how we're going to really make lives better for people.

So, once again, go to HillaryClinton.com. We have literally Trump—you can fact check him in real time. Last time at the first debate, we had millions of people fact checking, so I expect we'll have millions more fact

checking, because, you know, it is—it's just awfully good that someone with the temperament of Donald Trump is not in charge of the law in our country.

Well, Martha, first, let me say—and I've said before, but I'll repeat it, because I want everyone to hear it—that was a mistake, and I take responsibility for using a personal e-mail account. Obviously, if I were to do it over again, I would not. I'm not making any excuses. It was a mistake. And I am very sorry about that.

But I think it's also important to point out where there are some misleading accusations from critics and others. After a year-long investigation, there is no evidence that anyone hacked the server I was using and there is no evidence that anyone can point to at all—anyone who says otherwise has no basis—that any classified material ended up in the wrong hands.

I take classified materials very seriously and always have. When I was on the Senate Armed Services Committee, I was privy to a lot of classified material. Obviously, as secretary of state, I had some of the most important secrets that we possess, such as going after Bin Laden. So I am very committed to taking classified information seriously. And as I said, there is no evidence that any classified information ended up in the wrong hands.

Look, it's just not true. And so please, go to...

It was personal e-mails, not official.

Not—well, we turned over 35,000, so...

Yes, that's true, I didn't.

I didn't in the first debate, and I'm going to try not to in this debate, because I'd like to get to the questions that the people have brought here tonight to talk to us about.

OK, Donald. I know you're into big diversion tonight, anything to avoid talking about your campaign and the way it's exploding and the way Republicans are leaving you. But let's at least focus...

on some of the issues that people care about tonight. Let's get to their questions.

If he wants to start, he can start. No, go ahead, Donald.

Well, I think Donald was about to say he's going to solve it by repealing it and getting rid of the Affordable Care Act. And I'm going to fix it, because I agree with you. Premiums have gotten too high. Copays, deductibles, prescription drug costs, and I've laid out a series of actions that we can take to try to get those costs down.

But here's what I don't want people to forget when we're talking about reining in the costs, which has to be the highest priority of the next president, when the Affordable Care Act passed, it wasn't just that 20 million people got insurance who didn't have it before. But that in and of itself was a good thing. I meet these people all the time, and they tell me what a difference having that insurance meant to them and their families.

But everybody else, the 170 million of us who get health insurance through our employers got big benefits. Number one, insurance companies can't deny you coverage because of a pre-existing condition. Number two, no lifetime limits, which is a big deal if you have serious health problems.

Number three, women can't be charged more than men for our health insurance, which is the way it used to be before the Affordable Care Act. Number four, if you're under 26, and your parents have a policy, you can be on that policy until the age of 26, something that didn't happen before.

So I want very much to save what works and is good about the Affordable Care Act. But we've got to get costs down. We've got to provide some additional help to small businesses so that they can afford to provide health insurance. But if we repeal it, as Donald has proposed, and start over again, all of those benefits I just mentioned are lost to everybody, not just people who get their health insurance on the exchange. And then we would have to start all over again.

Right now, we are at 90 percent health insurance coverage. That's the highest we've ever been in our country.

So I want us to get to 100 percent, but get costs down and keep quality up.

No, I mean, he clarified what he meant. And it's very clear. Look, we are in a situation in our country where if we were to start all over again, we might come up with a different system. But we have an employer-based system. That's where the vast majority of people get their health care.

And the Affordable Care Act was meant to try to fill the gap between people who were too poor and couldn't put together any resources to afford health care, namely people on Medicaid. Obviously, Medicare, which is a single-payer system, which takes care of our elderly and does a great job doing it, by the way, and then all of the people who were employed, but people who were working but didn't have the money to afford insurance and didn't have anybody, an employer or anybody else, to help them.

That was the slot that the Obamacare approach was to take. And like I say, 20 million people now have health insurance. So if we just rip it up and throw it away, what Donald's not telling you is we just turn it back to the insurance companies the way it used to be, and that means the insurance companies...

get to do pretty much whatever they want, including saying, look, I'm sorry, you've got diabetes, you had cancer, your child has asthma...

you may not be able to have insurance because you can't afford it. So let's fix what's broken about it, but let's not throw it away and give it all back to the insurance companies and the drug companies. That's not going to work.

Well, thank you for asking your question. And I've heard this question from a lot of Muslim-Americans across our country, because, unfortunately, there's been a lot of very divisive, dark things said about Muslims. And even

someone like Captain Khan, the young man who sacrificed himself defending our country in the United States Army, has been subject to attack by Donald.

I want to say just a couple of things. First, we've had Muslims in America since George Washington. And we've had many successful Muslims. We just lost a particularly well-known one with Muhammad Ali.

My vision of America is an America where everyone has a place, if you're willing to work hard, you do your part, you contribute to the community. That's what America is. That's what we want America to be for our children and our grandchildren.

It's also very short-sighted and even dangerous to be engaging in the kind of demagogic rhetoric that Donald has about Muslims. We need American Muslims to be part of our eyes and ears on our front lines. I've worked with a lot of different Muslim groups around America. I've met with a lot of them, and I've heard how important it is for them to feel that they are wanted and included and part of our country, part of our homeland security, and that's what I want to see.

It's also important I intend to defeat ISIS, to do so in a coalition with majority Muslim nations. Right now, a lot of those nations are hearing what Donald says and wondering, why should we cooperate with the Americans? And this is a gift to ISIS and the terrorists, violent jihadist terrorists.

We are not at war with Islam. And it is a mistake and it plays into the hands of the terrorists to act as though we are. So I want a country where citizens like you and your family are just as welcome as anyone else.

Well, first of all, I will not let anyone into our country that I think poses a risk to us. But there are a lot of refugees, women and children—think of that picture we all saw of that 4-year-old boy with the blood on his forehead because he'd been bombed by the Russian and Syrian air forces.

There are children suffering in this catastrophic war, largely, I believe, because of Russian aggression. And we need to do our part. We by no means are carrying anywhere near the load that Europe and others are. But we will have vetting that is as tough as it needs to be from our professionals, our intelligence experts and others.

But it is important for us as a policy, you know, not to say, as Donald has said, we're going to ban people based on a religion. How do you do that? We are a country founded on religious freedom and liberty. How do we do what he has advocated without causing great distress within our own country? Are we going to have religious tests when people fly into our country? And how do we expect to be able to implement those?

So I thought that what he said was extremely unwise and even dangerous. And indeed, you can look at the propaganda on a lot of the terrorist sites, and what Donald Trump says about Muslims is used to recruit fighters, because they want to create a war between us.

And the final thing I would say, this is the 10th or 12th time that he's denied being for the war in Iraq. We have it on tape. The entire press corps has looked at it. It's been debunked, but it never stops him from saying whatever he wants to say.

So, please...

go to HillaryClinton.com and you can see it.

Well, right. As I recall, that was something I said about Abraham Lincoln after having seen the wonderful Steven Spielberg movie called "Lincoln." It was a master class watching President Lincoln get the Congress to approve the 13th Amendment. It was principled, and it was strategic.

And I was making the point that it is hard sometimes to get the Congress to do what you want to do and you have to keep working at it. And, yes, President Lincoln was trying to convince some people, he used some arguments, convincing other people, he used other arguments. That was a great—I thought a great display of presidential leadership.

But, you know, let's talk about what's really going on here, Martha, because our intelligence community just came out and said in the last few days that the Kremlin, meaning Putin and the Russian government, are directing the attacks, the hacking on American accounts to influence our election. And WikiLeaks is part of that, as are other sites where the Russians hack information, we don't even know if it's accurate information, and then they put it out.

We have never in the history of our country been in a situation where an adversary, a foreign power, is working so hard to influence the outcome of the election. And believe me, they're not doing it to get me elected. They're doing it to try to influence the election for Donald Trump.

Now, maybe because he has praised Putin, maybe because he says he agrees with a lot of what Putin wants to do, maybe because he wants to do business in Moscow, I don't know the reasons. But we deserve answers. And we should demand that Donald release all of his tax returns so that people can see what are the entanglements and the financial relationships that he has...

Well, everything you've heard just now from Donald is not true. I'm sorry I have to keep saying this, but he lives in an alternative reality. And it is sort of amusing to hear somebody who hasn't paid federal income taxes in maybe 20 years talking about what he's going to do.

But I'll tell you what he's going to do. His plan will give the wealthy and corporations the biggest tax cuts they've ever had, more than the Bush tax cuts by at least a factor of two. Donald always takes care of Donald and people like Donald, and this would be a massive gift. And, indeed, the way that he talks about his tax cuts would end up raising taxes on middle-class families, millions of middle-class families.

Now, here's what I want to do. I have said nobody who makes less than \$250,000 a year—and that's the vast majority of Americans as you know—will have their taxes raised, because I think we've got to go where the money is. And the money is with people who have taken advantage of every single break in the tax code.

And, yes, when I was a senator, I did vote to close corporate loopholes. I voted to close, I think, one of the loopholes he took advantage of when he claimed a billion-dollar loss that enabled him to avoid paying taxes.

I want to have a tax on people who are making a million dollars. It's called the Buffett rule. Yes, Warren Buffett is the one who's gone out and said somebody like him should not be paying a lower tax rate than his secretary. I want to have a surcharge on incomes above \$5 million.

We have to make up for lost times, because I want to invest in you. I want to invest in hard-working families. And I think it's been unfortunate, but it's happened, that since the Great Recession, the gains have all gone to the top. And we need to reverse that.

People like Donald, who paid zero in taxes, zero for our vets, zero for our military, zero for health and education, that is wrong.

And we're going to make sure that nobody, no corporation, and no individual can get away without paying his fair share to support our country.

Well, here we go again. I've been in favor of getting rid of carried interest for years, starting when I was a senator from New York. But that's not the point here.

Because I was a senator with a Republican president.

I will be the president and we will get it done. That's exactly right.

You know, under our Constitution, presidents have something called veto power. Look, he has now said repeatedly, "30 years this and 30 years that." So let me talk about my 30 years in public service. I'm very glad to do so.

Eight million kids every year have health insurance, because when I was first lady I worked with Democrats and Republicans to create the Children's Health Insurance Program. Hundreds of thousands of kids now have a chance to be adopted because I worked to change our adoption and foster care system. After 9/11, I went to work with Republican mayor, governor and president to rebuild New York and to get health care for our first responders who were suffering because they had run toward danger and gotten sickened by it. Hundreds of thousands of National Guard and Reserve members have health care because of work that I did, and children have safer medicines because I was able to pass a law that required the dosing to be more carefully done.

When I was secretary of state, I went around the world advocating for our country, but also advocating for women's rights, to make sure that women had a decent chance to have a better life and negotiated a treaty with Russia to lower nuclear weapons. Four hundred pieces of legislation have my name on it as a sponsor or cosponsor when I was a senator for eight years.

I worked very hard and was very proud to be re-elected in New York by an even bigger margin than I had been elected the first time. And as president, I will take that work, that bipartisan work, that finding common ground, because you have to be able to get along with people to get things done in Washington.

And I've proven that I can, and for 30 years, I've produced results for people.

No, I wasn't. I was gone. I hate to interrupt you, but at some point...

At some point, we need to do some fact-checking here.

I would not use American ground forces in Syria. I think that would be a very serious mistake. I don't think American troops should be holding territory, which is what they would have to do as an occupying force. I don't think that is a smart strategy.

I do think the use of special forces, which we're using, the use of enablers and trainers in Iraq, which has had some positive effects, are very much in our interests, and so I do support what is happening, but let me just...

Well, Martha, I hope that by the time I—if I'm fortunate...

I hope by the time I am president that we will have pushed ISIS out of Iraq. I do think that there is a good chance that we can take Mosul. And, you know, Donald says he knows more about ISIS than the generals. No, he doesn't.

There are a lot of very important planning going on, and some of it is to signal to the Sunnis in the area, as well as Kurdish Peshmerga fighters, that we all need to be in this. And that takes a lot of planning and preparation.

I would go after Baghdadi. I would specifically target Baghdadi, because I think our targeting of Al Qaida leaders—and I was involved in a lot of those operations, highly classified ones—made a difference. So I think that could help.

I would also consider arming the Kurds. The Kurds have been our best partners in Syria, as well as Iraq. And I know there's a lot of concern about that in some circles, but I think they should have the equipment they need so that Kurdish and Arab fighters on the ground are the principal way that we take Raqqa after pushing ISIS out of Iraq.

Well, 67 percent of the people voted to re-elect me when I ran for my second term, and I was very proud and very humbled by that.

Mr. Carter, I have tried my entire life to do what I can to support children and families. You know, right out of law school, I went to work for the Children's Defense Fund. And Donald talks a lot about, you know, the 30 years I've been in public service. I'm proud of that. You know, I started off as a young lawyer working against

discrimination against African-American children in schools and in the criminal justice system. I worked to make sure that kids with disabilities could get a public education, something that I care very much about. I have worked with Latinos—one of my first jobs in politics was down in south Texas registering Latino citizens to be able to vote. So I have a deep devotion, to use your absolutely correct word, to making sure that every American feels like he or she has a place in our country.

And I think when you look at the letters that I get, a lot of people are worried that maybe they wouldn't have a place in Donald Trump's America. They write me, and one woman wrote me about her son, Felix. She adopted him from Ethiopia when he was a toddler. He's 10 years old now. This is the only country he's ever known. And he listens to Donald on TV and he said to his mother one day, will he send me back to Ethiopia if he gets elected? You know, children listen to what is being said. To go back to the very, very first question. And there's a lot of fear—in fact, teachers and parents are calling it the Trump effect. Bullying is up. A lot of people are feeling, you know, uneasy. A lot of kids are expressing their concerns.

So, first and foremost, I will do everything I can to reach out to everybody.

Democrats, Republicans, independents, people across our country. If you don't vote for me, I still want to be your president.

I want to be the best president I can be for every American.

Well, within hours I said that I was sorry about the way I talked about that, because my argument is not with his supporters. It's with him and with the hateful and divisive campaign that he has run, and the inciting of violence at his rallies, and the very brutal kinds of comments about not just women, but all Americans, all kinds of Americans.

And what he has said about African-Americans and Latinos, about Muslims, about POWs, about immigrants, about people with disabilities, he's never apologized for. And so I do think that a lot of the tone and tenor that he has said—I'm proud of the campaign that Bernie Sanders and I ran. We ran a campaign based on issues, not insults. And he is supporting me 100 percent.

Because we talked about what we wanted to do. We might have had some differences, and we had a lot of debates...

No.

Well, it's not only my opinion. It's the opinion of many others, national security experts, Republicans, former Republican members of Congress. But it's in part because those of us who have had the great privilege of seeing this job up close and know how difficult it is, and it's not just because I watched my husband take a \$300 billion deficit and turn it into a \$200 billion surplus, and 23 million new jobs were created, and incomes went up for everybody. Everybody. African-American incomes went up 33 percent.

And it's not just because I worked with George W. Bush after 9/11, and I was very proud that when I told him what the city needed, what we needed to recover, he said you've got it, and he never wavered. He stuck with me. And I have worked and I admire President Obama. He inherited the worst financial crisis since the Great Depression. That was a terrible time for our country.

Nine million people lost their jobs.

Five million homes were lost.

And \$13 trillion in family wealth was wiped out. We are back on the right track. He would send us back into recession with his tax plans that benefit the wealthiest of Americans.

Thank you. Well, you're right. This is one of the most important issues in this election. I want to appoint Supreme Court justices who understand the way the world really works, who have real-life experience, who have not just been in a big law firm and maybe clerked for a judge and then gotten on the bench, but, you know, maybe they tried some more cases, they actually understand what people are up against.

Because I think the current court has gone in the wrong direction. And so I would want to see the Supreme Court reverse Citizens United and get dark, unaccountable money out of our politics. Donald doesn't agree with that.

I would like the Supreme Court to understand that voting rights are still a big problem in many parts of our country, that we don't always do everything we can to make it possible for people of color and older people and young people to be able to exercise their franchise. I want a Supreme Court that will stick with Roe v. Wade and a woman's right to choose, and I want a Supreme Court that will stick with marriage equality.

Now, Donald has put forth the names of some people that he would consider. And among the ones that he has suggested are people who would reverse Roe v. Wade and reverse marriage equality. I think that would be a terrible mistake and would take us backwards.

I want a Supreme Court that doesn't always side with corporate interests. I want a Supreme Court that understands because you're wealthy and you can give more money to something doesn't mean you have any more rights or should have any more rights than anybody else.

So I have very clear views about what I want to see to kind of change the balance on the Supreme Court. And I regret deeply that the Senate has not done its job and they have not permitted a vote on the person that President Obama, a highly qualified person, they've not given him a vote to be able to be have the full complement of nine Supreme Court justices. I think that was a dereliction of duty.

I hope that they will see their way to doing it, but if I am so fortunate enough as to be president, I will immediately move to make sure that we fill that, we have nine justices that get to work on behalf of our people. Well...

The question was about the Supreme Court. And I just want to quickly say, I respect the Second Amendment. But I believe there should be comprehensive background checks, and we should close the gun show loophole, and close the online loophole.

We have to save as many lives as we possibly can.

And actually—well, that was very interesting. First of all, China is illegally dumping steel in the United States and Donald Trump is buying it to build his buildings, putting steelworkers and American steel plants out of business. That's something that I fought against as a senator and that I would have a trade prosecutor to make sure that we don't get taken advantage of by China on steel or anything else.

You know, because it sounds like you're in the business or you're aware of people in the business—you know that we are now for the first time ever energy-independent. We are not dependent upon the Middle East. But the Middle East still controls a lot of the prices. So the price of oil has been way down. And that has had a damaging effect on a lot of the oil companies, right? We are, however, producing a lot of natural gas, which serves as a bridge to more renewable fuels. And I think that's an important transition.

We've got to remain energy-independent. It gives us much more power and freedom than to be worried about what goes on in the Middle East. We have enough worries over there without having to worry about that.

So I have a comprehensive energy policy, but it really does include fighting climate change, because I think that is a serious problem. And I support moving toward more clean, renewable energy as quickly as we can, because I think we can be the 21st century clean energy superpower and create millions of new jobs and businesses.

But I also want to be sure that we don't leave people behind. That's why I'm the only candidate from the very beginning of this campaign who had a plan to help us revitalize coal country, because those coal miners and their fathers and their grandfathers, they dug that coal out. A lot of them lost their lives. They were injured, but they turned the lights on and they powered our factories. I don't want to walk away from them. So we've got to do something for them.

But the price of coal is down worldwide. So we have to look at this comprehensively.

And that's exactly what I have proposed. I hope you will go to HillaryClinton.com and look at my entire policy.

Well, I certainly will, because I think that's a very fair and important question. Look, I respect his children. His children are incredibly able and devoted, and I think that says a lot about Donald. I don't agree with nearly anything else he says or does, but I do respect that. And I think that is something that as a mother and a grandmother is very important to me.

So I believe that this election has become in part so—so conflict-oriented, so intense because there's a lot at stake. This is not an ordinary time, and this is not an ordinary election. We are going to be choosing a president who will set policy for not just four or eight years, but because of some of the important decisions we have to make here at home and around the world, from the Supreme Court to energy and so much else, and so there is a lot at stake. It's one of the most consequential elections that we've had.

And that's why I've tried to put forth specific policies and plans, trying to get it off of the personal and put it on to what it is I want to do as president. And that's why I hope people will check on that for themselves so that they can see that, yes, I've spent 30 years, actually maybe a little more, working to help kids and families. And I want to take all that experience to the White House and do that every single day.

Clinton_3

October 19th, 2016

Thank you very much, Chris. And thanks to UNLV for hosting us.

You know, I think when we talk about the Supreme Court, it really raises the central issue in this election, namely, what kind of country are we going to be? What kind of opportunities will we provide for our citizens? What kind of rights will Americans have?

And I feel strongly that the Supreme Court needs to stand on the side of the American people, not on the side of the powerful corporations and the wealthy. For me, that means that we need a Supreme Court that will stand up on behalf of women's rights, on behalf of the rights of the LGBT community, that will stand up and say no to Citizens United, a decision that has undermined the election system in our country because of the way it permits dark, unaccountable money to come into our electoral system.

I have major disagreements with my opponent about these issues and others that will be before the Supreme Court. But I feel that at this point in our country's history, it is important that we not reverse marriage equality, that we not reverse Roe v. Wade, that we stand up against Citizens United, we stand up for the rights of people in the workplace, that we stand up and basically say: The Supreme Court should represent all of us.

That's how I see the court, and the kind of people that I would be looking to nominate to the court would be in the great tradition of standing up to the powerful, standing up on behalf of our rights as Americans.

And I look forward to having that opportunity. I would hope that the Senate would do its job and confirm the nominee that President Obama has sent to them. That's the way the Constitution fundamentally should operate. The president nominates, and then the Senate advises and consents, or not, but they go forward with the process.

Well, first of all, I support the Second Amendment. I lived in Arkansas for 18 wonderful years. I represented upstate New York. I understand and respect the tradition of gun ownership. It goes back to the founding of our country.

But I also believe that there can be and must be reasonable regulation. Because I support the Second Amendment doesn't mean that I want people who shouldn't have guns to be able to threaten you, kill you or members of your family.

And so when I think about what we need to do, we have 33,000 people a year who die from guns. I think we need comprehensive background checks, need to close the online loophole, close the gun show loophole. There's other matters that I think are sensible that are the kind of reforms that would make a difference that are not in any way conflicting with the Second Amendment.

You mentioned the Heller decision. And what I was saying that you referenced, Chris, was that I disagreed with the way the court applied the Second Amendment in that case, because what the District of Columbia was trying to do was to protect toddlers from guns and so they wanted people with guns to safely store them. And the court didn't accept that reasonable regulation, but they've accepted many others. So I see no conflict between saving people's lives and defending the Second Amendment.

Well, I was upset because, unfortunately, dozens of toddlers injure themselves, even kill people with guns, because, unfortunately, not everyone who has loaded guns in their homes takes appropriate precautions.

But there's no doubt that I respect the Second Amendment, that I also believe there's an individual right to bear arms. That is not in conflict with sensible, commonsense regulation.

And, you know, look, I understand that Donald's been strongly supported by the NRA. The gun lobby's on his side. They're running millions of dollars of ads against me. And I regret that, because what I would like to see is for people to come together and say: of course we're going to protect and defend the Second Amendment. But we're going to do it in a way that tries to save some of these 33,000 lives that we lose every year.

Well, I strongly support Roe v. Wade, which guarantees a constitutional right to a woman to make the most intimate, most difficult, in many cases, decisions about her health care that one can imagine. And in this case, it's not only about Roe v. Wade. It is about what's happening right now in America.

So many states are putting very stringent regulations on women that block them from exercising that choice to the extent that they are defunding Planned Parenthood, which, of course, provides all kinds of cancer screenings and other benefits for women in our country.

Donald has said he's in favor of defunding Planned Parenthood. He even supported shutting the government down to defund Planned Parenthood. I will defend Planned Parenthood. I will defend Roe v. Wade, and I will defend women's rights to make their own health care decisions.

And we have come too far to have that turned back now. And, indeed, he said women should be punished, that there should be some form of punishment for women who obtain abortions. And I could just not be more opposed to that kind of thinking.

Because Roe v. Wade very clearly sets out that there can be regulations on abortion so long as the life and the health of the mother are taken into account. And when I voted as a senator, I did not think that that was the case.

The kinds of cases that fall at the end of pregnancy are often the most heartbreaking, painful decisions for families to make. I have met with women who toward the end of their pregnancy get the worst news one could get, that their health is in jeopardy if they continue to carry to term or that something terrible has happened or just been discovered about the pregnancy. I do not think the United States government should be stepping in and making those most personal of decisions. So you can regulate if you are doing so with the life and the health of the mother taken into account.

Well, that is not what happens in these cases. And using that kind of scare rhetoric is just terribly unfortunate. You should meet with some of the women that I have met with, women I have known over the course of my life. This is one of the worst possible choices that any woman and her family has to make. And I do not believe the government should be making it.

You know, I've had the great honor of traveling across the world on behalf of our country. I've been to countries where governments either forced women to have abortions, like they used to do in China, or forced women to bear children, like they used to do in Romania. And I can tell you: The government has no business in the decisions that women make with their families in accordance with their faith, with medical advice. And I will stand up for that right.

Well, as he was talking, I was thinking about a young girl I met here in Las Vegas, Carla, who is very worried that her parents might be deported, because she was born in this country but they were not. They work hard, they do everything they can to give her a good life.

And you're right. I don't want to rip families apart. I don't want to be sending parents away from children. I don't want to see the deportation force that Donald has talked about in action in our country.

We have 11 million undocumented people. They have 4 million American citizen children, 15 million people. He said as recently as a few weeks ago in Phoenix that every undocumented person would be subject to deportation. Now, here's what that means. It means you would have to have a massive law enforcement presence, where law enforcement officers would be going school to school, home to home, business to business, rounding up people who are undocumented. And we would then have to put them on trains, on buses to get them out of our country. I think that is an idea that is not in keeping with who we are as a nation. I think it's an idea that would rip our country apart.

I have been for border security for years. I voted for border security in the United States Senate. And my comprehensive immigration reform plan of course includes border security. But I want to put our resources where I think they're most needed: Getting rid of any violent person. Anybody who should be deported, we should deport them.

When it comes to the wall that Donald talks about building, he went to Mexico, he had a meeting with the Mexican president. Didn't even raise it. He choked and then got into a Twitter war because the Mexican president said we're not paying for that wall.

So I think we are both a nation of immigrants and we are a nation of laws and that we can act accordingly. And that's why I'm introducing comprehensive immigration reform within the first 100 days with a path to citizenship.

I voted for border security, and there are...

There are some limited places where that was appropriate. There also is necessarily going to be new technology and how best to deploy that.

But it is clear, when you look at what Donald has been proposing, he started his campaign bashing immigrants, calling Mexican immigrants rapists and criminals and drug dealers, that he has a very different view about what we should do to deal with immigrants.

Now, what I am also arguing is that bringing undocumented immigrants out from the shadows, putting them into the formal economy will be good, because then employers can't exploit them and undercut Americans' wages.

And Donald knows a lot about this. He used undocumented labor to build the Trump Tower. He underpaid undocumented workers, and when they complained, he basically said what a lot of employers do: "You complain, I'll get you deported."

I want to get everybody out of the shadows, get the economy working, and not let employers like Donald exploit undocumented workers, which hurts them, but also hurts American workers.

We will not have open borders. That is...

That is a rank mischaracterization.

We will have secure borders, but we'll also have reform. And this used to be a bipartisan issue. Ronald Reagan was the last president...

to sign immigration reform, and George W. Bush supported it, as well.

Well, if you went on to read the rest of the sentence, I was talking about energy. You know, we trade more energy with our neighbors than we trade with the rest of the world combined. And I do want us to have an electric grid, an energy system that crosses borders. I think that would be a great benefit to us.

But you are very clearly quoting from WikiLeaks. And what's really important about WikiLeaks is that the Russian government has engaged in espionage against Americans. They have hacked American websites, American accounts of private people, of institutions. Then they have given that information to WikiLeaks for the purpose of putting it on the Internet.

This has come from the highest levels of the Russian government, clearly, from Putin himself, in an effort, as 17 of our intelligence agencies have confirmed, to influence our election.

So I actually think the most important question of this evening, Chris, is, finally, will Donald Trump admit and condemn that the Russians are doing this and make it clear that he will not have the help of Putin in this election, that he rejects Russian espionage against Americans, which he actually encouraged in the past. Those are the questions we need answered. We've never had anything like this happen in any of our elections before.

Well, that's because he'd rather have a puppet as president of the United States.

And it's pretty clear...

It's pretty clear you won't admit...

that the Russians have engaged in cyberattacks against the United States of America, that you encouraged espionage against our people, that you are willing to spout the Putin line, sign up for his wish list, break up NATO, do whatever he wants to do, and that you continue to get help from him, because he has a very clear favorite in this race.

So I think that this is such an unprecedented situation. We've never had a foreign government trying to interfere in our election. We have 17—17 intelligence agencies, civilian and military, who have all concluded that these espionage attacks, these cyberattacks, come from the highest levels of the Kremlin and they are designed to influence our election. I find that deeply disturbing.

And I think it's time you take a stand...

I am not quoting myself.

I am quoting 17...

17 intelligence—do you doubt 17 military and civilian...

agencies.

Well, he'd rather believe Vladimir Putin than the military and civilian intelligence professionals who are sworn to protect us. I find that just absolutely...[crosstalk]

I—I find it ironic that he's raising nuclear weapons. This is a person who has been very cavalier, even casual about the use of nuclear weapons. He's...

advocated more countries getting them, Japan, Korea, even Saudi Arabia. He said, well, if we have them, why don't we use them, which I think is terrifying.

But here's the deal. The bottom line on nuclear weapons is that when the president gives the order, it must be followed. There's about four minutes between the order being given and the people responsible for launching nuclear weapons to do so. And that's why 10 people who have had that awesome responsibility have come out and, in an unprecedented way, said they would not trust Donald Trump with the nuclear codes or to have his finger on the nuclear button.

Well, I'm just quoting you when you were asked...

about a potential nuclear—nuclear competition in Asia, you said, you know, go ahead, enjoy yourselves, folks. That kind...

of language—well...

The United States has kept the peace—the United States has kept the peace through our alliances. Donald wants to tear up our alliances. I think it makes the world safer and, frankly, it makes the United States safer. I would work with our allies in Asia, in Europe, in the Middle East, and elsewhere. That's the only way we're going to be able to keep the peace.

Well, I think when the middle class thrives, America thrives. And so my plan is based on growing the economy, giving middle-class families many more opportunities. I want us to have the biggest jobs program since World War II, jobs in infrastructure and advanced manufacturing. I think we can compete with high-wage countries, and I believe we should. New jobs and clean energy, not only to fight climate change, which is a serious problem, but to create new opportunities and new businesses.

I want us to do more to help small business. That's where two-thirds of the new jobs are going to come from. I want us to raise the national minimum wage, because people who live in poverty should not—who work full-time should not still be in poverty. And I sure do want to make sure women get equal pay for the work we do.

I feel strongly that we have to have an education system that starts with preschool and goes through college. That's why I want more technical education in high schools and in community colleges, real apprenticeships to prepare young people for the jobs of the future. I want to make college debt-free and for families making less than \$125,000, you will not get a tuition bill from a public college or university if the plan that I worked on with Bernie Sanders is enacted.

And we're going to work hard to make sure that it is, because we are going to go where the money is. Most of the gains in the last years since the Great Recession have gone to the very top. So we are going to have the wealthy pay their fair share. We're going to have corporations make a contribution greater than they are now to our country.

That is a plan that has been analyzed by independent experts which said that it could produce 10 million new jobs. By contrast, Donald's plan has been analyzed to conclude it might lose 3.5 million jobs. Why? Because his whole plan is to cut taxes, to give the biggest tax breaks ever to the wealthy and to corporations, adding \$20 trillion to our debt, and causing the kind of dislocation that we have seen before, because it truly will be trickle-down economics on steroids.

So the plan I have I think will actually produce greater opportunities. The plan he has will cost us jobs and possibly lead to another Great Recession.

Well, let me translate that, if I can, Chris, because...

the fact is, he's going to advocate for the largest tax cuts we've ever seen, three times more than the tax cuts under the Bush administration. I have said repeatedly throughout this campaign: I will not raise taxes on anyone making \$250,000 or less.

I also will not add a penny to the debt. I have costed out what I'm going to do. He will, through his massive tax cuts, add \$20 trillion to the debt.

Well, he mentioned the debt. We know how to get control of the debt. When my husband was president, we went from a \$300 billion deficit to a \$200 billion surplus and we were actually on the path to eliminating the national debt. When President Obama came into office, he inherited the worst economic disaster since the Great Depression. He has cut the deficit by two-thirds.

So, yes, one of the ways you go after the debt, one of the ways you create jobs is by investing in people. So I do have investments, investments in new jobs, investments in education, skill training, and the opportunities for people to get ahead and stay ahead. That's the kind of approach that will work.

Cutting taxes on the wealthy, we've tried that. It has not worked the way that it has been promised.

Well, it's a combination, Chris. And let me say that when you inherit the level of economic catastrophe that President Obama inherited, it was a real touch-and-go situation. I was in the Senate before I became secretary of

state. I've never seen people as physically distraught as the Bush administration team was because of what was happening to the economy.

I personally believe that the steps that President Obama took saved the economy. He doesn't get the credit he deserves for taking some very hard positions. But it was a terrible recession.

So now we've dug ourselves out of it, we're standing, but we're not yet running. So what I am proposing is that we invest from the middle out and the ground up, not the top down. That is not going to work.

That's why what I have put forward doesn't add a penny to the debt, but it is the kind of approach that will enable more people to take those new jobs, higher-paying jobs. We're beginning to see some increase in incomes, and we certainly have had a long string of increasing jobs. We've got to do more to get the whole economy moving, and that's what I believe I will be able to do.

Well, first, let me say, number one, when I saw the final agreement for TPP, I said I was against it. It didn't meet my test. I've had the same test. Does it create jobs, raise incomes, and further our national security? I'm against it now. I'll be against it after the election. I'll be against it when I'm president.

There's only one of us on this stage who's actually shipped jobs to Mexico, because that's Donald. He's shipped jobs to 12 countries, including Mexico.

But he mentioned China. And, you know, one of the biggest problems we have with China is the illegal dumping of steel and aluminum into our markets. I have fought against that as a senator. I've stood up against it as secretary of state.

Donald has bought Chinese steel and aluminum. In fact, the Trump Hotel right here in Las Vegas was made with Chinese steel. So he goes around with crocodile tears about how terrible it is, but he has given jobs to Chinese steelworkers, not American steelworkers.

That's the kind of approach that is just not going to work.

We're going to pull the country together. We're going to have trade agreements that we enforce. That's why I'm going to have a trade prosecutor for the first time in history. And we're going to enforce those agreements, and we're going to look for businesses to help us by buying American products.

No, I voted.

Well, first of all, what he just said about the State Department is not only untrue, it's been debunked numerous times.

But I think it's really an important issue. He raised the 30 years of experience, so let me just talk briefly about that. You know, back in the 1970s, I worked for the Children's Defense Fund. And I was taking on discrimination against African-American kids in schools. He was getting sued by the Justice Department for racial discrimination in his apartment buildings.

In the 1980s, I was working to reform the schools in Arkansas. He was borrowing \$14 million from his father to start his businesses. In the 1990s, I went to Beijing and I said women's rights are human rights. He insulted a former Miss Universe, Alicia Machado, called her an eating machine.

And on the day when I was in the Situation Room, monitoring the raid that brought Osama bin Laden to justice, he was hosting the "Celebrity Apprentice." So I'm happy to compare my 30 years of experience, what I've done for this country, trying to help in every way I could, especially kids and families get ahead and stay ahead, with your 30 years, and I'll let the American people make that decision.

Well...

At the last debate, we heard Donald talking about what he did to women. And after that, a number of women have come forward saying that's exactly what he did to them. Now, what was his response? Well, he held a number of big rallies where he said that he could not possibly have done those things to those women because they were not attractive enough for them to be assaulted.

In fact, he went on to say...

He went on to say, "Look at her. I don't think so." About another woman, he said, "That wouldn't be my first choice." He attacked the woman reporter writing the story, called her "disgusting," as he has called a number of women during this campaign.

Donald thinks belittling women makes him bigger. He goes after their dignity, their self-worth, and I don't think there is a woman anywhere who doesn't know what that feels like. So we now know what Donald thinks and what he says and how he acts toward women. That's who Donald is.

I think it's really up to all of us to demonstrate who we are and who our country is, and to stand up and be very clear about what we expect from our next president, how we want to bring our country together, where we don't want to have the kind of pitting of people one against the other, where instead we celebrate our diversity, we lift people up, and we make our country even greater.

America is great, because America is good. And it really is up to all of us to make that true, now and in the future, and particularly for our children and our grandchildren.

Well, every time Donald is pushed on something which is obviously uncomfortable, like what these women are saying, he immediately goes to denying responsibility. And it's not just about women. He never apologizes or says he's sorry for anything.

So we know what he has said and what he's done to women. But he also went after a disabled reporter, mocked and mimicked him on national television.

He went after Mr. and Mrs. Khan, the parents of a young man who died serving our country, a Gold Star family, because of their religion. He went after John McCain, a prisoner of war, said he prefers “people who aren’t captured.” He went after a federal judge, born in Indiana, but who Donald said couldn’t be trusted to try the fraud and racketeering case against Trump University because his parents were Mexican.

So it’s not one thing. This is a pattern, a pattern of divisiveness, of a very dark and in many ways dangerous vision of our country, where he incites violence, where he applauds people who are pushing and pulling and punching at his rallies. That is not who America is.

And I hope that as we move in the last weeks of this campaign, more and more people will understand what’s at stake in this election. It really does come down to what kind of country we are going to have.

Well, everything I did as secretary of state was in furtherance of our country’s interests and our values. The State Department has said that. I think that’s been proven.

But I am happy, in fact I’m thrilled to talk about the Clinton Foundation, because it is a world-renowned charity and I am so proud of the work that it does. You know, I could talk for the rest of the debate—I know I don’t have the time to do that.

But just briefly, the Clinton Foundation made it possible for 11 million people around the world with HIV-AIDS to afford treatment, and that’s about half of all the people in the world who are getting treatment. In partnership with the American Health Association...

we have made environments in schools healthier for kids, including healthier lunches...

Well, it is an open discussion. And you...

Well, but there is no—but there is no evidence—but there is...[crosstalk]

There is a lot of evidence about the very good work...

and the high rankings...

Well, very quickly, we at the Clinton Foundation spend 90 percent—90 percent of all the money that is donated on behalf of programs of people around the world and in our own country. I’m very proud of that. We have the highest rating from the watchdogs that follow foundations. And I’d be happy to compare what we do with the Trump Foundation, which took money from other people and bought a six-foot portrait of Donald. I mean, who does that? It just was astonishing.

But when it comes to Haiti, Haiti is the poorest country in our hemisphere. The earthquake and the hurricanes, it has devastated Haiti. Bill and I have been involved in trying to help Haiti for many years. The Clinton Foundation raised \$30 million to help Haiti after the catastrophic earthquake and all of the terrible problems the people there had.

We have done things to help small businesses, agriculture, and so much else. And we’re going to keep working to help Haiti...

because it’s an important part of the American experience.

But, of course, there’s no way we can know whether any of that is true, because he hasn’t released his tax returns. He is the first candidate ever to run for president in the last 40-plus years who has not released his tax returns, so everything he says about charity or anything else, we can’t prove it. You can look at our tax returns. We’ve got them all out there.

But what is really troubling is that we learned in the last debate he has not paid a penny in federal income tax. And we were talking about immigrants a few minutes ago, Chris. You know, half of all immigrants—undocumented immigrants in our country—actually pay federal income tax. So we have undocumented immigrants in America who are paying more federal income tax than a billionaire. I find that just astonishing.

Well, you know...

Made with Chinese steel.

Well, Chris, let me respond to that, because that’s horrifying. You know, every time Donald thinks things are not going in his direction, he claims whatever it is, is rigged against him.

The FBI conducted a year-long investigation into my e-mails. They concluded there was no case; he said the FBI was rigged. He lost the Iowa caucus. He lost the Wisconsin primary. He said the Republican primary was rigged against him. Then Trump University gets sued for fraud and racketeering; he claims the court system and the federal judge is rigged against him. There was even a time when he didn’t get an Emmy for his TV program three years in a row and he started tweeting that the Emmys were rigged against him.

This is—this is a mindset. This is how Donald thinks. And it’s funny, but it’s also really troubling.

So that is not the way our democracy works. We’ve been around for 240 years. We’ve had free and fair elections. We’ve accepted the outcomes when we may not have liked them. And that is what must be expected of anyone standing on a debate stage during a general election. You know, President Obama said the other day when you’re whining before the game is even finished...

it just shows you’re not up to doing the job. And let’s—you know, let’s be clear about what he is saying and what that means. He is denigrating—he’s talking down our democracy. And I, for one, am appalled that somebody who is the nominee of one of our two major parties would take that kind of position.

Well, I am encouraged that there is an effort led by the Iraqi army, supported by Kurdish forces, and also given the help and advice from the number of special forces and other Americans on the ground. But I will not support

putting American soldiers into Iraq as an occupying force. I don't think that is in our interest, and I don't think that would be smart to do. In fact, Chris, I think that would be a big red flag waving for ISIS to reconstitute itself. The goal here is to take back Mosul. It's going to be a hard fight. I've got no illusions about that. And then continue to press into Syria to begin to take back and move on Raqqa, which is the ISIS headquarters.

I am hopeful that the hard work that American military advisers have done will pay off and that we will see a real—a really successful military operation. But we know we've got lots of work to do. Syria will remain a hotbed of terrorism as long as the civil war, aided and abetted by the Iranians and the Russians, continue.

So I have said, look, we need to keep our eye on ISIS. That's why I want to have an intelligence surge that protects us here at home, why we have to go after them from the air, on the ground, online, why we have to make sure here at home we don't let terrorists buy weapons. If you're too dangerous to fly, you're too dangerous to buy a gun.

And I'm going to continue to push for a no-fly zone and safe havens within Syria not only to help protect the Syrians and prevent the constant outflow of refugees, but to, frankly, gain some leverage on both the Syrian government and the Russians so that perhaps we can have the kind of serious negotiation necessary to bring the conflict to an end and go forward on a political track.

Well, you know, once again, Donald is implying that he didn't support the invasion of Iraq. I said it was a mistake. I've said that years ago. He has consistently denied what is... a very clear fact that...

before the invasion, he supported it. And, you know, I just want everybody to go Google it. Google "Donald Trump Iraq." And you will see the dozens of sources which verify that he was for the invasion of Iraq.

And you can actually hear the audio of him saying that. Now, why does that matter? Well, it matters because he has not told the truth about that position. I guess he believes it makes him look better now to contrast with me because I did vote for it.

But what's really important here is to understand all the interplay. Mosul is a Sunni city. Mosul is on the border of Syria. And, yes, we do need to go after Baghdadi, and—just like we went after bin Laden, while you were doing "Celebrity Apprentice," and we brought him to justice. We need to go after the leadership.

But we need to get rid of them, get rid of their fighters. There are an estimated several thousand fighters in Mosul. They've been digging underground. They've been prepared to defend. It's going to be tough fighting. But I think we can take back Mosul, and then we can move on into Syria and take back Raqqa.

This is what we have to do. I'm just amazed that he seems to think that the Iraqi government and our allies and everybody else launched the attack on Mosul to help me in this election, but that's how Donald thinks. You know, he always is looking for some conspiracy.

He has all the conspiracy theories...[crosstalk]

This conspiracy theory, which he's been spewing out for quite some time.

He says...

unfit, and he proves it every time he talks.

Well, you should ask Bernie Sanders who he's supporting for president. And he has said...

as he has campaigned for me around the country, you are the most dangerous person to run for president in the modern history of America. I think he's right.

Well, Chris, first of all, I think a no-fly zone could save lives and could hasten the end of the conflict. I'm well aware of the really legitimate concerns that you have expressed from both the president and the general.

This would not be done just on the first day. This would take a lot of negotiation. And it would also take making it clear to the Russians and the Syrians that our purpose here was to provide safe zones on the ground.

We've had millions of people leave Syria and those millions of people inside Syria who have been dislocated. So I think we could strike a deal and make it very clear to the Russians and the Syrians that this was something that we believe was in the best interests of the people on the ground in Syria, it would help us with our fight against ISIS.

But I want to respond to what Donald said about refugees. He's made these claims repeatedly. I am not going to let anyone into this country who is not vetted, who we do not have confidence in. But I am not going to slam the door on women and children. That picture of that little 4-year-old boy in Aleppo, with the blood coming down his face while he sat in an ambulance, is haunting. And so we are going to do very careful, thorough vetting. That does not solve our internal challenges with ISIS and our need to stop radicalization, to work with American Muslim communities who are on the front lines to identify and prevent attacks. In fact, the killer of the dozens of people at the nightclub in Orlando, the Pulse nightclub, was born in Queens, the same place Donald was born. So let's be clear about what the threat is and how we are best going to be able to meet it.

And, yes, some of that threat emanates from over in Syria and Iraq, and we've got to keep fighting, and I will defeat ISIS, and some of it is we have to up our game and be much smarter here at home.

Well, first, when I hear Donald talk like that and know that his slogan is "Make America Great Again," I wonder when he thought America was great. And before he rushes and says, "You know, before you and President Obama were there," I think it's important to recognize that he has been criticizing our government for decades.

You know, back in 1987, he took out a \$100,000 ad in the New York Times, during the time when President Reagan was president, and basically said exactly what he just said now, that we were the laughingstock of the

world. He was criticizing President Reagan. This is the way Donald thinks about himself, puts himself into, you know, the middle and says, “You know, I alone can fix it,” as he said on the convention stage.

But if you look at the debt, which is the issue you asked about, Chris, I pay for everything I’m proposing. I do not add a penny to the national debt. I take that very seriously, because I do think it’s one of the issues we’ve got to come to grips with.

So when I talk about how we’re going to pay for education, how we’re going to invest in infrastructure, how we’re going to get the cost of prescription drugs down, and a lot of the other issues that people talk to me about all the time, I’ve made it very clear we are going where the money is. We are going to ask the wealthy and corporations to pay their fair share.

And there is no evidence whatsoever that that will slow down or diminish our growth. In fact, I think just the opposite. We’ll have what economists call middle-out growth. We’ve got to get back to rebuilding the middle class, the families of America. That’s where growth will come from. That’s why I want to invest in you. I want to invest in your family.

And I think that’s the smartest way to grow the economy, to make the economy fairer. And we just have a big disagreement about this. It may be because of our experiences. You know, he started off with his dad as a millionaire...

I started off with—my dad was a small-business man.

And I think it—you know, it’s a difference that affects how we see the world and what we want to do with the economy.

Well, Chris, I am on record as saying that we need to put more money into the Social Security Trust Fund. That’s part of my commitment to raise taxes on the wealthy. My Social Security payroll contribution will go up, as will Donald’s, assuming he can’t figure out how to get out of it. But what we want to do is to replenish the Social Security Trust Fund...

by making sure that we have sufficient resources, and that will come from either raising the cap and/or finding other ways to get more money into it. I will not cut benefits. I want to enhance benefits for low-income workers and for women who have been disadvantaged by the current Social Security system.

But what Donald is proposing with these massive tax cuts will result in a \$20 trillion additional national debt. That will have dire consequences for Social Security and Medicare.

And I’ll say something about the Affordable Care Act, which he wants to repeal. The Affordable Care Act extended the solvency of the Medicare Trust Fund. So if he repeals it, our Medicare problem gets worse. What we need to do is go after...

the long-term health care drivers. We’ve got to get costs down, increase value, emphasize wellness. I have a plan for doing that. And I think that we will be able to get entitlement spending under control by with more resources and smarter decisions.

Well, I would like to say to everyone watching tonight that I’m reaching out to all Americans—Democrats, Republicans, and independents—because we need everybody to help make our country what it should be, to grow the economy, to make it fairer, to make it work for everyone. We need your talents, your skills, your commitments, your energy, your ambition.

You know, I’ve been privileged to see the presidency up close. And I know the awesome responsibility of protecting our country and the incredible opportunity of working to try to make life better for all of you. I have made the cause of children and families really my life’s work.

That’s what my mission will be in the presidency. I will stand up for families against powerful interests, against corporations. I will do everything that I can to make sure that you have good jobs, with rising incomes, that your kids have good educations from preschool through college. I hope you will give me a chance to serve as your president.

Biden_1

September 29th, 2020.

How you doing, man?

I’m well.

Well, first of all, thank you for doing this and looking forward to this, Mr. President.

The American people have a right to have a say in who the Supreme Court nominee is and that say occurs when they vote for United States Senators and when they vote for the President of United States. They’re not going to get that chance now because we’re in the middle of an election already. The election has already started. Tens of thousands of people already voted and so the thing that should happen is we should wait. We should wait and see what the outcome of this election is because that’s the only way the American people get to express their view is by who they elect as President and who they elect as Vice President.

Now, what's at stake here is the President's made it clear, he wants to get rid of the Affordable Care Act. He's been running on that, he ran on that and he's been governing on that. He's in the Supreme Court right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which will strip 20 million people from having health insurance now, if it goes into court. And the justice, I'm not opposed to the justice, she seems like a very fine person. But she's written, before she went in the bench, which is her right, that she thinks that the Affordable Care Act is not Constitutional. The other thing that's on the court, and if it's struck down, what happens? Women's rights are fundamentally changed. Once again, a woman could pay more money because she has a pre-existing condition of pregnancy. They're able to charge women more for the same exact procedure a man gets.

And that ended when we, in fact, passed the Affordable Care Act, and there's a hundred million people who have pre-existing conditions and they'll be taken away as well. Those pre-existing conditions, insurance companies are going to love this. And so it's just not appropriate to do this before this election. If he wins the election and the Senate is Republican, then he goes forward. If not, we should wait until February.

He's elected to the next election.

That's simply not true.

Open discussion.

Number one, he knows what I proposed. What I proposed is that we expand Obamacare and we increase it. We do not wipe any. And one of the big debates we had with 23 of my colleagues trying to win the nomination that I won, were saying that Biden wanted to allow people to have private insurance still. They can. They do. They will under my proposal.

That is simply a lie.

The party is me. Right now, I am the Democratic Party.

I am the Democratic Party right now.

The platform of the Democratic Party is what I, in fact, approved of, what I approved of. Now, here's the deal. The deal is that it's going to wipe out pre-existing conditions. And, by the way, the 20, the 200 mil- the 200,000 people that have died on his watch, how many of those have survived? Well, there's seven million people that contracted COVID. What does it mean for them going forward if you strike down the Affordable Care Act?

I'm happy to talk about this.

You're not going to be able to shut him up.

Let me finish. The point is that the President also is opposed to Roe V. Wade. That's on the ballot as well and the court, in the court, and so that's also at stake right now. And so the election is all-

It's on the ballot in the court.

In the court.

Donald would you just be quiet for a minute.

All right.

Good healthcare.

He has not done healthcare.

Yes.

It is not.

It does not. It's only for those people who are so poor they qualify for Medicaid they can get that free in most States, except Governors who want to deny people who are poor Medicaid. Anyone who qualifies for Medicare, excuse me, Medicaid would automatically be enrolled in the public option. The vast majority of the American people would still not be in that option. Number one. Number two.

Look, hey.

I'm not going to listen to him. The fact of the matter is I beat Bernie Sanders.

I beat him by a whole hell of a lot.

I'm here standing facing you, old buddy.

All he knows how to do-

Look he's the deal. I got very lucky. I'm going to get very lucky tonight as well.

And tonight I'm going to make sure.

Because here's the deal, here's the deal. The fact is that everything he's saying so far is simply a lie. I'm not here to call out his lies. Everybody knows he's a liar.

God, I want to make sure-

No, he doesn't know how to do that.

The wrong guy, the wrong night, at the wrong time.

There is no manifesto, number one.

Number two.

Number two.

I'll tell you what, he is not for any help for people needing healthcare.

Because he, in fact, already has costs 10 million people their healthcare that they had from their employers because of his recession. Number one. Number two, there are 20 million people getting healthcare through Obamacare now that he wants to take it away. He won't ever look you in the eye and say that's what he wants to do. Take it away.

He doesn't know how. He doesn't know how to do that.

He has never offered a plan.

He has no plan for healthcare.

He sends out wishful thinking. He has Executive Orders that have no power. He hasn't lowered drug costs for anybody. He's been promising a healthcare plan since he got elected. He has none, like almost everything else he talks about. He does not have a plan. He doesn't have a plan. And the fact is this man doesn't know what he's talking about.

Sure.

Whatever position I take on that, that'll become the issue. The issue is the American people should speak. You should go out and vote. You're voting now. Vote and let your Senators know strongly how you feel.

Vote now.

Make sure you, in fact, let people know, your Senators.

I'm not going to answer the question.

Will you shut up, man?

This is so un-Presidential.

That was really a productive segment, wasn't it? Keep yapping, man.

They sure do.

Good luck. 200,000 dead. As you said, over seven million infected in the United States. We, in fact, have 4% of the world's population, 20% of the deaths. 40,000 people a day are contracting COVID. In addition to that, about between 750 and 1000 people a day are dying. When he was presented with that number, he said, "It is what it is." Well, it is what it is because you are who you are. That's why it is. The President has no plan. He hasn't laid out anything. He knew all the way back in February how serious this crisis was. He knew it was a deadly disease. What did he do? He's on tape as acknowledging he knew it. He said he didn't tell us or give people a warning of it because he didn't want to panic the American people. You don't panic. He panicked. In addition to that, what did he do?

He went in and we were insisting that the people we had in the ground in China should be able to go to Wuhan and determine for themselves how dangerous this was. He did not even ask Xi to do that.

He told us what a great job Xi was doing. He said we owe him debt of gratitude for being so transparent with us. And what did he do then? He then did nothing. He waited and waited and waited. He still doesn't have a plan.

I laid out back in March, exactly what we should be doing. And I laid out again in July, what we should be doing. We should be providing all the protective gear possible. We should be providing the money the House has passed in order to be able to go out and get people the help they need to keep their businesses open. Open schools cost a lot of money. You should get out of your bunker and get out of the sand trap in your golf course and go in the Oval Office and bring together the Democrats and Republicans and fund what needs to be done now to save lives. I know how to do the job. I know how to get the job done.

14,000 people died, not 200,000.

And there was no one ... We didn't shut down the economy. This is his economy he shut down. The reason it's shut down is because, look, you folks at home. How many of you got up this morning and had an empty chair at the kitchen table because someone died of COVID? How many of you are in a situation where you lost your mom or dad and you couldn't even speak to them, you had a nurse holding a phone up so you could in fact say goodbye?

His own CDC Director says we could lose as many as another 200,000 people between now and the end of the year. And he said, if we just wear a mask, we can save half those numbers. Just a mask. And by the way, in terms of the whole notion of a vaccine, we're for a vaccine, but I don't trust him at all. Nor do you. I know you don't. What we trust is a scientist.

God.

This is the same man who told you-

... by Easter, this would be gone away. By the warm weather, it'd be gone. Miraculous, like a miracle. And by the way, maybe you could inject some bleach in your arm, and that would take care of it. This is the same man.

So here's the deal. This man is talking about a vaccine. Every serious company is talking about maybe having a vaccine done by the end of the year, but the distribution of that vaccine will not occur until sometime beginning of the middle of next year to get it out, if we get the vaccine. And pray God we will. Pray God we will.

No more than the question you just asked him. You pointed out he puts pressure and disagrees with his own scientists.

Everybody knows-

Well, no, no. You can trust the scientist. She didn't say that. You can trust the-

Yes. Well, that's what he's going to try to do, but there's thousands of scientists out there, like here at this great hospital that don't work for him. Their job doesn't depend on him. They're the people... And by the way-

By the way-

Do you believe for a moment what he's telling you in light of all the lies he's told you about the whole issue relating to COVID? He still hasn't even acknowledged that he knew this was happening, knew how dangerous it was going to be back in February, and he didn't even tell you. He's on record as saying it. He panicked or he just

looked at the stock market. One of the two. Because guess what? A lot of people died and a lot more are going to die unless he gets a lot smarter, a lot quicker-

Oh, give me a break.

Well, let's have this debate-

Because he doesn't have a plan. If I were running it, I'd know what the plan is. You've got to provide these businesses the ability to have the money to be able to reopen with the PPE, as well as with the sanitation they need. You have to provide them classic-

Will he just shush for a minute?

Nancy Pelosi and Schumer, they have a plan. He won't even meet with them. The Republicans won't meet in the Senate. He sits in his golf course. Well, I mean, literally, think about it. Think about it.

You just admitted you'd shut it down.

I got to respond to that.

I got to respond to that.

Just like your rally.

Look, the way to open businesses is give them the wherewithal to be able open. We provided money, the-

Well, masks make a big difference. His own head of the CDC said if we just wore masks between now, if everybody wore a mask and social distanced between now and January, we'd probably save up to 100,000 lives. It matters. It matters.

No serious person has said the opposite. No serious person.

He did not say the opposite.

By the way, did you see one of the last big rallies he had? A reporter came up to him to ask him a question, he said, "No, no, no. Stand back, put on your mask, put on a mask. Have you been tested? I'm way far away from those other people." That's what he said, "I'm going to be okay." He's not worried about you. He's not worried about the people out there

No negative effect. Come on.

Yes, I would. He's been totally irresponsible the way in which he has handled the social distancing and people wearing masks, basically encouraged them not to. He's a fool on this.

The difference is millionaires and billionaires like him in the middle of the COVID crisis have done very well. Billionaires have made another \$300 billion because of his profligate tax proposal, and he only focused on the market. But you folks at home, you folks living in Scranton and Claymont and all the small towns and working class towns in America, how well are you doing? This guy paid a total of \$750 in taxes.

Do I get my time back? The fact is that he has in fact, worked on this in a way that he's going to be the first president of the United States to leave office, having fewer jobs in his administration than when he became president. Fewer jobs than when he became president. First one in American history.

Secondly, the people who have lost their jobs are those people who have been on the front lines. Those people who have been saving our lives, those people who have been out there dying. People who've been putting themselves in the way to make sure that we could all try to make it. And the idea that he is insisting that we go forward and open when you have almost half the states in America with a significant increase in COVID deaths and COVID cases in the United States of America, and he wants to open it up more. Why is he want to open it up? Why does he take care of the... You can't fix the economy until you fix the COVID crisis. And he has no intention of doing anything about making it better for you all at home in terms of your health and your safety.

Schools. Why aren't schools open? Because it costs a lot of money to open them safely. They were going to give, his administration going to give the teachers and school students masks, and then they decided no, couldn't do that because it's not a national emergency. Not a national emergency. They've done nothing to help small businesses. Nothing. They're closing. One in six is now gone. He ought to get on the job and take care of the needs of the American people so we can open safely.

People want to be safe.

People want to be safe.

Show us your tax returns.

Show us your tax returns.

Release your tax return.

When? Inshallah?

In

Yeah, I do want to respond. Look, the tax code that put him in a position that he pays less tax than on the money a school teacher makes is because of him... He says he's smart because he can take advantage of the tax code. And he does take advantage of the tax code. That's why I'm going to eliminate the Trump tax cuts. And I'm going to eliminate those tax cuts.

And make sure that we invest in the people who in fact need the help. People out there need help.

Because you weren't president-

Because you weren't president and screwing things up.

You're the worst president America has ever had. Come on.

Well, just take a look at what is the analysis done by Wall Street firms, points out that my economic plan would create 7 million more jobs than his in four years, number one. And number two, it would create an additional \$1 trillion in economic growth, because it would be about buying American. The federal government spends \$600 billion a year on everything from ships, to steel, to buildings and the like. And under my proposal, we're going to make sure that every penny of that has to be made by a company-

By the way, I'm going to eliminate a significant number of the taxes. I'm going to make the corporate tax 28%. It shouldn't be 21%. You have 91 companies federal, I mean, the fortune 500, who don't pay a single penny in tax making billions of dollars.

Because you in fact passed that, that was your tax proposal.

Yeah, you got it done-

The economy-

Let me finish.

Not lower tax for the American people.

Look-

... we inherited the worst recession, short of a depression in American history. I was asked to bring it back. We were able to have an economic recovery that created the jobs you're talking about. We handed him a booming economy, he blew it.

He blew it.

Yeah, because what he did, even before COVID, manufacturing went in the hole. Manufacturing went in a hole-

... number one. Number two-

Number three.

No.

This guy-

We did not.

I'm the guy that brought back the automobile industry.

I was asked to bring back Chrysler and General Motors. He brought them back right here in the state of Ohio and Michigan. He blew it. They're gone. He blew it. And in fact, they're gone-

That is not true.

And so you take a look at what he's actually done. He's done very little. His trade deals are the same way. He talks about these great trade deals. He talks about the art of the deal. China's perfected the art of the steel. We have a higher deficit with China now than we did before. We have the highest trade deficit-

... with Mexico.

That is not true.

None of that is true.

None of that is true.

Totally discredited. Totally discredited. And by the way-

Mr. Vice-

That is not true.

It is not a fact.

It's been totally discredited.

My son did nothing wrong at Barisma-

He doesn't want to let me answer, because he knows I have the truth. His position has been totally thoroughly discredited-

And you can-

by everybody. Well, by the media, by our allies.

By the World Bank-

By everyone, has discredited. And matter of fact [crosstalk 00:23:30] Matter of fact-

Even the people who testified under oath-

Even the people under-

... testified under oath in his administration said I did my job and I did it very well.

I did it honorably.

Well, I'll give you the list of the people who-

I'm sure that you've already fired most of them, because they did a good job.

Well, here's the-

Well, it's hard to get any word in with this clown. Excuse me, this person.

No, no. Mr. President-

That is simply not true.

Look, here's the deal. We want to talk about families and ethics. I don't want to do that. I mean, his family, we could talk about all night. His family's already-

And that's such a-

This is not about my family or his family. It's about your family, the American people. That's not true. It doesn't want to talk about what you need. You, the American people, it's about you. That's what we're talking about here.

He didn't take that.

Try to be honest.

That is absolutely not true.

That's a good point.

It's about equity and equality. It's about decency. It's about the constitution. And we have never walked away from trying to require equity for everyone, equality for the whole of America. But we've never accomplished it, but we've never walked away from it like he has done. It is true, the reason I got in the race is when those people... Close your eyes, remember what those people look like coming out of the fields, carrying torches, their veins bulging, just spewing anti-Semitic bile and accompanied by the Ku Klux Klan. A young woman got killed and they asked the president what he thought. He said, "There were very fine people on both sides." No president's ever said anything like that.

... second point I'd make to you, is that when Floyd was killed, when Mr. Floyd was killed, there was a peaceful protest in front of the White House. What did he do? He came out of his bunker, had the military use tear gas on them so he could walk across to a church and hold up a Bible. And then what happened after that? The Bishop of that very church said that it was a disgrace. The general who was with him said all he ever wants to do is divide people, not unite people at all. This is a president who has used everything as a dog whistle, to try to generate racists hatred, racist division.

This is a man who, in fact, you talk about helping African-Americans, one in 1000 African Americans has been killed because of the coronavirus. And if he doesn't do something quickly, by the end of the year, one in 500 will have been killed. One in 500 African Americans. This man is as a savior of African-Americans? This man cares at all? This man's done virtually nothing. Look, the fact is that you have to look at what he talks about. You have to look at what he did. And what he did has been disastrous for the African-American community.

I've never said-

Yes, there is. There's systemic injustice in this country, in education and work and in law enforcement and the way in which it's enforced. But look, the vast majority of police officers are good, decent, honorable men and women. They risk their lives every day to take care of us, but there are some bad apples. And when they occur, when they find them, they have to be sorted out. They have to be held accountable. They have to be held accountable. And what I'm going to do as President of the United States is call together an entire group of people at the White House, everything from the civil rights groups, to the police officers, to the police chiefs, and we're going to work this out.

We're going to work this out. So we changed the way in which we have more transparency, in when these things happen. These cops aren't happy to see what happened to George Floyd. These cops aren't happy to see what happened to Breonna Taylor. Most don't like it, but we have to have a system where people are held accountable when... And by the way, violence in response is never appropriate, never appropriate. Peaceful protest is, violence is never appropriate.

That is not peaceful protest.

Nobody's doing that. He's the racist.

Here's the deal. I know a lot more about this-

The fact is that there is racial insensitivity. People have to be made aware of what other people feel like, what insults them, what is demeaning to them. It's important people know. Many people don't want to hurt other people's feelings, but it makes a big difference. It makes a gigantic difference in the way a child is able to grow up and have a sense of self-esteem. It's a little bit like how this guy and his friends look down on so many people. They look down their nose on people like Irish Catholics, like me, who grow up in Scranton. They look down on people who don't have money. They look down on people who are of a different faith. They looked down on people who are a different color. In fact, we're all Americans. The only way we're going to bring this country together is bring everybody together. There's nothing we cannot do, if we do it together. We can take this on and we can defeat racism in American.

Oh my Lord.

This is ridiculous.

Absolutely ridiculous.

Violent crime-

I'm in favor of law. You-

Law and order with justice, where people get treated fairly.

And the fact of the matter is, violent crime went down 17%, 15% in our administration. It's gone up on his watch. He wouldn't know a suburb unless you took a wrong turn.

I was raised in the suburbs. This is not 1950. All these dog whistles and racism don't work anymore. Suburbs are by and large integrated. There's many people today driving their kids to soccer practice and/or black and white and Hispanic in the same car as there have been any time in the past, what really is a threat to the suburbs and their safety is his failure to deal with COVID. They're dying in the suburbs. His failure to deal with the environment, they're being flooded, they're being burned out because his refusal to do anything. That's why the suburbs are in trouble.

Look, what I support are the police having the opportunity to deal with the problems they face and I'm totally opposed to defunding the police offices. As a matter of fact police, local police, the only one defunding in his budget calls for a \$400 million cut in local law enforcement assistance. They need more assistance. They need when they show up for a 9-11 call to have someone with them as a psychologist or psychiatrist to keep them from having to use force and be able to talk people down. We have to have community policing like we had before where the officers get to know the people in the communities. That's when crime went down, it didn't go up. It went down. And so we have to be...

That is not true.

That's not true.

We don't have time to do anything.

I don't hold public office. Now I am a former vice president. I've made it clear. I've made it clear in my public statements that the violence should be prosecuted. It should be prosecuted and anyone who committed it should be prosecuted.

They can in fact take care of it if he just stay out of the way.

And by the way his own former spokesperson said, "Riots and chaos and violence help he cause." That's what this is all about.

I do.

I think Kellyanne Conway.

She said that.

Here's the point, the point is that that's why he keeps trying to rile everything up. He doesn't want to calm things down instead of going in and talking to people and saying, "Let's get everybody together. Figure out how to deal with this." What's he do? He just pours gasoline in the fire constantly and every single solitary time.

Say it, do it say it.

Proud Boys.

His own FBI Director said unlike white supremacist, Antifa is an idea not an organization- ... not a militia. That's what his FBI Director said.

Every body in your administration tells you the truth, it's a bad idea. You have no idea about anything.

Under this president, we become weaker, sicker, poor, more divided and more violent. When I was vice president, we inherited a recession. I was asked to fix it. I did. We left him a booming economy and he caused the recession. With regard to being weaker, the fact is that I've gone head to head with Putin and made it clear to him we're not going to take any of his stuff. He's Putin's puppy. He still refuses to even say anything to Putin about the bounty on the heads of American soldiers.

By the way, my son...

He never keeps his word.

Can you get back 30 seconds?

So thirdly, we're poor. The billionaires have gotten much more wealthy by a tune of over \$3- \$400 billion more just since COVID. You in the home, you got less you're in more trouble than you were before. In terms of being more violent. When we were in office there were 15% less violence in America than there is today. He's President United States. It's on his watch. And with regard to more divided the nation, it can't stay divided. We can't be this way. And speaking of my son, the way you talk about the military, the way you talk about them being losers and being and just being suckers. My son was in Iraq. He spent a year there. He got the Brown Star. He got the Conspicuous Service Medal. He was not a loser. He was a Patriot and the people left behind there were heroes.

And I resent-

I'm talking about my son, Beau Biden, you're talking about Hunter?

That's not true he was not dishonorably discharged.

None of that is true.

That is not true.

My son like a lot of people at home had a drug problem. He's overtaking it. He's fixed it. He's worked on it. And I'm proud of him, I'm proud of my son.

He wasn't given tens of millions of dollars. It was all discredited.

That is not true. That report is totally discredited.

Mitt Romney on that committee said it wasn't worth taxpayer's money. That report was written for political reason.

So would I.

Why have you relaxed fuel economy standards that are going to create more pollution from cars and trucks?

He's absolutely wrong, number one. Number two, if in fact, during our administration in the recovery act, I was in charge able to bring down the cost of renewable energy to cheaper than are as cheap as coal and gas and oil. Nobody's going to build another coal fired plant in America. No one's going to build another oil fire plant in America. They're going to move to renewable energy. Number one, number two, we're going to make sure that we are able to take the federal fleet and turn it into a fleet that's run on their electric vehicles. Making sure that we can do that, we're going to put 500,000 charging stations in all of the highways that we're going to be

building in the future. We're going to build a economy that in fact is going to provide for the ability of us to take 4 million buildings and make sure that they in fact are weatherized in a way that in fact will they'll emit significantly less gas and oil because the heat will not be going out. There's so many things that we can do...

Gas and oil because the heat will not be going out. There's so many things that we can do now to create thousands and thousands of jobs. We can get to net zero, in terms of energy production, by 2035. Not only not costing people jobs, creating jobs, creating millions of good-paying jobs. Not 15 bucks an hour, but prevailing wage, by having a new infrastructure that in fact, is green. And the first thing I will do, I will rejoin the Paris Accord. I will join the Paris Accord because with us out of it, look what's happening. It's all falling apart. And talk about someone who has no relationship with foreign policy. The rainforests of Brazil are being torn down, are being ripped down. More carbon is absorbed in that rainforest than every bit of carbon that's emitted in the United States. Instead of doing something about that, I would be gathering up and making sure we had the countries of the world coming up with \$20 billion, and say, "Here's \$20 billion. Stop tearing down the forest. And If you don't, then you're going to have significant economic consequences."

Well, he hasn't drawn a line. He wants to make sure that methane's not a problem. You can now emit more methane without it being a problem. Methane. This is a guy who says that you don't have to have mileage standards for automobiles that exist now. This is the guy who says that, the fact that-

It's all true. And here's the deal-

I'm talking about the Biden plan

No.

That is not-

Not true-

Not true

Not true

Simply... Look

That is simply not the case

What it's going to do, it's going to create thousands and millions of jobs. Good paying jobs

He doesn't know how to do that

The fact is, it's going to create millions of good paying jobs, and these tax incentives for people to weatherize, which he wants to get rid of. It's going to make the economy much safer. Look how much we're paying now to deal with the hurricanes, deal with... By the way, he has an answer for hurricanes. He said, maybe we should drop a nuclear weapon on them, and they may-

Yeah, he did say that-

And here's the deal

... we're going to be in a position where we can create hard, hard, good jobs by making sure the environment is clean, and we all are in better shape. We spend billions of dollars now, billions of dollars, on floods, hurricanes, rising seas. We're in real trouble. Look what's happened just in the Midwest with these storms that come through and wipe out entire sections and counties in Iowa. They didn't happen before. They're because of global warming. We make up 15% of the world's problem. But the rest of the world, we've got to get them to come along. That's why we have to get back into the Paris Accord.

For 47

That is not my plan The Green New Deal is not my plan.

I did not say that-

Play it. Play it-

The final question is, I can't remember which of all his rantings

Yeah.

The economy

The Green New Deal will pay for itself as we move forward. We're not going to build plants that, in fact, are great polluting plants

Pardon me?

No, I don't support the Green New Deal.

I support

I support the Biden plan that I put forward.

The Biden plan, which is different than what he calls the radical Green New Deal.

Prepare to let people vote. They should go to iwillvote.com, decide how they're going to vote, when they're going to vote, and what means by which they're going to vote. His own Homeland Security director, and as well as the FBI director, says that there is no evidence at all that mail-in ballots are a source of being manipulated and cheating. They said that. The fact is that there are going to be millions of people because of COVID that are going to be voting by mail-in ballots like he does, by the way. He sits behind the Resolute Desk and sends his ballot to Florida, number one. Number two, we're going to make sure that those people who want to vote in person are able to vote because there are enough poll watchers are there to make sure they can socially distance. The polls are open on time, and the polls stay open until the votes are counted. And this is all about trying to dissuade people from voting because he's trying to scare people into thinking that it's not going to be legitimate.

Show up and vote. You will determine the outcome of this election. Vote, vote, vote. If you're able to vote early in your state, vote early. If you're able to vote in person, vote in person. Vote whatever way is the best way for you, because you will... He cannot stop you from being able to determine the outcome of this election. And in terms of whether or not... When the votes are counted and they're all counted, that will be accepted. If I win, that will be accepted. If I lose, that'll be accepted. But by the way, if in fact he says, he's not sure what he's going to accept. Well, let me tell you something, it doesn't matter, because if we get the votes, it's going to be all over. He's going to go. He can't stay in power. It won't happen. It won't happen, so vote. Just make sure you understand, you have it in your control to determine what this country is going to look like the next four years. Is it going to change, or are you going to get four more years of these lies?

There is no ... There is no evidence of that-

There is no evidence of that-

Five states have had mail-in ballots for the last decade or more. Five, including two Republican states. And you don't have to solicit the ballot. It's sent to you. It's sent to your home. What they're saying is that it has to be a postmark by election day. If it doesn't get in until the seventh, eighth, ninth, it still should be counted. He's just afraid of counting the votes-

I am concerned that any court would settle this, because here's the deal. When you get a ballot and you fill it out, you're supposed to have an affidavit. If you didn't know, you have someone say that, this is me. You should be able to, if in fact you can verify that's you before the ballot is thrown out, that's sufficient to be able to count the ballot because someone made a mistake and not dotting the correct I. Who they voted for, testify, say who they voted for, say it's you. That is totally legitimate.

Mail service delivers 185 million pieces of mail a day

Yes. And here's the deal. We count the ballots, as you pointed out. Some of these ballots in some states can't even be opened until election day. And if there's thousands of ballots, it's going to take time to do it. And by the way, our military... They've been voting by ballots since the end of the Civil War, in effect. And that's what's going to happen. Why is it, for them, somehow not fraudulent. It's the same process. It's honest. No one has established at all that there is fraud related to mail-in ballots, that somehow it's a fraudulent process.

He has no idea what he's talking about. Here's the deal. The fact is, I will accept it, and he will too. You know why? Because once the winner is declared after all the ballots are counted, all the votes are counted, that'll be the end of it. That'll be the end of it. And if it's me, in fact, fine. If it's not me, I'll support the outcome. And I'll be a president, not just for the Democrats. I'll be a president for Democrats and Republicans. And this guy-

Biden_2

October 22nd, 2020

220,000 Americans dead. You hear nothing else I say tonight, hear this. Anyone who is responsible for not taking control. In fact, not saying I take no responsibility initially. Anyone is responsible for that many deaths should not remain as president of the United States of America. We're in a situation where there are a thousand deaths a day now. A thousand deaths a day. And there are over 70,000 new cases per day. Compared to what's going on in Europe as the New England Medical Journal said, they're starting from a very low rate. We're starting from a very high rate.

The expectation is we'll have another 200,000 Americans dead between now and the end of the year. If we just wore these masks, the president's own advisors have told him, we can save a 100,000 lives. And we're in a circumstance where the president thus far and still has no plan, no comprehensive plan.

What I would do is make sure we have everyone encouraged to wear a mask all the time. I would make sure we move into the direction of rapid testing, investing in rapid testing. I would make sure that we set up national standards as to how to open up schools and open up businesses so they can be safe and give them the wherewithal, the financial resources to be able to do that.

We're in a situation now where the New England Medical Journal, one of the serious, most serious journals in the whole world said for the first time ever that the way this president has responded to this crisis has been absolutely tragic. And so folks, I will take care of this. I will end this. I will make sure we have a plan.

Make sure it's totally transparent. Have the scientists of the world see it, know it, look at it, go through all the processes. And by the way, this is the same fellow who told you, "This is going to end by Easter" last time. This is the same fellow who told you that, "Don't worry, we're going to end this by the summer." We're about to go into a dark winter, a dark winter and he has no clear plan. And there's no prospect that there's going to be a vaccine available for the majority of the American people before the middle of next year.

My response is he is xenophobic, but not because he shutdown access from China. And he did it late after 40 countries had already done that. In addition to that, what he did, he made sure that we had 44 people that were in there in China trying to get the Wuhan to determine what exactly the source was. What did the president say in January? He said, "No." He said, "He's being transparent. The president of China is being transparent. We owe him a debt of gratitude. We have to thank him."

And then what happened was we started talking about using the Defense Act to make sure we go out and get whatever is needed out there to protect people. And again, I go back to this. He had nothing, he did virtually nothing. And then he gets out of the hospital and he talks about, "Oh, don't worry. It's all going to be over soon." Come on. There's not another serious scientist in the world who thinks it's going to be over soon.

Can I respond to that?

Number one, he says that we're learning to live with it. People are learning to die with it. You folks home will have an empty chair at the kitchen table this morning. That man or wife going to bed tonight and reaching over to try to touch, there out of habit, where their wife or husband was, is gone. Learning to live with it. Come on. We're dying with it, because he's never said. See, you said, "It's dangerous." When's the last time? Is it really dangerous still? Are we dangerous. You tell the people it's dangerous now. What should they do about the danger? And you say, "I take no responsibility."

The fact is that when we knew it was coming, when it hit, what happened? What did the President say? He said, "Don't worry. It's going to go away. It'll be gone by Easter. Don't worry. Warm weather. Don't worry. Maybe inject bleach." He said he was kidding when he said that, but a lot of people thought it was serious. A whole range of things the President has said, even today, he thinks we are in control. We're about to lose 200,000 more people.

I didn't say either of those things.

I talked about his xenophobia in a different context. It wasn't about closing the border to Chinese coming to the United States.

No.

What I would say is, I'm going to shut down the virus, not the country. It's his ineptitude that caused the country to have to shut down in large part, why businesses have gone under, why schools are closed, why so many people have lost their living, and why they're concerned. Those other concerns are real. That's why he should have been, instead of in a sand trap at his golf course, he should have been negotiating with Nancy Pelosi and the rest of the Democrats and Republicans about what to do about the acts they were passing for billions of dollars to make sure people had the capacity.

Oh, well, no. I'm not shutting down today, but there are ... Look, you need standards. The standard is, if you have a reproduction rate in a community that's above a certain level, everybody says, "Slow up. More social distancing. Do not open bars and do not open gymnasiums. Do not open until you get this under control, under more control." But when you do open, give the people the capacity to be able to open and have the capacity to do it safely. For example, schools. Schools, they need a lot of money to be open. They need to deal with ventilation systems. They need to deal with smaller classes, more teachers, more pods, and he's refused to support that money, or at least up to now.

Simply not true. We ought to be able to walk and chew gum at the same time. We ought to be able to safely open, but they need resources to open? You need to be able to, for example, if you're going to open a business, have social distancing within the business. You need to have, if you have a restaurant, you need to have plexiglass dividers so people cannot infect one another. You need to be in a position where you can take testing rapidly and know whether the person is in fact infected. You need to be able to trace. You need to be able to provide all the resources that are needed to do this. And that is not inconsistent with saying that we're going to make sure that we're going to open safely. And by the way, all you teachers out there, not that many of you are going to die, so don't worry about it. So don't worry about it. Come on.

Take a look at what New York has done in terms of turning the curve down, in terms of the number of people dying. And I don't look at this in terms of the way he does, blue states and red states. They're all the United States. And look at the states that are having such a spike in the coronavirus. They're the red states, they're the states in the Midwest, they're the states in the upper Midwest. That's where the spike is occurring significantly. But they're all Americans. They're all Americans. And what we have to do is say, wear these masks, number one. Make sure we get the help that the businesses need. That money's already been passed to do that. It's been out there since the beginning of the summer, and nothing's happened.

My response is that think about what the President knew in January and didn't tell the American people. He was told this was a serious virus that spread in the air, and it was much worse, much worse, than the flu. He went on record and said to one of your colleagues, recorded, that in fact he knew how dangerous it was but he didn't want to tell us. He didn't want to tell us because he didn't want us to panic. He didn't want us... Americans don't panic. He panicked. But guess what, in the meantime, we find out in the New York Times the other day, that in fact his folks went to Wall Street and said, "This is a really dangerous thing." And a memo out of that meeting — not from his administration, but from some of the brokers — said, "Sell short, because we've got to get moving. It's a dangerous problem."

I haven't-

Average contribution, \$43.

I made it clear and I asked everyone else to take the pledge. I made it clear that any country, no matter who it is, that interferes in American elections will pay a price. They will pay a price. And it's been overwhelmingly clear this election — I won't even get into the last one — this election, that Russia has been involved, China's been involved to some degree, and now we learn that Iran is involved. They will pay a price if I'm elected. They're

interfering with American sovereignty. That's what's going on right now. They're interfering with American sovereignty.

And to the best of my knowledge, I don't think the President has said anything to Putin about it. I don't think he's talking to them a lot. I don't think he's said a word. I don't know why he hasn't said a word to Putin about it, and I don't know what he has recently said, if anything, to the Iranians. My guess is he'd probably be more outspoken with regard to the Iranians.

But the point is this, folks. We are in a situation where we have foreign countries trying to interfere in the outcome of our election. His own National Security Advisor told him that what is happening with his buddy... Well, I shouldn't... Well, I will. His buddy Rudy Giuliani. He's being used as a Russian pawn. He's being fed information that is Russian that is not true. And then what happens? Nothing happens. And then you find out that everything that's going on here, about Russia is wanting to make sure that I do not get elected the next President of the United States, because they know I know them, and they know me.

I don't understand why this President is unwilling to take on Putin when he's actually paying bounties to kill American soldiers in Afghanistan, when he's engaged in activities that are trying to destabilize all of NATO. I don't know why he doesn't do it, but it's worth asking the question. Why isn't that being done? Any country that interferes with us will, in fact, pay a price, because they're affecting our sovereignty.

I have not taken a penny from any foreign source ever in my life. We learned that this president paid 50 times the tax in China as a secret bank account with China, does business in China, and in fact, is talking about me taking money? I have not taken a single penny from any country, whatsoever, ever, number one.

Number two, this is a president... I have released all of my tax returns, 22 years, go look at them, 22 years of my tax return. You have not released a single solitary year of your tax return. What are you hiding? Why are you unwilling? The foreign countries are paying you a lot. Russia's paying you a lot. China's paying you a lot on your hotels and all your businesses all around the country, all around the world. And China's building a new road to a new golf course you have overseas. So, what's going on here? Release your tax return or stop talking about corruption.

I have to respond to that.

Why did he... he's been saying this for four years, show us, just show us, stop playing around. You've been saying for four years you're going to release your taxes.

Nobody knows, Mr. President. What they do know is you're not paying your taxes, or you're paying taxes that are so low, when last time he said, what he paid, he said, I only pay that little because I'm smart. I know how to game the system. Come on. Come on, folks.

Sure.

Nothing was unethical. Here's what the deal. With regard to Ukraine. We had this whole question about whether or not, because he was on the board, I later learned of Burisma, a company that somehow, I had done something wrong, yet every single solitary person, when he was going through his impeachment, testifying under oath, who work for him, said I did my job impeccably. I carried out U.S. policy, not one single solitary thing was out of line, not a single thing, number one.

Number two, the guy who got in trouble in Ukraine was this guy trying to bribe the Ukrainian government to say something negative about me, which they would not do and did not do because it never ever, ever happened. My son has not made money in terms of this thing about, what are you talking about, China. I have not had... the only guy who made money from China is this guy. He's the only one. Nobody else has made money from China. No basis for that. Everybody investigated that. No one said anything he did was wrong in Ukraine.

Not true.

What I'd make China do is play by the international rules, not like he has done. He has caused the deficit of the China to go up, not down, with China, up, not down. We are making sure that in order to do business in China, you have to give all your intellectual property. You have to have a partner in China. It's 51%, we would not do that at all, number one.

Number two, we're in a situation where China would have to play by the rules internationally as well. When I met with Xi and when I was still vice-president, he said we're setting up air identification zones in the South China Sea. You can't fly through them. I said we're going to fly through them. We just flew B-52, B-1 bombers through it. We're not going to pay attention. They have to play by the rules. And what's he do? He embraces guys like the thugs, like in North Korea and the Chinese president and Putin and others, and he pokes his finger [inaudible 00:10:36] all of our friends, all of our allies. We make up only... we're 25%, 25% of the world's economy. We need to be having the rest of our friends with us saying to China, "These are the rules. You play by them, or you're going to pay the price for not paying by them economically."

That's the way I will run it, and that's what we did and upholding steel tariffs and a range of other things when we were president and vice-president.

Not true.

That's not true.

Tax payer's money.

Taxpayer's money. Didn't come from China.

Not true.

My response is, look, there's a reason why he's bringing up all this malarkey. There's a reason for it. He doesn't want to talk about the substantive issues. It's not about his family and my family. It's about your family, and your family's hurting badly. If you're a middle-class family, you're getting hurt badly right now. You're sitting at the kitchen table this morning deciding, "Well, we can't get new tires. They're bald, because we have to wait another month or so." Or, "Are we going to be able to pay the mortgage?" Or, "Who's going to tell her she can't go back to community college?" They're the decisions you're making, and the middle-class families like I grew up in Scranton and Claymont, they're in trouble. We should be talking about your families, but that's the last thing he wants to talk about.

I want to talk about North Korea.

Because I'd make it clear, which we were making clear to China, they had to be part of the deal, because I made it clear as a spokesperson for the illustration when I went to China that I said, "Why are you moving your missile defense up so close? Why are you moving more forces here? Why are you continue to do military maneuvers with South Korea?" I said, "Because North Korea is a problem, and we're going to continue to do it so we can control them. We're going to make sure we can control them and make sure they can not hurt us. And so if you want to do something about it, step up and help. If not, it's going to continue." What has he done? He's legitimized North Korea. He's talked about his good buddy, who's a thug, a thug. And he talks about how we're better off. And they have much more capable missiles, able to reach us territory much more easily than they ever did before.

On the condition that he would agree that he would be drawing down his nuclear capacity. The Korean Peninsula should be a nuclear free zone.

We had a good relationship with Hitler before he, in fact, invaded Europe, the rest of Europe. Come on. The reason he would not meet with President Obama is because President Obama said, "We're going to talk about denuclearization. We're not going to legitimize you and we're going to continue to push stronger and stronger sanctions on you." That's why he wouldn't meet with us.

What I'm going to do is pass Obamacare with a public option, and become Bidencare. The public option is an option that says that if you in fact do not have the wherewithal, if you qualify for Medicaid and you do not have the wherewithal in your state to get Medicaid, you automatically are enrolled, providing competition for insurance companies. That's what's going to happen. Secondly, we're going to make sure we reduce the premiums and reduce drug prices by making sure that there's competition, that doesn't exist now, by allowing Medicare to negotiate drug prices with the insurance companies. Thirdly, the idea that I want to eliminate private insurance, the reason why I had such a fight with 20 candidates for the nomination was I support private insurance. That's why. Not one single person with private insurance would lose their insurance under my plan, nor did they under Obamacare. They did not lose their insurance unless they chose they wanted to go to something else.

Lastly, we're going to make sure we're in a situation that we actually protect pre-existing. There's no way he can protect pre-existing conditions. None, zero. You can't do it in the ether. He's been talking about this for a long time. He's never come up with a plan. I guess we're going to get the pre-existing condition plan the same time we got the infrastructure plan that we waited for since '17, '18, '19, and 20. I still have a few more minutes. I know you're getting anxious. The fact is that he's already cost the American people, because of his terrible handling of the COVID virus and economic spillover. 10 million people have lost their private insurance, and he wants to take away 22 million more people who have it under Obamacare and over 110 million people with pre-existing conditions. And all the people from COVID are going to have pre-existing conditions, what are they going to do?

I say it's ridiculous. It's like saying that the fact that there's a public option that people can choose, that makes it a socialist plan. Look, the difference between the president and I... I think healthcare is not a privilege, it's a right. Everyone should have the right to have affordable healthcare, and I am very proud of my plan. It's gotten endorsed by all the major labor unions, as well as a whole range of other people who, in fact, are concerned in the medical field. This is something that's going to save people's lives. And this is going to give some people an opportunity to have healthcare for their children. How many of you at home are worried and rolling around in bed tonight, wondering what in God's name you're going to do if you get sick, because you've lost your health insurance and your company's gone under? We have to provide health insurance for people at an affordable rate, and that's what I do.

By the way-

You can ask it.

I have to respond to healthcare.

My response is, people deserve to have affordable healthcare, period. Period, period, period. And the Biden care proposal will in fact provide for that affordable healthcare, lower premiums. What we're going to do is going to cost some money. It's going to cost over \$750 billion over 10 years to do it. And they're going to have lower premiums. You can buy into the better plans, the cheaper plans, lower your premiums, deal with unexpected billing, and have your drug prices drop significantly. He keeps talking about it. He hasn't done a thing for anybody on healthcare. Not a thing.

Wrong.

Bernie.

He's a very confused guy. He thinks he's running against somebody else. He's running against Joe Biden. I beat all those other people because I disagreed with them. Joe Biden, he's running against. And the idea that we're in a situation that is going to destroy Medicare... This is the guy that the actuary of Medicare said, "If in fact..." That's Social Security. "If in fact he continues his plan to withhold the tax on Social Security, Social Security will be bankrupt by 2023 with no way to make up for it." This is the guy who's tried to cut Medicare. The idea that Donald Trump is lecturing me on Social Security and Medicare?

May I respond?

Look, the idea that the stock market is booming is his only measure of what's happening. Where I come from in Scranton and Claymont, the people don't live off of the stock market. Just in the last three years, during this crisis, the billionaires in this country made, according to Wall Street, 700 billion more dollars. 700 billion more dollars. Because that's his only measure. What happens to the ordinary people out there? What happens to them? By the way, as you know, the Republican leader in the United States Senate said he can't pass it. He will be able to pass it. He does not have Republican votes. Why isn't he talking to his Republican friends?

I have, and they have pushed it. Look, they passed this act all the way back in the beginning of the summer. It's not new. It's been out there. This HEROES Act has been sitting there. And look at what's happening. When I was in charge of the recovery act with \$800 billion, I was able to get \$145 billion to local communities that have to balance their budgets and states that have to balance their budgets. And then they have to fire firefighters, teachers, first responders, law enforcement officers, so they could keep their cities and counties running. He will not support that. They have not done a thing for them. And Mitch McConnell said, "Let them go bankrupt. Let them go bankrupt." Come on. What's the matter with these guys?

By the way, if I get elected, I'm not going to... I'm running as a proud Democrat, but I'm going to be an American president. I don't see red states and blue states. What I see is American United States. And folks, every single state out there finds itself in trouble. They're going to start laying off, whether they're red or blue, cops, firefighters, first responders, teachers, because they have to balance their budget. And the founders were smart. They allowed the federal government to deficit spend to compensate for the United States of America.

I do, because I think one of the things we're going to have to do is we're going to have to bail them out too. We should be bailing them out now, those small businesses. You got one in six of them going under. They're not going to be able to make it back. They passed a package that allows us to be able... They call it PPP. Money is supposed to go to help them do everything from organize how they can deal with their businesses being open safely, schools, how they can make classrooms smaller, how they can hire more teachers, how they can put ventilation systems in. They need the help. The businesses, as well as the schools, need the help. These guys will not help them. It's not giving them any of the money.

Not true, by the way.

Every-

No one should work one job, be below poverty. People are making six, seven, eight bucks an hour. These first responders we all clap for as they come down the street because they've allowed us to make it. What's happening? They deserve a minimum wage of \$15. Anything below that puts you below the poverty level. And there is no evidence that when you raise the minimum wage, businesses go out of business. That is simply not true.

It's an

These 500-plus kids came with parents. They separated them at the border to make it a disincentive to come to begin with. "Be real tough. We're really strong." And guess what? They cannot... Coyotes didn't bring them over. Their parents were with them. They got separated from their parents. And it makes us a laughingstock and violates every notion of who we are as a nation.

We did not separate the [crosstalk 00:34:25]-

Let's talk about what we're talking about.

Let's talk about what we're talking about. What happened? Parents were ripped... Their kids were ripped from their arms and separated, and now they cannot find over 500 of the sets of those parents, and those kids are alone. Nowhere to go. Nowhere to go. It's criminal. It's criminal.

Because we made a mistake made. It took too long to get it right. Took too long to get it right. I'll be President of the United States, not Vice President of the United States. And the fact is I've made it very clear. Within a 100 days, I'm going to send to the United States Congress a pathway to citizenship for over 11 million undocumented people. And all of those so-called dreamers, those DACA kids, they're going to be immediately certified again to be able to stay in this country and put on a path to citizenship. The idea that they are being sent home by this guy and they want to do that is they've gone to they've never seen before. I can imagine. You're five years old. Your parents are taking across the Rio Grande River and it's illegal. And you say, "Oh, no, Mom. Leave me here. I'm not going to go with you." They been here. Many of them are model citizens. Over 20,000 of them are first responders out there taking care of people during this crisis. We owe them. We owe them.

The catch and release, you know what he's talking about there? If in fact you had a family came across and they were arrested, they in fact were given a date to show up for their hearing. They were released. And guess what? They showed up for a hearing. And this is the first President in the history of the United States of America that anybody seeking asylum has to do it in another country. That's never happened before in America. That's never

happened before in America. You come to the United States and you make your case that, "I seek asylum based on the following premise, why I deserve it under American law." They're sitting in squalor on the other side of the river.

Know the law, what he's telling you is simply not true. Check it out.

Check it out.

That's right. And you 525 kids not knowing where in God's name they're going to be and lost their parents.

I do. I do. My daughter is a social worker and she's written a lot about this. She has her graduate degree from the University of Pennsylvania in social work. And one of the reasons why I ended up working on the East Side of Wilmington, Delaware, which is 90% African-American, was to learn more about what was going on. I never had to tell my daughter if she's pulled over, make sure she puts... For a traffic stop. "Put both hands on top of the wheel and don't reach for the glove box because someone may shoot you." But a Black parent, no matter how wealthy or how poor they are, has to teach their child, "When you're walking down the street, don't have a hoodie on when you go across the street.

Making sure that you, in fact, if you get pulled over just, yes, sir, no, sir. Hands on top of the wheel. Because you are in fact, the victim, whether you're a person making 300,000 ... child of a \$300,000 a year person or someone who's on food stamps. The fact of the matter is, there is institutional racism in America. And we have always said, we've never lived up to it, that we hold these truths to be self-evident, all men and women are created equal. Well, guess what, we have never, ever lived up to it. But we've always constantly been moving the needle further and further to inclusion, not exclusion. This is the first president to come along and says, that's the end of that. We're not going to do that anymore. We have to provide for economic opportunity, better education, better healthcare, better access to schooling, better access to opportunity to borrow money to start businesses, all the things we can do. And I've laid out a clear plan as to how to do those things just to give people a shot. It's about accumulating the ability to have wealth as well as it is to be free from violence.

My response to that is I never ever said what he accused me of saying. The fact of the matter is in 2000 though, after the crime bill had been in the law for awhile, this is a guy who said, "The problem with the crime bill, there's not enough people in jail. There's not enough people in jail." And go on my website, get the quote, the date when he said it, "not enough people." He talked about marauding gangs, young gangs, and the people who are going to maraud our cities. This is a guy who in the Central Park Five, five innocent black kids, he continued to push for making sure that they got the death penalty. None of them were guilty of the crimes they were suggested. Look and granted, he did in fact, let 20 people ... he commuted 20 people's sentences.

We commuted over 1,000 people's sentences, over 1,000. The very law he's talking about is a law that in fact, initiated by Barack Obama. And secondly, we're in a situation here where the federal prison system was reduced by 38,000 people under our administration. And one of those things we should be doing, there should be no, no minimum mandatories in the law. That's why I'm offering \$20 billion to states to change their state laws to eliminate minimum mandatories and set up drug courts. No one should be going to jail because they have a drug problem. They should be going to rehabilitation, not to jail. We should fundamentally change the system and that's what I'm going to do.

We did-

Well, I'll tell you what I hope he does look at me because what's happening here is, you know who I am. You know who he is, you know his character, you know my character, you know our reputations for honor and telling the truth. I am anxious to have this race. I'm anxious to see this take place. I am ... The character of the country is on the ballot. Our character's on the ballot, look at us closely.

Nobody's calling me-

Nobody.

I have to respond to that. Because look-

There are 50 former national intelligence folks who said that what he's accusing me of is a Russian plant. They have said that this has all the ... five former heads of the CIA, both parties, say what he's saying is a bunch of garbage. Nobody believes it except him and his good friend, Rudy Giuliani.

That's exactly what was told.

Abraham Lincoln here is one of the most racist presidents we've had in modern history, he pours fuel on every single racist fire, every single one. Started off his campaign coming down the escalator saying he's getting rid of those Mexican rapists, he's ban Muslims because they're Muslims, he has moved around and made everything worse across the board. He says to... About the Proud Boys, last time we were on stage here he said, "I tell them to stand down and stand ready." Come on, this guy has a dog whistle about as big as a foghorn.

You said you're Abraham Lincoln.

You said-

And I'm saying-

Oh, God.

Not true.

One of the things is that in the '80s we passed 100 percent, all 100 senators voted for a bill on drugs and how to deal with drugs, it was a mistake. I've been trying to change since then particularly the portion on cocaine. That's why I've been arguing that in fact we should not send anyone to jail for a pure drug offense, they should be

going into treatment across the board, that's what we should be spending money. And that's why I set up drug courts which were never funded by our Republican friends. They should not be going to jail for a drug or an alcohol problem, they should be going into treatment. That's what we've been trying to do, that's what I'm going to get done because I think the American people have now seen that in fact it was a mistake to pass those laws relating to drugs, but they were not in the Crime Bill.

We got a lot of it done. We released 38,000-

We got 38,000 prisoners

38,000 prisoners were released from federal prison, we have... There were over a thousand people who were given clemency. [inaudible 00:03:38]. In fact, were the ones that put in the legislation saying we could look at pattern and practice of police departments and what they were doing, how they're conducting themselves. I could go on, but we began the process, we lost an election, that's why I'm running to win back that election and change his terrible policy.

We had a Republican Congress, that's the answer.

You did what we already had done.

Climate change, global warming is an existential threat to humanity. We have a moral obligation to deal with it. And we're told by all the leading scientists in the world we don't have much time, we're going to pass the point of no return within the next 8 to 10 years. Four more years of this man eliminating all the regulations that were put in by us to clean up the climate, to clean up... To limit the emissions, will put us in a position where we're going to be in real trouble. Here's where we have a great opportunity. I was able to get both all the environmental organizations as well as the labor, the people worried about jobs, to support my climate plan.

Because what it does, it will create millions of new good paying jobs, we're going to invest in, for example, 500,000... Excuse me, 50,000 charging stations on our highways so that we can own the electric car market of the future. In the meantime, China is doing that. We're going to be in a position where we're going to see to it that we're going to take 4 million existing buildings and 2 million existing homes and retrofit them so they don't leak as much energy, saving hundreds of millions of barrels of...

So they don't leak as much energy saving hundreds of millions of barrels of oil in the process and creating significant number of jobs. By the way, the whole idea of what this is all going to do, it's going to create millions of jobs and it's going to clean the environment. Our health and our jobs are at stake. That's what's happening and what right now, by the way, Wall Street firms indicated that my plan, my plan will in fact, create 18.6 million jobs, 7 million more than his. This is from Wall Street and I'll create \$1 trillion more in economic growth than his proposal does. Not on climate, just on economy.

I don't know where he comes from. I don't know where he comes up with these numbers.

A hundred trillion dollars, give me a break. This plan has been endorsed by every major, every major environmental group and every labor group, labor, because they know the future lies. The future lies in us being able to breathe and they know they're good jobs and getting us there.

By the way, the fastest growing industry in America is the electric, excuse me, solar energy and wind. He thinks wind causes cancer, windmills. It's the fastest growing jobs and they pay good prevailing wages, 45, 50 bucks an hour. We can grow and we can be cleaner if we go the route I'm proposing.

Find me a scientist who says that.

False.

I never said I oppose fracking.

Show the tape, put it on your website.

Put it on the website. The fact of the matter is he's flat lying.

I do rule out banning fracking because the answer we need, we need other industries to transition, to get to ultimately a complete zero emissions by 2025. What I will do with fracking over time is make sure that we can capture the emissions from the fracking, capture the emissions from gas. We can do that and we can do that by investing money in doing it, but it's a transition to that.

Good.

Fracking on federal land. I said, no fracking and/or oil on federal land.

My response is that those people live on what they call fence lines. He doesn't understand this. They live near chemical plants that in fact, pollute, chemical plants and oil plants and refineries that pollute.

I used to live near that when I was growing up in Claymont, Delaware and there are more oil refineries in Marcus Hook and the Delaware River than there is any place, including in Houston at the time. When my mom get in the car and when there are first frost to drive me to school, turning the windshield wiper, there'd been oil slick in the window. That's why so many people in my state were dying and getting cancer. The fact is those frontline communities, it's not a matter of what you're paying them. It matters how you keep them safe. What do you do? You impose restrictions on the pollutions that if the pollutants coming out of those fence line communities.

By the way, I have a transition from the old industry, yes.

I will transition. It is a big statement.

Because I would stop.

Because the oil industry pollutes, significantly.

Here's the deal-

Well if you let me finish the statement, because it has to be replaced by renewable energy over time, over time, and I'd stopped giving to the oil industry, I'd stop giving them federal subsidies. You won't get federal subsidies to the gas, oh, excuse me to solar and wind.

Why are we giving it to oil industry?

He takes everything out of context, but the point is, look, we have to move toward net zero emissions. The first place to do that by the year 2035 is in energy production, by 2050 totally.

No, I'm going to rejoin Paris Accord and make China abide by what they agreed to.

I will say, I'm an American President. I represent all of you, whether you voted for me or against me, and I'm going to make sure that you're represented. I'm going to give you hope. We're going to move; we're going to choose science over fiction. We're going to choose hope over fear. We're going to choose to move forward because we have enormous opportunities, enormous opportunities to make things better.

We can grow this economy, we can deal with the systemic racism. At the same time, we can make sure that our economy is being run and moved and motivated by clean energy, creating millions of new jobs. That's the fact, that's what we're going to do. And I'm going to say, as I said at the beginning, what is on the ballot here is the character of this country. Decency, honor, respect. Treating people with dignity, making sure that everyone has an even chance. And I'm going to make sure you get that. You haven't been getting it the last four years.

Thank you.

Biden_3

October 15th, 2020

Hi, Nathan.

Well, let me start on the last point and work my way back. I think there's great reason to be concerned. I was on the road most of the time during these hearings so I didn't hear many of them. I just got the recaps when I -- I -- you know be in -- I get in late at night from -- I've been going around the country, Florida and anyway.

And -- but my reading online what the -- what the judge said was she didn't answer very many questions at all. And I don't even think she's laid out much of a judicial philosophy, in terms of the basis upon which she thinks, are their unenumerated rights in the Constitution and -- so, number one.

So, I think there's great reason to be concerned for the LGBT community, something I fought very hard for, for a long time, to make sure there's equality across the board.

Number two, I think that, also, health care overall is very much in jeopardy as a consequence of the president's going to go directly -- after this election, directly to the Supreme Court within a month to try to get Obamacare wiped out, after we have already -- 10 million people have already lost their insurance from their employer and wants to take 20 million people out of the system as well, plus 100 million people with preexisting conditions.

So, there's a lot at stake.

I don't think it's appropriate -- I think the Constitution implies -- there's no provision in the Constitution. My problem is, I made a mistake at teaching constitutional law for 21 years and the separation of powers.

The Constitution implies that the way the people have a right to determine who is going to be on the court is how they vote for their senators and their president, which -- seek the advice and consent of the Senate and...

No, he is.

But, once an election begins, by implication, it is inconsistent with the constitutional principles, in my view. You will get disagreement among scholars on this, but I believe it's inconsistent, when over well -- millions of people have already voted, to put someone on the court.

I think it should be -- should have been held until the next -- this election is over, see what the makeup of the Senate is going to be. If the president won this -- wins this election, he should be able to...

What is -- the nomination of -- what I wanted to do, George -- you know, if I had answered the question directly, then all the focus would be on, what's Biden going to do if he wins, instead of on, is it appropriate, what is going on now?

And it should stay -- this is the thing that the president loves to do, always take our eye off the ball, what's at stake.

One of the things Pete has suggested is -- and there's a number of constitutional scholars who have suggested as well -- that there are at least four or five options that are available to determine whether or not you can change the way in which the court lifetime appointment takes place, consistent, arguably, with the Constitution.

I have not been a fan of pack -- court packing, because I think it just generates what will happen every -- whoever wins, it just keeps moving in a way that is inconsistent with what is going to be manageable...

Well, I'm not a fan.

I would then say, it depends on how this turns out, not how he wins, but how it's handled, how it's handled.

But there's a number of things that are going to be coming up, and there's going to be a lot of discussion about other alternatives as well.

Well, for example, if there's actually real live debate on the floor, if people are really going to be able to have a time to go through this -- you know, I don't know anybody who has gone on the floor and just -- and that's been a controversial justice, in terms of making -- fundamentally altering the makeup of the court, that's gone through in a day, kind of thing.

It depends on how much they rush this.

And you think about it, George, here you have got a lot of people not being able to pay their mortgage, not being able to put food on the table, not being able to keep their business open, not being able to do anything to deal with what's going on in terms of the economy, as a consequence of COVID, and they have no time to deal with that, but they have time to rush this through.

That's an appropriate day.

I'm open to considering what happens from that point on.

It is, but, George, if I -- if I say -- no matter what answer I gave you, if I say it, that's the headline tomorrow.

It won't be about what's going on now, the improper way they're proceeding.

They do have a right to know where I stand. And they will have a right to know where I stand before they vote.

Yes, depending on how they handle this.

But, look, what you should do is, you got to make sure you vote, and vote for a senator who, in fact, thinks -- reflects your general view on constitutional interpretation.

And vote for a president who you think is more in line with you. And if you oppose the position that I -- I would not have appointed her. But if you oppose my position, vote for Trump. Vote for a Republican who shares that view.

But that's your opportunity to get involved in lifetime appointments that a -- presidents come and go. Justices stay and stay and stay.

And John's writing in for me, by the way.

I'm sorry.

Oh, yes. I'll be darned.

And as written by a fellow who won the Pulitzer Prize for a book he wrote about the presidency, he said, "You know, I doubt whether Biden is really Irish. He doesn't hold a grudge."

In politics, grudges don't work. They're not -- they make no sense. I really mean it. I have never-- and the second point I'd make is, everybody talks about "Yeah, Joe, when you were a senator and a chairman of Foreign Relations or chairman of the Judiciary, you got a lot of things done. You were able to cross the aisle. Well, the days have changed, and when you were vice president you got a lot done. But it can't happen any ore."

It can. We've got to change the nature of the way we deal with one another. And it starts off by the way your father was, and Tip was, and others. You don't question other men and women's motives. You can question their judgment, but not their motive.

Well, we badly need an infrastructure bill. Well, what happens? I stand up and I say, "You know, we need an infrastructure bill, Senator. But I'll tell you what, you're in the pocket of the cement industry. But let's see what we can do." We can't get anywhere, and nothing happens. Nothing happens. I learned that lesson a long time ago. I've never even -- when it's obvious on its face what the motive is. Stick to the subject. And listen to the other guy. Listen.

What I will be doing as -- if I'm elected president, the first thing -- and not a joke, and you can ask, if they'd tell you, your dad's old friends on the Republican side. I'm going to pick up the phone and call them and say, "Let's get together. We've got to figure out how we're going to move forward here." Because there are so many things we really do agree on.

And with Trump out of the way, the vindictiveness of a president going after Republicans who don't do exactly what he says gets -- gets taken away. There's going to be -- I promise you-- between four and eight Republican senators who are willing -- they're going to be willing to move on things where they're bipartisan consensus.

Last example I'll give. You know, after we -- the -- after Trump had been elected, named the next president, wasn't sworn in yet, I'd been working on a thing called the Cure -- a bill relating to cancer cures. OK. And it was called the Cancer Moon Shot. And I worked with a number of Democrats and Republicans, and we had a bill that was about \$9 billion, that made significant increases in research and development on cancer alternatives in NIH, and particularly cancer -- specific cancer initiatives.

And we only had, at the time, I think it was 111 or 114, whatever it was, votes in the House. I don't know an exact number. And we had fewer than 40 in the Senate. But after he was elected, I got those people together as vice-president, and we sat down and we worked it out. And we ended up getting it passed, 396 votes in the House and our 94 votes in the Senate. And at the end of the day, because it was -- had to do with the Biden Cancer Moon Shot I'd been working on, Mitch McConnell -- Mitch McConnell stood up, and I was the presiding officer, and moved to name the bill after my deceased son Beau who had just died.

So, there is -- there is -- there are ways to bring this together.

What the Biden Justice Department will do is let the Department of Justice be the Department of Justice. Let them make the judgments of who should be prosecuted.

They are not my lawyers. They are not my personal lawyers.

I'm not going to rule it in or out. I'm going to hire really first-rate prosecutors, and people who understand the law, like Democrat and Republican Administrations have had, and let them make the judgment.

But turning this into a vehicle for your -- as if it's your own law firm. You don't own that Justice Department. You pick the best people you can, and you hope that what they're going to do is they're going to enforce the law as they see it. But can you remember any Republican president going out there - or (inaudible) Democratic president, go find that guy and prosecute him. You ever hear that? Or, by the way, I'm being sued because a woman's accused me of rape. Represent me. Represent me. Personally represent me in the state of New York on my not allowing my tax returns. What's that all about? What is that about?

Hello.

Well first of all I make it clear, I do not propose banning fracking. I think you have to make sure the fracking is in fact not admitting methane or polluting the well or dealing with what can be small earthquakes and how they're drilling. So it has to be managed very, very well, number one.

Number two. What we have to do is the future rests in renewable energy. The single fastest-growing energy source in the world right now because I'm going to say something that's going to sound self-serving but I managed the Recovery Act and I was able to invest billions of dollars into bringing down the cost of the cost per BTU of wind and solar so now it's cheaper than coal and it's cheaper than oil right now and it has great, great promise.

And it's also the fastest-growing employer in the energy industry and so there are a number of things that I would do immediately. Number one, there are well over 100,000 wells that are left uncapped in the region. We could hire 128,000 of these people who are working in the industry to cap these wells and get a good salary doing it now, number one.

Number two, we should be moving toward finding the new technologies that are going to be able to deal with carbon capture so all the millions of transition we moved from to a net zero emission of carbon that we're still going to be able to use if we find the right technology, some gases, some gas to be able to if we can carbon capture it. And I think we're going to be able to move in a direction by the year 2035 we'll be able to have net zero emissions of carbon from the creation of energy, energy creation. That's so we can move it by dealing with those and every time we talk about global warming or the environment, the president thinks of you know it's a joke and I think it's jobs.

Because what we're going to have happen is you'll be able to see now as I started to say before, I as president am going to invest that \$600 billion we spend in government contracts only on those things that in fact also are not only made in America but building an infrastructure that's clean and new and what we have to do is focus on the transmission of energy across the country from areas relating to solar and wind. The reason is that that has not been mastered yet. I met a lot of people in Silicon Valley; the battery technology's increasing significantly so you're going to be able to have for example solar on your home and a battery the size, this-by this-by this, as I'm showing you here, in your basement so when the sun doesn't shine for five days you still have enough energy.

So we're making significant progress. The other thing we're going to do is provide an awful lot of work; it's estimated to put close to a million people to work by weatherizing four million buildings and two million homes, because we'll save tons and tons of energy or billions of barrels of energy over time and at the same time provide significant employment and at good union wages, prevailing wages.

Sure.

I'm telling the Boilermakers overwhelmingly endorse me, OK, so the Boilermakers Union has endorsed me because I sat down with them and went into great detail earlier to show their leadership exactly what I would do, number one. Number two, what I would do is I would stop making -- I would stop giving tax breaks and subsidizing oil.

We don't need to subsidize oil any longer, number one. We should stop that. It'd save billions of dollars overtime. What I would also do with regard to -- there's no -- the difference between me and the New Green Deal they say automatically by 2030 we're going to be carbon free. Not possible.

My deals a crucial framework but not the New Green Deal. The New Green Deal calls for elimination of all non-renewable energy by 2030. You can't get there.

You're going to need to be able to transition, George, to be able to transition to get to the place where we invest in new technologies that allow us to do things that get us to a place where we get to net zero emission including in agriculture. I've laid out a detailed plan.

We should be taking the plan where we allow significant more land to be put in conservation, plant a deep root of plants which absorb carbon from the air and in fact pay farmers to do it.

We can do things like pelletize all the chicken manure and all the horse manure and cow manure and they can be -- and take out the methane and use it as fertilizer and make a lot of money doing it. For example, right now down in -- and people when I say that they wonder what I'm talking about.

The biggest carbon sink in the world is the Amazon. More carbon absorbed from the air diminishing global warming in the Amazon and all the carbon emitted on a yearly basis from the United States America all vehicles and all names. So we have to use our imaginations.

We have to move in the direction as well providing for electric vehicles. Electric vehicles will save billions of gallons of oil, create estimated (inaudible) made Wall Street one million automobile jobs. But we're lagging because we're not investing. We're not doing any of the research.

Good to be back home. I'm from Pennsylvania.

Yep.

A little, but not a whole lot. We find ourselves in a position where we're more isolated in the world than we've ever been. Our allies are -- our go it alone, our -- you know, America first has made America alone.

You have Iran closer to having enough nuclear material to build a bomb. North Korea has more bombs and missiles available to it. We find ourselves where our NATO allies are publicly saying they can't count on us. We're in a situation, as well, where in the Far East, we find ourselves in the -- in the Western Pacific, where we're isolated, as well.

You have Japan and South Korea at odds with one another, China is making moves. So, I -- you know, I would say we find ourselves less secure than we've been.

I do compliment the president on the deal with Israel recently, but, you know, if you take a look, we're not very well trusted around the world. When 17 major nations of the world were asked who they trust more, who is a better leader, and the president came in behind both -- a national survey, international survey -- both behind Putin as well as Xi.

And look what Putin is doing. You know, you have Americans -- bounties on American military's heads in Afghanistan. They have more people there now, by the way, than when I left -- when we left, in Afghanistan.

And we find ourselves in a situation where he spoke to Putin six times, hasn't said a word to him. And NATO is in the risk of beginning to crack because they don't doubt -- they doubt our -- whether we're there. You see what's happened in everything from Belarus to Poland to Hungary, and the rise of totalitarian regimes in the world, and as well, this president embraces all the thugs in the world.

I mean, he's best friends with the leader of North Korea, sending love letters. He doesn't take on Putin in any way, and he -- he's just -- he's learned the art of the steal from the art of the deal by Xi and China.

So, I -- I would respectfully suggest -- no, there is no plan. No coherent plan for foreign policy.

You know, we've always ruled -- we've been most effective as a world leader, in my humble opinion, not just by the exercise of our power -- we're the most powerful nation in the world -- but the power of our example. That's what's led the rest of the world to follow us, on almost everything.

He's pulled out of almost every international organization. He gets laughed at when he goes to the -- literally, not figuratively when he goes to the United Nations.

I mean it's not -- it's not about the president per se, it's about the nation and the lack of respect that's showing to us.

Hi, Mieke, how are you?

I will flat out just change the law. Every -- eliminate those executive orders, number one. You may recall I'm the guy who said -- I was raised by a man who I remember I was being dropped off, my -- my dad was a high school educated, well read man who was a really decent guy.

And I was being dropped off to get an application in the center of our city; Wilmington, Delaware, the corporate capital of the world at the time. And these two men, I'm getting out to get an application to be a lifeguard in the African American community because there was a big swimming pool complex.

And these two men, well dressed, leaned up and hugged one another and kissed one another. And I'm getting out of the car at the light and I turn to my dad. My dad looked at me and said Joey, it's simple. They love each other.

The idea that an 8-year-old child or a 10-year-old child decides, you know I decided I want to be transgender. That's what I think I'd like to be. It would make my life a lot easier. There should be zero discrimination.

And what's happening is too many transgender women of color are being murdered. They're being murdered. And I think it's up now to 17, don't hold me to that number. But it's -- it's higher now?

And that's just this year. And so I promise you there is no reason to suggest that there should be any right denied your daughter or daughters, whichever one or two ...

... one, your daughter -- that your other daughter has a right to be and do. None, zero. And by the way, my son Bo, passed away; he was the attorney general in the state of Delaware. He was the guy who got the first transgender passed in the state of Delaware and because of a young man who became a woman who worked for him in the attorney general offices.

And I'm proud of that.

Well, to be very honest with you, I think that's very hard.

He is not -- things have not lent themselves to him learning from what's happened, what's gone before. Instead of being chastened by being one of the few presidents, the only president, to be impeached and then have a member of his own party vote to expel him, it emboldened him.

So -- but what I will do, I will -- hopefully, I will go back to being a professor at the University of Pennsylvania and making the case that I have been -- made and at the Biden Institute at the University of Delaware, focusing on -- on these same issues relating to what constitutes decency and honor in this country.

It's just the thing that got me involved in public life to begin with. As a kid, I had moved from Scranton, where there were no African-Americans, and moved down to Claymont, Delaware. And, in Delaware, we have the eighth largest Black population as a percent of population.

It was an epiphany for me, seeing what was going on. And I got deeply involved. I'm no great shakes. I don't mean I -- I wasn't John Lewis. I don't mean to imply that.

But it's the thing that's motivated -- my dad used to have an expression, for real. He said, "Everyone is entitled to be treated with dignity," everybody. And it was real. Everybody is.

And so, whether I'm a defeated candidate for president back teaching, or I'm elected president, it is a major element of everything that I'm about, because it reflects who we are as a nation. And it's what makes us -- this is -- every single solitary generation, the dial has moved closer and closer and more and more to inclusion.

And we are a country that is a country of slaves who came here 400 years ago, indigenous people, and everyone else is an immigrant. And we're a diverse country. Unless we are able to treat people equally, we're -- we're just never going to meet our potential.

But I think the American people want to see that happen. I think they're ready to see that happen. And I'll tell you one thing. If I'm elected president, you will not hear my race-baiting and you'll not hear me dividing you. I'm (inaudible) trying to unify. And unify with -- bring people together.

When I said I was running because I wanted to unify the country, people said, "Well, there are the old days." Well, we'd better be able to do it again.

We'd better be able to do it again.

Well, it could say that I'm a lousy candidate, and I didn't do a good job. But I think -- I hope . . .

that it doesn't say that we are as racially, ethnically, and religiously at odds with one another as it appears the President wants us to be. Usually, you know, the President, in my view, with all due respect, it's been divide and conquer, the way he does better if he splits us and where there's division.

And I think people need hope. I think -- look, George, I've never been more optimistic of the prospects for this country than I am today. And I really mean that. I think the people are ready. They understand what's at stake. And it's not about Democrat or Republican.

If I get elected, you know, I'm going to be -- I'm running as a proud Democrat, but I'm going to be an American president. I'm going to take care of those that voted against me as well as those who voted for me, for real. That's what presidents do. We've got to heal this nation, because we have the greatest opportunity of any country in the world to own the 21st century. And we can't do it divided.

Yes. By the way, before I came up here, I took another test, I've been taking it every day, the deep test, you know, the one, they go in both. And -- because I wanted to be able to -- if I had not passed that test, I didn't want to come here and not -- expose anybody. And I just think it's -- it's just decency to be able to determine whether or not you are -- you're clear.

And it's not -- I'm less concerned about me, but then the people -- the guys with the cameras, the people working on the -- the secret service guys you drive up with, all those people. And so, yes, I believe he will do that.

Look, I'm going to abide by what the commission rules call for. I was prepared to debate him remotely, which was supposed to happen. And he said he wouldn't do that. You know a virtual debate. Our town hall, he didn't want to do that. That -- I didn't set those rules. The commission set the rules.

So, whatever rules they set, I and -- I'm confident that -- the Cleveland Clinic is the one overseeing it, I think they're going to not let happen what happened last time, they're going to demand that it's safe.

I expect to be there.

Kaine

October 4th, 2016

Elaine, thank you for being here tonight, and, Governor Pence, welcome. It is so great to be back at Longwood University in Farmville, Virginia.

This is a very special place. Sixty-five years ago, a young, courageous woman, Barbara Johns, led a walkout of her high school, Moton High School. She made history by protesting school segregation. She believed our nation was stronger together. And that walkout led to the Brown v. Board of Education decision that moved us down the path toward equality.

I am so proud to be running with another strong, history-making woman, Hillary Clinton, to be president of the United States. I'm proud because her vision of stronger together, building an economy that works for all, not just those at the top, being safe in the world not only with a strong military, but also strong alliances to battle terrorism and climate change, and also to build a community of respect, just like Barbara Johns tried to do 65 years ago. That's why I'm so proud to be her running mate.

Hillary told me why she asked me to be her running mate. She said the test of a Clinton administration will not be the signing of a bill or the passage of a bill. It'll be whether we can make somebody's life better, whether we

can make a classroom better learning environment for schoolkids or teachers, whether we can make a safer — it's going to be about results.

And she said to me, you've been a missionary and a civil rights lawyer. You've been a city councilman and mayor. You've been a lieutenant governor and governor and now a U.S. senator. I think you will help me figure out how to govern this nation so that we always keep in mind that the success of the administration is the difference we make in people's lives.

And that's what I bring to the ticket, that experience having served at all levels of government. But my primary role is to be Hillary Clinton's right-hand person and strong supporter as she puts together the most historic administration possible. And I relish that role. I'm so proud of her.

I'll just say this: We trust Hillary Clinton, my wife and I, and we trust her with the most important thing in our life. We have a son deployed overseas in the Marine Corps right now. We trust Hillary Clinton as president and commander-in-chief, but the thought of Donald Trump as commander-in-chief scares us to death.

Elaine, let me tell you why I trust Hillary Clinton. Here's what people should look at as they look at a public servant. Do they have a passion in their life that showed up before they were in public life? And have they held onto that passion throughout their life, regardless of whether they were in office or not, succeeding or failing?

Hillary Clinton has that passion. From a time as a kid in a Methodist youth group in the suburbs of Chicago, she has been focused on serving others with a special focus on empowering families and kids. As a civil rights lawyer in the South, with the Children's Defense Fund, first lady of Arkansas and this country, senator, secretary of state, it's always been about putting others first. And that's a sharp contrast with Donald Trump.

Donald Trump always puts himself first. He built a business career, in the words of one of his own campaign staffers, "off the backs of the little guy." And as a candidate, he started his campaign with a speech where he called Mexicans rapists and criminals, and he has pursued the discredited and really outrageous lie that President Obama wasn't born in the United States.

It is so painful to suggest that we go back to think about these days where an African-American could not be a citizen of the United States. And I can't imagine how Governor Pence can defend the insult-driven selfish "me first" style of Donald Trump.

You guys love Russia. You both have said...

You both have said — you both have said Vladimir Putin is a better leader than the president.

These guys have praised Vladimir Putin as a great leader. How can that...

And paid few taxes and lost a billion a year.

You are Donald Trump's apprentice. Let me talk about this...

Well, I think — isn't this a discussion?

Yeah, let's talk about the state of...

Finish your sentence.

OK, now I can weigh in. Now...

Now, I get to weigh in. Now, let me just say this...

Governor Pence — Governor Pence doesn't think the world's going so well and he, you know, is going to say it's everybody's fault.

Let me tell you this. When Hillary Clinton became secretary of state, Governor Pence, do you know that Osama bin Laden was alive?

Do you know that we had 175,000 troops deployed in the battlefield in Iraq and Afghanistan? Do you know that Iran was racing toward a nuclear weapon and Russia was expanding its stockpile?

Under Secretary Clinton's leadership, she was part of the national team, public safety team that went after and revived the dormant hunt against bin Laden and wiped him off the face of the Earth. She worked to deal with the Russians to reduce their chemical weapons stockpile. She worked a tough negotiation with nations around the world to eliminate the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot.

Absolutely, without firing a shot. And instead of 175,000 American troops deployed overseas, we now have 15,000.

These are very, very good things.

Well, if you want to put more American troops in Iraq, you can propose that.

No, that is incorrect. That's incorrect.

But I'd like to correct...

Governor, President Bush said we would leave Iraq at the end of 2011. And, Elaine, Iraq didn't want our troops to stay, and they wouldn't give us the protection for our troops. And guess what? If a nation where our troops are serving does not want us to stay, we're not going to stay without their protection.

If Governor Pence wants to put more troops back in Iraq, that's...

OK.

Elaine, on the economy, there's a fundamental choice for the American electorate. Do you want a "you're hired" president in Hillary Clinton or do you want a "you're fired" president in Donald Trump? I think that's not such a hard choice.

Hillary and I have a plan that's on the table that's a "you're hired" plan. Five components. First thing we do is we invest in manufacturing, infrastructure, and research in the clean energy jobs of tomorrow. Second thing is we

invest in our workforce, from pre-K education to great teachers to debt-free college and tuition-free college for families that make less than \$125,000 a year.

Third, we promote fairness by raising the minimum wage, so you can't work full-time and be under the poverty level, and by paying women equal pay for equal work.

Fourth, we promote small business growth, just as we've done in Virginia, to make it easier to start and grow small businesses. Hillary and I each grew up in small-business families. My dad, who ran an iron working and welding shop, is here tonight.

And, fifth, we have a tax plan that targets tax relief to middle- class individuals and small businesses and asks those at the very top who've benefited as we've come out of recession to pay more.

The Trump plan is a different plan. It's a "you're fired" plan. And there's two key elements to it. First, Donald Trump said wages are too high. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence think we ought to eliminate the federal minimum wage.

Mike Pence, when he was in Congress, voted against raising the minimum wage above \$5.15. And he has been a one-man bulwark against minimum wage increases in Indiana.

The second component of the plan is massive tax breaks for the very top, trillions of dollars of tax breaks for people just like Donald Trump. The problem with this, Elaine, is that's exactly what we did 10 years ago and it put the economy into the deepest recession — the deepest recession since the 1930s.

Independent analysts say the Clinton plan would grow the economy by 10.5 million jobs. The Trump plan would cost 3.5 million jobs. And Donald Trump — why would he do this? Because his tax plan basically helps him. And if he ever met his promise and he gave his tax returns to the American public like he said he would, we would see just how much his economic plan is really a Trump-first plan.

Fifteen million new jobs?
Fifteen million new jobs?

And the poverty level and the median income... improved dramatically between 2014 and 2015.

But it's not the giveaway tax relief to the folks at the top.

I am interested to hear whether he'll defend his running mate's not releasing taxes and not paying taxes.

But why won't he release his tax returns?
I do want to come back to that, but...
How do you know that? You haven't seen his tax returns.
How do you know that?
Elaine, let me talk about something.

OK.

Donald Trump started this campaign in 2014 and he said, "If I run for president, I will absolutely release my taxes." He's broken his first...

He's broken his first promise. Second, he stood on the stage...

He stood on the stage last week and when Hillary said, you haven't been paying taxes, he said, "That makes me smart." So it's smart not to pay for our military? It's smart not to pay for veterans? It's smart not to pay for teachers? And I guess all of us who do pay for those things, I guess we're stupid. And the last thing I'll say is this...

The last thing — the last thing I want to ask Governor Pence is...

Governor Pence had to give Donald Trump his tax returns to show he was qualified to be vice president. Donald Trump must give the American public his tax returns to show that he's qualified to be president. And he's breaking his promise.

But he said he would release his tax returns.

Richard Nixon released tax returns when he was under audit.

If you can't meet Nixon's standard...

All right. We're having fun up here.

First, we're going to protect Social Security, which is one of the greatest programs that the American government has ever done. It happened at a time when you would work your whole life, your whole life, raising your kids, working, being a Little League coach or a Sunday school teacher, and then you would retire into poverty. And Social Security has enabled people to retire with dignity and overwhelmingly not be in poverty. We have to keep it solvent. And we will keep it solvent. And we'll look for strategies like adjusting the payroll tax cap upward in order to do that.

Here's what Hillary and I will not do. And I want to make this very plain. We will never, ever engage in a risky scheme to privatize Social Security. Donald Trump wrote a book and he said Social Security is a Ponzi scheme and privatization would be good for all of us.

And when Congressman Pence was in Congress, he was the chief cheerleader for the privatization of Social Security. Even after President Bush stopped pushing for it, Congressman Pence kept pushing for it. We're going to stand up against efforts to privatize Social Security. And we'll look for ways to keep it solvent going forward, focusing primarily on the payroll tax cap.

Go read — go read the book.

Go read the book.

But — but you have a voting record, Governor.

I...

I can't believe that you won't defend your own voting record.

You're not going to cut taxes. You're going to raise taxes on the middle class.

You did ask this question about debt, and the debt explosion on the Trump plan is much, much bigger than anything on the Clinton side.

Elaine, I think that's a very fair comment. I think we put a lot on police shoulders. And this is something I got a lot of scar tissue and experience on.

I was a city councilman and mayor in Richmond. And when I came in, we had one of the highest homicide rates in the United States. We fought very, very hard over the course of my time in local office with our police department, and we reduced our homicide rate nearly in half.

And then when I was governor of Virginia, we worked hard, too. And we did something we had really wanted to do. For the first time ever, we cracked the top 10, 10 safest states, because we worked together.

Here's what I learned as a mayor and a governor. The way you make communities safer and the way you make police safer is through community policing. You build the bonds between the community and the police force, build bonds of understanding, and then when people feel comfortable in their communities, that gap between the police and the communities they serve narrows. And when that gap narrows, it's safer for the communities and it's safer for the police.

That model still works across our country, but there are some other models that don't work, an overly aggressive, more militarized model. Donald Trump recently said we need to do more stop-and-frisk around the country. That would be a big mistake because it polarizes the relationship between the police and the community.

So here's what we'll do. We'll focus on community policing. We will focus on — and Hillary Clinton has rolled out a really comprehensive mental health reform package that she worked on with law enforcement professionals, and we will also fight the scourge of gun violence in the United States.

I'm a gun-owner. I'm a strong Second Amendment supporter. But I've got a lot of scar tissue, because when I was governor of Virginia, there was a horrible shooting at Virginia Tech, and we learned that through that painful situation that gaps in the background record check system should have been closed and it could have prevented that crime, and so we're going to work to do things like close background record checks. And if we do, we won't have the tragedies that we did.

One of those killed at Virginia Tech was a guy named Liviu Librescu. He was a 70-plus-year-old Romanian Holocaust survivor. He had survived the Holocaust. Then he survived the Soviet Union takeover of his country. But then he was a visiting professor at Virginia Tech, and he couldn't survive the scourge of gun violence.

We can support the Second Amendment and do things like background record checks and make us safer, and that will make police safer, too.

Can I — can I explain...

Elaine — Elaine, people shouldn't be afraid to bring up issues of bias in law enforcement. And if you're afraid to have...

And if — if you're afraid to have the discussion, you'll never solve it. And so here's — here's an example, heartbreaking. We would agree this is a heartbreaking example.

The guy, Philando Castile, who was killed in St. Paul, he was a worker, a valued worker in a local school. And he was killed for no apparent reason in an incident that will be discussed and will be investigated.

But when folks went and explored this situation, what they found is that Philando Castile, who was a — they called him Mr. Rogers with Dreadlocks in the school that he worked. The kids loved him. But he had been stopped by police 40 or 50 times before that fatal incident. And if you look at sentencing in this country, African-Americans and Latinos get sentenced for the same crimes at very different rates.

Well, we do.

But I just want to say, those who say that we should not...

we should not be able to bring up and talk about bias in the system, we'll never solve the problem...

Well, I guess I can't believe you are defending the position that there is no bias and it's a topic we don't even...

A U.S. senator.

Elaine, can I...

Elaine, let me — let me...

Elaine, if I could — if I could jump in. I've heard Senator Scott make that eloquent plea. And look, criminal justice is about respecting the law and being respected by the law. So there is a fundamental respect issue here.

And I just want to talk about the tone that's set from the top. Donald Trump during his campaign has called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He's called women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting. I don't like saying that in front of my wife and my mother. He attacked an Indiana-born federal judge and said he was unqualified to hear a federal lawsuit because his parents were Mexican. He went after John McCain, a POW, and said he wasn't a hero because he'd been captured. He said African-Americans are living in Hell. And he perpetrated this outrageous and bigoted lie that President Obama is not a U.S. citizen.

If you want to have a society where people are respected and respect laws, you can't have somebody at the top who demeans every group that he talks about. And I just — again, I cannot believe that Governor Pence will defend the insult-driven campaign that Donald Trump has run.

These were Donald's — hold on a second, Governor.

I apologize. It's your two minutes. I apologize.

Hillary Clinton said something on the campaign trail, and the very next day, she said, you know what, I shouldn't have said that.

Yeah, that's right, so now we're even.

Look for Donald Trump apologizing to John McCain for saying he wasn't a hero...

to Donald Trump apologizing for calling women slobs, pigs, dogs, disgusting.

Did Donald Trump apologize for taking after somebody in a Twitter war and making fun of her weight? Did he apologize for saying African-Americans are living in Hell? Did he apologize for saying President Obama was not even a citizen of the United States? You will look in vain to see Donald Trump ever taking responsibility for anybody and apologizing.

Immigration. There's two plans on the table. Hillary and I believe in comprehensive immigration reform. Donald Trump believes in deportation nation. You've got to pick your choice. Hillary and I want a bipartisan reform that will put keeping families together as the top goal, second, that will help focus enforcement efforts on those who are violent, third, that will do more border control, and, fourth, that will provide a path to citizenship for those who work hard, pay taxes, play by the rules, and take criminal background record checks.

That's our proposal. Donald Trump proposes to deport 16 million people, 11 million who are here without documents. And both Donald Trump and Mike Pence want to get rid of birthright citizenship. So if you're born here, but your parents don't have documents, they want to eliminate that. That's another 4.5 million people.

These guys — and Donald Trump has said it — deportation force. They want to go house to house, school to school, business to business, and kick out 16 million people. And I cannot believe...

I cannot believe that Governor Pence would sit here and defend his running mate's claim that we should create a deportation force to — so that they'll all be gone.

So you like the 16 million deportations?

Our plan is like Ronald Reagan's plan from 1986.

No, I...

border security three years ago, and Governor Pence was against it.

I just have to correct Governor Pence....

I have to...

I look forward to working together in whatever capacities we serve in. But I just want to make it very, very clear that he's trying to fuzz up what Donald Trump has said. When Donald Trump spoke in Phoenix, he looked the audience in the eye and he said, no, we're building a wall, and we're deporting everybody. He said, quote, "They will all be gone." "They will all be gone." And this is one of these ones where you can just go to the tape on it and see what Donald Trump has said. And to add...

And to add to it, and to add to it, and to add to it, we are a nation of immigrants. Mike Pence and I both are descended from immigrant families. Some things, you know, maybe weren't said so great about the Irish when they came, but we've done well by absorbing immigrants, and it's made our nation stronger.

When Donald Trump says Mexicans are rapists and criminals, Mexican immigrants, when Donald Trump says about your judge, a Hoosier judge, he said that Judge Curiel was unqualified to hear a case because his parents were Mexican, I can't imagine how you could defend that.

The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways, because bin Laden is dead. The terrorist threat has decreased in some ways because an Iranian nuclear weapons program has been stopped. The terrorist threat to United States troops has been decreased in some ways because there's not 175,000 in a dangerous part of the world. There's only 15,000.

But there are other parts of the world that are challenging. Let me tell you this: To beat terrorism, there's only one candidate who can do it, and it's Hillary Clinton. Remember, Hillary Clinton was the senator from New York on 9/11. She was there at the World Trade Center when they were still searching for victims and survivors. That's seared onto her, the need to beat terrorism.

And she's got a plan to do it. She was part of the national security team that wiped out bin Laden. Here's her plan to defeat ISIL. First, we've got to keep taking out their leaders on the battlefield. She was part of the team that got bin Laden, and she'll lead the team that will get Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi, the head of ISIS.

Second, we've got to disrupt financing networks, third, disrupt their ability to recruit on the Internet, in their safe havens. But, fourth, we also have to work with allies to share and surge intelligence. That's the Hillary Clinton plan; she's got the experience to do it.

Donald Trump. Donald Trump can't start a Twitter war with Miss Universe without shooting himself in the foot. Donald Trump doesn't have a plan. He said, "I have a secret plan," and then he said, "Um, I know more than all the generals about ISIL." And then he said, "I'm going to call the generals to help me figure out a plan." And finally he said, "I'm going to fire all the generals." He doesn't have a plan.

But he does have dangerous ideas. Here's four. He trash talks the military. The military is a disaster, John McCain's no hero, the generals need all to be fired, and I know more than them. He wants to tear up alliances. NATO is obsolete, and we'll only work together with Israel if they pay "big league."

Third, he loves dictators. He's got kind of a personal Mount Rushmore, Vladimir Putin, Kim Jong-un, Moammar Gadhafi...

and Saddam Hussein. And last and most dangerously, Donald Trump believes — Donald Trump believes that the world will be safer if more nations have nuclear weapons. He's said Saudi Arabia should get them, Japan should get them, Korea should get them. And when he was confronted with this, and told, wait a minute, terrorists could get those, proliferation could lead to nuclear war, here's what Donald Trump said, and I quote: "Go ahead, folks, enjoy yourselves."

I'd love to hear Governor Pence tell me what's so enjoyable or comical about nuclear war.

Well, I'm going to see if you can defend any of it.

I was in Virginia where the Pentagon's...

Stopping a nuclear weapons program without firing a shot?

Yes, we did.

Even the Israeli military says it stopped.

Elaine, I want to...[crosstalk]

Or instead of you violating the Constitution by blocking people based on their national origin rather than whether they're dangerous.

That's what the Seventh Circuit decided just — here's the difference, Elaine.

We have different views on — on refugee issues and on immigration. Hillary and I want to do enforcement based on, are people dangerous? These guys say all Mexicans are bad.

And with respect to refugees, we want to keep people out if they're dangerous. Donald Trump said keep them out if they're Muslim. Mike Pence...

put a program in place to keep them out if they're from Syria. And yesterday an appellate court with three Republican judges struck down the Pence plan...

and said it was discriminatory...

We should focus upon danger, not upon discrimination.

But they told you there's a right way and a wrong way to do it.

But, Governor Pence...

But, Governor Pence, I just...

Sure. Can we just be clear — Hillary and I will do immigration enforcement and we'll vet refugees based on whether they're dangerous or not. We won't do it based on discriminating against you from the country you come from or the religion that you practice.

That is completely antithetical to the Jeffersonian values of...[crosstalk]

Yes, we can, and when we don't let them know, we don't let them in.

When we don't know who they are, we don't let them in.

By trashing all Syrians or trashing all Muslims?

Yes.

Intelligence surge is two things, Elaine. It's two things. It's, first, dramatically expanding our intelligence capacities by hiring great professionals, but also we've got some of the best intel and cyber employees in the world right here in the United States working for many of our private sector companies.

So it involves increasing our own workforce, but striking great partnerships with some of our cyber and intel experts in the private sector so that we can, consistent with constitutional principles, gather more intelligence.

But the second piece of this is really, really important. It also means creating stronger alliances, because you gather intelligence and then you share your intelligence back and forth with allies. And that's how you find out who may be trying to recruit, who may be trying to come from one country to the next. Alliances are critical.

That's why Donald Trump's claim that he wants to — that NATO is obsolete and that we need to get rid of NATO is so dangerous.

Well, he said NATO is obsolete. And, look, if you put aside — push aside your alliances, who you're going to share intelligence with? Hillary Clinton is the secretary of state who knows how to build alliances. She built the sanctions regime around the world that stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. And that's what an intelligence surge means. Better skill and capacity, but also better alliances.

We will work together in whatever roles we inhabit.

A full investigation concluded that not one reasonable prosecutor would take any additional step. You don't get to decide the rights and wrongs of this. We have a justice system that does that. And a Republican FBI director did an investigation and concluded that...

That is absolutely false and you know that.

And you know that, Governor.

Because the FBI did an investigation.

And they concluded that there was no reasonable prosecutor who would take it further. Sorry.

Syria.

Hillary and I also agree that the establishment of humanitarian zones in northern Syria with the provision of international human aid, consistent with the U.N. Security Council resolution that was passed in February 2014, would be a very, very good idea.

And Hillary also has the ability to stand up to Russia in a way that this ticket does not. Donald Trump, again and again, has praised Vladimir Putin. And it's clear that he has business dealings with Russian oligarchs who are very connected to Putin.

The Trump campaign management team had to be fired a month or so ago because of those shadowy connections with pro-Putin forces. Governor Pence made the odd claim, he said inarguably Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama. Vladimir Putin has run his economy into the ground. He persecutes LGBT folks and journalists. If you don't know the difference between dictatorship and leadership, then you got to go back to a fifth-grade civics class.

I'll tell you what offends me...

Governor Pence just said — Governor Pence just said that Donald Trump will rebuild the military. No, he won't. Donald Trump is avoiding paying taxes. The New York Times story — and we need to get this — but the New York Times suggested that he probably didn't pay taxes for about 18 years starting in 1995. Those years included the years of 9/11.

So get this. On 9/11, Hillary Clinton and Donald Trump's hometown was attacked by the worst terrorist attack in the history of the United States. Young men and women — young men and women signed up to serve in the military to fight terrorism. Hillary Clinton went to Washington to get funds to rebuild her city and protect first responders, but Donald Trump was fighting a very different fight. It was a fight to avoid paying taxes so that he wouldn't support the fight against terror.

He wouldn't support troops. He wouldn't — he wouldn't support — this is important, Elaine. When a guy running for president will not support the troops, not support veterans, not support teachers, that's really important.

And I said about Aleppo, we do agree the notion is we have to create a humanitarian zone in northern Syria. It's very important.

He won't pay taxes.

It is about our troops. It is about our troops.

How can you support the troops if you won't pay taxes?

Do you think Donald Trump is smart to not pay taxes?

Well, let me — let me come back...

and talk about — let me talk about the things that Governor Pence doesn't want to acknowledge, Elaine. He doesn't want to acknowledge that we stopped the Iranian nuclear weapons program. He doesn't want to acknowledge...

that Hillary was part of the team that got bin Laden. He doesn't want to acknowledge...

that it's a good thing, not a bad thing, that it's a good thing — not a bad thing — that we're down from 175,000 troops deployed overseas to 15,000.

But let me tell you what will really make the Middle East dangerous. Donald Trump's idea that more nations should get nuclear weapons, Saudi Arabia, Japan, South Korea. Ronald Reagan said something really interesting about nuclear proliferation back in the 1980s. He said the problem with nuclear proliferation is that some fool or maniac could trigger a catastrophic event. And I think that's who Governor Pence's running mate is, exactly who Governor Reagan warned us about.

But do you — do you think — do you think we should have — more nuclear weapons in the world will make us safer?

That's what Donald Trump thinks.

But can you defend Donald Trump's claim that more nations should get nuclear weapons?

That's what the Israeli joint chiefs of staff is saying right now.

Gadi Eizenkot, you can go check it.

Go to the tape.

No, I visited him in his office. I visited him in his office.

And then Hillary used them to get a deal.

Elaine, let me just mention one thing.

Elaine...

Six times tonight, I have said to Governor Pence I can't imagine how you can defend your running mate's position on one issue after the next. And in all six cases, he's refused to defend his running mate.

And yet he is asking everybody to vote for somebody that he cannot defend. And I just think that should be underlined.

More nations should get nuclear weapons. Try to defend that.

He absolutely said it. Saudi Arabia, South Korea, Japan.

You've got to be tough on Russia. So let's start with not praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader. Donald Trump and Mike Pence have said he's a great leader. And Donald Trump has business...

has business dealings — has business dealings with Russia that he refuses to disclose. Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to-toe with Russia. She went toe-to-toe with Russia as secretary of state to do the New START Agreement to reduce Russia's nuclear stockpile. She's had the experience doing it.

She went toe-to-toe with Russia and lodged protests when they went into Georgia. And we've done the same thing about Ukraine, but more than launching protests, we've put punishing economic sanctions on Russia that we need to continue.

Donald Trump, on the other hand, didn't know that Russia had invaded the Crimea.

He was on a TV show a couple months back, and he said, "I'll guarantee you this, Russia's not going into the Ukraine." And he had to be reminded that they had gone into the Crimea two years before.

Hillary Clinton has gone toe-to-toe with Russia to work out a deal on New START. She got them engaged in a meaningful way to cap Iran's nuclear weapons program. And yet she stood up to them on issues such as Syria and their invasion of Georgia. You've got to have the ability to do that, and Hillary does.

On the other hand, in Donald Trump, you have somebody who praises Vladimir Putin all the time. America should really wonder about a President Trump, who had a campaign manager with ties to Putin, pro-Putin elements in the Ukraine, who had to be fired for that reason. They should wonder — when Donald Trump is sitting down with Vladimir Putin, is it going to be America's bottom line or is it going to be Donald Trump's bottom line that he's going to be worried about with all of his business dealings?

Now, this could be solved if Donald Trump would be willing to release his tax returns, as he told the American public that he would do. And I know he's laughing at this, but every president...

Every president since Richard Nixon has done it, and Donald Trump has said I'm doing business with Russia. The only way the American public will see whether he has a conflict of interest...

He has, actually.

You know, I'm just saying facts about your running mate.

And I know you can't defend.

You're not.

I'll run through the list of things where you won't defend...

We wiped out the leader of Al Qaida.

We stopped Iran from getting nuclear weapons.

And we stopped a nuclear weapons program without a shot.

Business dealings.

Donald Trump's son says that the Trump organization...

Well, this is one where we can just kind of go to the tape on it. But Governor Pence said, inarguably, Vladimir Putin is a better leader than President Obama.

And — and — and I just think a guy who praises...

No, he said leader. And if — and I'll just say this, Governor.

If you mistake leadership for dictatorship, and you can't tell the difference, a country that's running its economy into the ground...

persecuting journalists...

if you can't tell the difference, you shouldn't be commander-in-chief.

And with Donald Trump — Donald Trump's sons say that they have all these business dealings with Russia. Those could be disclosed with tax returns, but they refuse to do them. Americans need to worry about whether Donald Trump will be watching out for America's bottom line or his own bottom line.

Vladimir Putin. Vladimir Putin is a dictator.

Vladimir Putin is a dictator. He's not a leader. Anybody who thinks otherwise doesn't know Russian history and they don't know Vladimir Putin. Hillary Clinton knows exactly who this guy is. John McCain said, I look in his eyes and I see KGB. And Hillary kind of has that same feeling.

So how do deal with him? You've got to — we do have to deal with Russia in a lot of different ways. There are areas where we can cooperate. So it was Hillary Clinton who worked with Russia on the New START Treaty to reduce their nuclear weapons stockpile. It was Hillary Clinton that worked with Russia to get them engaged in a community of nations to stop the Iranian nuclear weapons program without firing a shot.

She's not going around praising Vladimir Putin as a great guy. But she knows how to sit down at a table and negotiate tough deals. This is a very challenging part of the world, and we ought to have a commander-in-chief who is prepared and done it, rather than somebody who goes around praising Vladimir Putin as a great leader.

Until he...

I'm going to talk about the foundation, and then I'll talk about North Korea. So, on the foundation. I am glad to talk about the foundation. The Clinton Foundation is one of the highest-rated charities in the world. It provides AIDS drugs to about 11.5 million people. It helps Americans deal with opioid overdoses. It gets higher rankings for its charity than the American Red Cross does. The Clinton Foundation does an awful lot of good work.

Hillary Clinton as secretary of state took no action to benefit the foundation. The State Department did an investigation, and they concluded that everything Hillary Clinton did as secretary of state was completely in the interest of the United States. So the foundation does good work. And Hillary Clinton as secretary of state acted in the interests of the United States.

But let's compare this now with the Trump organization and the Trump Foundation. The Trump organization is an octopus-like organization with tentacles all over the world whose conflict of interests could only be known if Donald Trump would release his tax returns. He's refused to do it.

His sons have said that the organization has a lot of business dealings in Russia. And remember, the Trump organization is not a non-profit. It's putting money into Donald Trump's pockets and into the pockets of his children, whereas the Clinton Foundation is a non-profit and no Clinton family member draws any salary.

In addition, Donald Trump has a foundation. The foundation was just fined for illegally contributing foundation dollars to a political campaign of a Florida attorney general. They made an illegal contribution, and then they tried to hide it by disguising it to somebody else. And the person they donated to was somebody whose office was charged with investigating Trump University.

This is the difference between a foundation that does good work and a secretary of state who acted in accord with American interest and somebody who is conflicted and doing work around the world and won't share with the American public what he's doing and what those conflicts are.

Political contributions?

A \$20,000 portrait of Donald Trump? PENCE: Less than 10 cents on the dollar of the Clinton Foundation has gone to charitable causes.

Ninety percent.

If we — look, a president should take action to defend the United States against imminent threat. You have to. A president has to do that. Now exactly what action, you would have to determine what your intelligence was, how certain you were of that intelligence, but you would have to take action.

You asked the question about how do we deal with a North Korea. I'm on the Foreign Relations Committee. We just did an extensive sanctions package against North Korea. And interestingly enough, Elaine, the U.N. followed and did this — virtually the same package. Often China will use their veto in the Security Council to veto a package like that. They're starting to get worried about North Korea, too. So they actually supported the sanctions package, even though many of the sanctions are against Chinese firms, Chinese financial institutions.

So we're working together with China, and we need to. China's another one of those relationships where it's competitive, it's also challenging, and in times like North Korea, we have to be able to cooperate. Hillary understands that very well. She went once famously to China and stood up at a human rights meeting and looked them in the eye and said, "Women's rights are human rights." They didn't want her to say that, but she did.

But she's also worked on a lot of diplomatic and important diplomatic deals with China. And that's what it's going to take.

The thing I would worry a little bit about is that Donald Trump owes about \$650 million to banks, including the Bank of China. I'm not sure he could stand up so tough to the people who have loaned him money.

Yeah, that's an easy one for me, Elaine. It's an easy one. I'm really fortunate. I grew up in a wonderful household with great Irish Catholic parents. My mom and dad are sitting right here. I was educated by Jesuits at Rockhurst High School in Kansas City. My 40th reunion is in 10 days.

And I worked with Jesuit missionaries in Honduras, now nearly 35 years ago, and they were the heroes of my life. I try to practice my religion in a very devout way and follow the teachings of my church in my own personal life. But I don't believe in this nation, a First Amendment nation, where we don't raise any religion over the other, and we allow people to worship as they please, that the doctrines of any one religion should be mandated for everyone.

For me, the hardest struggle in my faith life was the Catholic Church is against the death penalty and so am I. But I was governor of a state, and the state law said that there was a death penalty for crimes if the jury determined them to be heinous. And so I had to grapple with that.

When I was running for governor, I was attacked pretty strongly because of my position on the death penalty. But I looked the voters of Virginia in the eye and said, look, this is my religion. I'm not going to change my religious practice to get one vote, but I know how to take an oath and uphold the law. And if you elect me, I will uphold the law.

And I was elected, and I did. It was very, very difficult to allow executions to go forward, but in circumstances where I didn't feel like there was a case for clemency, I told Virginia voters I would uphold the law, and I did.

That was a real struggle. But I think it is really, really important that those of us who have deep faith lives don't feel like we could just substitute our own views for everybody else in society, regardless of their views.

That's shared.

Elaine, this is a fundamental question, a fundamental question. Hillary and I are both people out of religious backgrounds, from Methodist church experience, which was really formative for her as a public servant.

But we really feel like you should live fully and with enthusiasm the commands of your faith. But it is not the role of the public servant to mandate that for everybody else.

So let's talk about abortion and choice. Let's talk about them. We support Roe v. Wade. We support the constitutional right of American women to consult their own conscience, their own supportive partner, their own minister, but then make their own decision about pregnancy. That's something we trust American women to do that.

And we don't think that women should be punished, as Donald Trump said they should, for making the decision to have an abortion.

Governor Pence wants to repeal Roe v. Wade. He said he wants to put it on the ash heap of history. And we have some young people in the audience who weren't even born when Roe was decided. This is pretty important. Before Roe v. Wade, states could pass criminal laws to do just that, to punish women if they made the choice to terminate a pregnancy.

I think you should live your moral values. But the last thing, the very last thing that government should do is have laws that would punish women who make reproductive choices. And that is the fundamental difference between a Clinton-Kaine ticket and a Trump-Pence ticket that wants to punish women who make that choice.

Then why did Donald Trump say that?

Why did he say that?

Well, I would admit that's not a polished... Well, can I say...

Great line from the — great line from the gospel of Matthew. From the fullness of the heart, the mouth speaks.

When Donald Trump says women should be punished or Mexicans are rapists and criminals...

or John McCain is not a hero, he is showing you who he is.

Can you defend it?

You want to — you want to use a big broad brush against Mexicans on that?

This is important —

But, Governor...

Governor, why don't you trust women to make this choice for themselves? We can encourage people to support life. Of course we can. But why don't you trust women? Why doesn't Donald Trump trust women to make this choice for themselves?

That's what we ought to be doing in public life. Living our lives of faith or motivation with enthusiasm and excitement, convincing each other, dialoguing with each other about important moral issues of the day...

but on fundamental issues of morality, we should let women make their own decisions.

That's a really important one. That may be the \$64,000 question, because it has been a divisive campaign. And again, Hillary is running a campaign about stronger together, and Donald Trump — and this is — this is not directed at this man, except to the extent that he can't defend Donald Trump — Donald Trump has run a campaign that's been about one insult after the next.

But we do have to bring the country together. So here's what we'll do. Hillary Clinton was first lady, then senator for eight years and secretary of state. And I served in the Senate. And I'm really amazed, Elaine, as I talk to Republican senators, how well they regard and respect Hillary Clinton.

She was on the Armed Services Committee. She was on other committees. She worked across the aisle when she was first lady to get the CHIP program passed so that 8 million low-income kids have health insurance in this country, including 150,000 in Indiana.

She worked across the aisle after 9/11 to get health benefits for the first responders who bravely went into the towers and into the Pentagon. She worked to get benefits for — TRICARE benefits for National Guard members, including Hoosiers and Virginians in the National Guard.

She has a track record of working across the aisle to make things happen. And, you know, Elaine, I have the same track record. I was a governor of Virginia with two Republican houses. And in the Senate, I have good working relationships across the aisle.

Because I think it's fine to be a Democrat or Republican or independent, but after Election Day, the goal is work together. And Hillary Clinton has a track record of accomplishment across the aisle that will enable her to do just that when we work with the new Congress in January.

Absolutely.

Harris

October 7th, 2020

Thank you, Susan. Well, the American people have witnessed what is the greatest failure of any presidential administration in the history of our country. And here are the facts. 210,000 dead people in our country in just the last several months. Over 7 million people who have contracted this disease. One in five businesses closed. We're looking at frontline workers who have been treated like sacrificial workers. We are looking at over 30 million people, who in the last several months, had to file for unemployment. And here's the thing, on January 28th, the vice president and the president were informed about the nature of this pandemic. They were informed that it's lethal in consequence, that it is airborne, that it will affect young people, and that it would be contracted because it is airborne. And they knew what was happening, and they didn't tell you.

Can you imagine if you knew on January 28th, as opposed to March 13th, what they knew, what you might've done to prepare? They knew, and they covered it up. The president said it was a hoax. They minimized the

seriousness of it. The president said, "You're on one side of his ledger if you wear a mask. You're on the other side of his ledger if you don't." And in spite of all of that, today, they still don't have a plan. They still don't have a plan. Well, Joe Biden does. And our plan is about what we need to do around a national strategy for contact tracing, for testing, for administration of the vaccine, and making sure that it will be free for all. That is the plan that Joe Biden has and that I have, knowing that we have to get a hold of what has been going on, and we need to save our country. And Joe Biden is the best leader to do that. And frankly, this administration has forfeited their... right to reelection based on this.

Absolutely. Whatever the vice president is claiming the administration has done, clearly, it hasn't worked. When you're looking at over 210,000 dead bodies in our country, American lives that have been lost, families that are grieving that loss, and the vice president is the head of the task force and knew on January 28th, how serious this was. And then, thanks to Bob Woodward, we learned that they knew about it. And then when that was exposed, the vice president said, when asked, "Well, why didn't you all tell anybody?" He said, "Because the president wanted people to remain calm."

No. But Susan, this is important. And I want to add-

Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking.

I'm speaking.

Thank you. So I want to ask the American people, how calm were you when you were panicked about where you were going to get your next roll of toilet paper? How calm were you when your kids were sent home from school and you didn't know when they could go back? How calm were you-

... when your children-

... couldn't see your parents because you were afraid they could kill them.

I'm referring to the president-

Let's talk about respecting the American people. You respect the American people when you tell them the truth.

You respect the American people when you have the courage to be a leader.

Speaking of those things that you may not want people to hear, but they need to hear so they can protect themselves. But this administration stood on information that, if you had as a parent, if you had as a worker, knowing you didn't have enough money saved up, and now you're standing in a food line because of the ineptitude of an administration that was unwilling to speak the truth to the American people. So let's talk about caring about the American people. The American people have had to sacrifice far too much because of the incompetence of this administration. It is asking too much of the people-

It is asking too much of the people. That they would not be equipped with the information they need to help themselves to protect their parents and their children.

That's fine, I'm Kamala.

If the public health professionals, if Dr. Fauci, if the doctors tell us that we should take it, I'll be the first in line to take it, absolutely. But if Donald Trump tells us that we should take it, I'm not taking it.

Let me tell you first of all, the day I got the call from Joe Biden, it was actually a Zoom call, asking me to serve with him on this ticket was probably one of the most memorable days of my life. I thought about my mother, who came to the United States at the age of 19, gave birth to me at the age of 25 at Kaiser Hospital in Oakland, California. And the thought that I'd be sitting here right now, I know, would make her proud. And she must be looking down on this. Joe and I were raised in a very similar way. We were raised with values that are about hard work, about the value and the dignity of public service, and about the importance of fighting for the dignity of all people. And I think Joe asked me to serve with him because I have a career that included being elected the first woman District Attorney of San Francisco, where I created models of innovation for law enforcement, in terms of reform of the criminal justice system.

I was elected the first woman of color, and black woman to be elected Attorney General of the state of California, where I ran the second largest department of justice in the United States. Second only to the United States Department of Justice. And there, I took on everything from transnational criminal organizations, to the big banks that were taking advantage of homeowners, to for-profit colleges that were taking advantage of veterans. And then of course, now I serve in the United States Senate as only the second black woman ever elected to the United States Senate. I serve on the Senate Intelligence Committee where I've been in regular receipt of classified information about threats to our nation in hotspots around the world. I've traveled the world, I've met with our soldiers in war zones. And I think Joe has asked me to serve with him because he knows that we share a purpose, which is about lifting up the American people. And after the four years that we have seen of Donald Trump unifying our country around our common values and principles.

Thank you.

Absolutely. And that's why Joe Biden has been so incredibly transparent. And certainly by contrast that the President has not, both in terms of health records, but also let's look at taxes. We now know because of great investigative journalism that Donald Trump paid \$750 in taxes. When I first heard about it, I literally said, "You mean \$750,000?" And it was like no, \$750. We now know Donald Trump owes and is in debt for \$400 million. And just so everyone is clear, when we say in debt, it means you owe money to somebody. And it'd be really good to know who the President of the United States, the commander-in-chief owes money to because the

American people have a right to know what is influencing the President's decisions. And is he making those decisions on the best interest of the American people, of you or self-interest?

So, Susan, I'm glad you asked about transparency because it has to be across the board. Joe has been incredibly transparent over many, many years. The one thing we all know about Joe, he puts it all out there. He is honest, he is forthright, but Donald Trump on the other hand has been about covering up everything.

Thank you.

That's a great segue.

Thank you. On the issue of the economy, I think there couldn't be a more fundamental difference between Donald Trump and Joe Biden. Joe Biden believes you measure the health and the strength of America's economy based on the health and the strength of the American worker and the American family. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump who measures the strength of the economy based on how rich people are doing, which is why he passed a tax bill benefiting the top one percent and the biggest corporations of America, leading to a two trillion dollar deficit that the American people are going to have to pay for. On day one, Joe Biden will repeal that tax bill, he'll get rid of it. And what he'll do with the money is invest it in the American people.

And through a plan that is about investing in infrastructure, something that Donald Trump said he would do, I remember hearing about some infrastructure week, I don't think it ever happened, but Joe Biden will do that. He'll invest in infrastructure. It's about upgrading our roads and bridges, but also investing in clean energy and renewable energy. Joe was going to invest that money in what we need to do around innovation. There was a time when our country believed in science and invested in research and development, so that we were an innovation leader on the globe. Joe Biden will use that money to invest in education. So for example, for folks who want to go to a two-year community college, it will be free. If you come from a family that makes less than \$125,000, you'll go to a public university for free. And across the board, we'll make sure that if you have student loan debt, it's cut by \$10,000.

That's how Joe Biden thinks about the economy which is, it's about investing in the people of our country. As opposed to passing a tax bill, which had the benefit of letting American corporations go off-shore to do their business.

You're welcome.

That's not what I said.

Well, I mean, I thought we saw enough of it in last week's debate, but I think this is supposed to be a debate based on fact and truth and the truth and the fact is, Joe Biden has been very clear, he will not raise taxes on anybody who makes less than \$400,000 a year.

Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking. I'm speaking.

That is-

That is absolutely not true,

If you don't mind letting me finish, we can then have a conversation, okay?

Okay. Joe Biden will not raise taxes on anyone who makes less than \$400,000 a year. He has been very clear about that. Joe Biden will not end fracking, he has been very clear about that. Joe Biden is the one who, during the great recession was responsible for the Recovery Act that brought America back. And now that Trump- ... for the Recovery Act that brought America back, and now the Trump-Pence administration wants to take credit when they rode the coattails of Joe Biden's success for the economy that they had at the beginning of their term. Of course, now the economy is a complete disaster, but Joe Biden on the one hand did that. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump who has reigned over a recession that is being compared to the Great Depression. On the one hand, you have Joe Biden who was responsible with President Barack Obama for the Affordable Care Act, which brought healthcare to over 20 million Americans and protected people with preexisting conditions. And what it also did is it saved those families who otherwise were going bankrupt because of hospital bills they could not afford. On the other hand, you have Donald Trump, who is in court right now, trying to get rid of- ... trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, which means that you will lose protections if you have preexisting conditions. And I just, this is very important, Susan.

He interrupted me, and I'd like to just finish, please. If you have a preexisting condition, heart disease, diabetes, breast cancer, they're coming for you. If you love someone who has a pre-existing condition, they're coming for you. If you are under the age of 26 on your parents' coverage, they're coming for you.

You're welcome.

So, first of all, I will repeat and the American people know that Joe Biden will not ban fracking. That is a fact. That is a fact. I will repeat that Joe Biden has been very clear that he thinks about growing jobs, which is why he will not increase taxes for anyone who makes less than \$400,000 a year. Joe Biden's economic plan... Moody's, which is a reputable Wall Street firm, has said will create seven million more jobs than Donald Trump's.

And part of those jobs that will be created by Joe Biden are going to be about clean energy and renewable energy. Because, you see, Joe understands that the West Coast of our country is burning, including my home state of California. Joe sees what is happening on the Gulf states, which are being battered by storms. Joe has seen and talked with the farmers in Iowa whose entire crops have been destroyed because of floods.

And so Joe believes, again, in science. I'll tell you something, Susan, I served when I first got to the Senate on the committee that's responsible for the environment. Do you know, this administration took the word science off

the website, and then took the phrase climate change off the website? We have seen a pattern with this administration, which is they don't believe in science. And Joe's plan is about saying we're going to deal with it, but we're also going to create jobs. Donald Trump, when asked about the wildfires in California, and the question was, the science is telling us this... You know what Donald Trump said? Science doesn't know.

So let's talk about who is prepared to lead our country over the course of the next four years on what is an existential threat to us as human beings. Joe is about saying we're going to invest that in renewable energy, which is going to be about the creation of millions of jobs. We will achieve net zero emissions by 2050, carbon neutral by 2035. Joe has a plan. This has been a lot of talk from the Trump administration, and really it has been to go backward instead of forward. We will also reenter the Climate Agreement with pride.

Well, on the issue of jobs.

Let's talk about that. The vice-president earlier referred to it as part of what he thinks is an accomplishment. The president's trade war with China. You lost that trade war. You lost it. What ended up happening is because of a so-called trade war with China, America lost 300,000 manufacturing jobs. Farmers have experienced bankruptcy because of it. We are in a manufacturing recession because of it. And when we look at where this administration has been, there are estimates that by the end of the term of this administration, they will have lost more jobs than almost any other presidential administration and the American people know what I'm talking about.

I think about 20 year olds, we have a 20 something year old who are coming out of high school and college right now. And you're wondering, is there going to be a job there for me? We're looking at people who are trying to figure out how they're going to pay rent by the end of the month, almost half of American renters are worried about whether they're going to be able to pay rent by the end of the month. This is where the economy is in America right now. And it is because of the catastrophe and the failure of leadership of this administration.

Listen-

I just need to respond very quickly.

Thank you-

Thank you. Joe Biden is responsible for saving America's auto industry and you voted against it. So let's set the record straight. Thank you.

Susan, the Trump administration's perspective and approach to China has resulted in the loss of American lives, American jobs, and America's standing. There is a weird obsession that President Trump has had with getting rid of whatever accomplishment was achieved by President Obama and Vice President Biden. For example, they created within the White House and office that basically was responsible for monitoring pandemics. They got rid of it.

There was a team of disease experts that President Obama and Vice President Biden dispatched to China to monitor what is now predictable and what might happen. They pulled them out. We now are looking at 210,000 Americans who have lost their lives. Let's look at the job situation. We mentioned before, the trade deal, the trade war, they wanted to call it with China. It resulted in the loss of over 300 manufacturing jobs and a manufacturing recession and the American consumer paid thousands of dollars, more for goods because of that failed war that they called it. Then let's talk about standing. Pew, a reputable research firm has done an analysis that shows that leaders of all of our formerly allied countries have now decided that they hold in greater esteem and respect Xi Jinping the head of the Chinese communist party than they do Donald Trump. The President of the United States, the commander in chief of the United States. This is where we are today because of a failure of leadership by this administration.

So I love talking with Joe about a lot of these issues and Joe, I think he said it quite well. He says, "Foreign policy, it might sound complicated, but really it's relationships." Just think about it as relationships. So we know this in our personal and professional relationships, you got to keep your word to your friends. Got to be loyal to your friends. People who've stood with, you got to stand with them. You got to know who your adversaries are and keep them in check. But what we have seen with Donald Trump is that he has betrayed our friends and embraced dictators around the world.

Let's take for example, Russia. So I serve on the intelligence committee of the United States Senate. America's Intelligence Community told us Russia interfered in the election of the president of the United States in 2016 and his plan in 2020. Christopher Wray, the director of the FBI said the same, but Donald Trump, the commander in chief of the United States of America prefers to take the word of Vladimir Putin over the word of the American Intelligence Community. You look at our friends at NATO, he has walked away from agreements.

You can look at the Iran nuclear deal, which now has put us in a position where we are less safe because they are building up what might end up being a significant nuclear arsenal. We were in that deal guys. We were in the Iran nuclear deal with friends, with allies around the country. And because of Donald Trump's unilateral approach to foreign policy, coupled with his isolationism, he pulled us out and has made America less safe. So Susan it's about relationships. And the thing that has always been part of the strength of our nation in addition to our great military has been that we keep our word, but Donald Trump doesn't understand that because he doesn't understand what it means to be honest.

He doesn't understand what it means to be honest.

But I would like equal time.

Thank you.

First of all, to the Mueller family, I know about your daughter's case, and I'm so sorry. I'm so sorry. What happened to her is awful and it should have never happened, and I know Joe feels the same way, and I know that president Obama feels the same way, but you mentioned Soleimani. Let's start there. So, after the strike on Soleimani, there was a counter strike on our troops in Iraq, and they suffered serious brain injuries, and do you know what Donald Trump dismissed them as? Headaches. And this is about a pattern of Donald Trump's where he has referred to our men who are serving in our military as suckers and losers. Donald Trump, who went to Arlington cemetery and stood above the graves of our fallen heroes and said, "What's in it for them?" Because of course, he only thinks about what's in it for him. Let's take what he said about John McCain, a great American hero, and Donald Trump says, "He doesn't deserve to be called a hero because it was a prisoner of war."

Take, and this is very important when you want to talk about who is the current commander in chief and what they care about and what they don't care about. Public reporting that Russia had bounties on the heads of American soldiers. And you know what a bounty is? It's somebody puts a price on your head and they will pay it if you are killed, and Donald Trump had talked at least six times to Vladimir Putin and never brought up the subject. Joe Biden would never do that.

But Joe Biden would hold Russia to account for any threat to our nation security or to our troops who are sacrificing their lives for the sake of our democracy and our safety.

Yes.

Thank you, Susan. First of all, Joe Biden and I are both people of faith, and it's insulting to suggest that we would knock anyone for their faith, and in fact, Joe, if elected, will be only the second practicing Catholic as President of the United States. On the issue of this nomination, Joe and I are very clear, as are the majority of the American people, we are 27 days before the decision about who will be the next President of the United States, and before, when this conversation has come up, it's been about election year or election time. We're literally in an election. Over 4 million people have voted. People are in the process of voting right now. And so, Joe has been very clear, as the American people are, let the American people fill that seat in the White House. And then we'll fill that seat on the United States Supreme court, and to your point, Susan, the issues before us, couldn't be more serious. There's the issue of choice and I will always fight for a woman's right to make a decision about her own body.

It should be her decision and not that Donald Trump, and the Vice President, Michael Pence, but let's also look at what else is before the court. It's the Affordable Care Act like literally in the midst of a public health pandemic when over 210,000 people have died and 7 million people probably have what will be in the future considered a preexisting condition because you contracted the virus. Donald Trump is in court right now trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act, and I said it before, and it bears repeating. This means that there will be no more protections if they win for people with pre-existing conditions. This means that over 20 million people will lose your coverage. It means that if you're under the age of 26, you can't stay on your parents' coverage anymore, and here's the thing. The contrast couldn't be more clear. They're trying to get rid of the Affordable Care Act.

Joe Biden is saying let's expand coverage. Let's give you a choice of a public option or private coverage. Let's bring down premiums-

... Let's lower Medicare eligibility to 60.

That's true leadership.

I'm so glad we went through a little history lesson. Let's do that a little more. In 1864-

Mr. Vice President, I'm speaking, I'm speaking. Okay. In 1864, one of the, I think political heroes, certainly the President, I assume you also, Mr. Vice President, is Abraham Lincoln. Abraham Lincoln was up for reelection and it was 27 days before the election. And a seat became open on the United States Supreme Court. Abraham Lincoln's party was in charge, not only of the White House, but the Senate. But Honest Aid said, "It's not the right thing to do. The American people deserve to make the decision about who will be the next president of the United States. And then that person can select who will serve for a lifetime on the highest court of our land." And so Joe and I are very clear: the American people are voting right now and it should be their decision about who will serve on this most important body for a lifetime.

Let's talk about packing-

I'm trying to answer you now.

Yeah. Let's talk about packing the court then. Let's talk about the fact.

Yeah, I'm about to. So the Trump Pence administration has been, because I sit on the Senate judiciary committee, Susan as you mentioned, and I've witnessed the appointments for lifetime appointments to the federal courts, district courts, courts of appeal, people who are purely ideological, people who have been reviewed by legal professional organizations and found who have been not competent are substandard. And do you know that of the 50 people who President Trump appointed to the court of appeals for lifetime appointments, not one is black? This is what they've been doing. You want to talk about packing a court? Let's have that discussion.

I don't believe so. And I've talked with Breonna's mother, Tamika Palmer and her family and her family deserves justice. She was a beautiful young woman. She had as her life goal to become a nurse and she wanted to become an EMT to first learn what's going on out on the street so she could then become a nurse and save lives. And her life was taken justifiably and tragically and violently. And it brings me to the eight minutes and 46 seconds that America witnessed during which an American man was tortured and killed under the knee of an

armed uniformed police officer. And people around our country of every race, of every age, of every gender, perfect strangers to each other, marched shoulder to shoulder, arm in arm, fighting for us to finally achieve that ideal of equal justice under law. And I was a part of those peaceful protests.

And I believe strongly that first of all, we are never going to condone violence, but we always must fight for the values that we hold dear, including the fight to achieve our ideals. And that's why Joe Biden and I have said on this subject, look, and I'm a former career prosecutor. I know what I'm talking about. Bad cops are bad for good cops. We need reform of our policing in America and our criminal justice system, which is why Joe and I will immediately ban choke holes and carotid holes. George Floyd would be alive today if we did that. We will require a national registry for police officers who break the law. We will, on the issue of criminal justice reform, get rid of private prisons and cash bail and we will decriminalize marijuana.

And we will expunge the records of those who have been convicted of marijuana. This is a time for leadership- on a tragic, tragic issue-

Of honor on Black people in America who

I'd like to respond.

I will not sit here and be lectured by the Vice President on what it means to enforce the laws of our country. The only one on this stage, who has personally prosecuted everything from child sexual assault to homicide. I'm the only one on this stage who has prosecuted the big banks for taking advantage of America's homeowners. I am the only one on this stage who prosecuted for-profit colleges for taking advantage of our veterans.

And the reality of this is that we are talking about an election in 27 days where last week the President of the United States took a debate stage in front of 70 million Americans and refused to condemn white supremacists.

And it wasn't like he didn't have a chance. He didn't do it. And then he doubled down. And then he said, "when pressed, stand back, stand by." And this is a part of a pattern of Donald Trump's. He called Mexicans rapists and criminals. He instituted as his first act, a Muslim ban. He on the issue of Charlottesville, where people were peacefully protesting the need for racial justice, where a young woman was killed. And on the other side, there were neo-Nazis carrying Tiki torches, shouting racial epithets, anti-Semitic slurs. And Donald Trump when asked about it said, "There were fine people on both sides." This is who we have as the President of the United States and America, you deserve better. Joe Biden will be a president who brings our country together-

And recognizes the beauty in our diversity and the fact that we all have so much more in common than what separates us.

But he attacked my record. I would like an opportunity to respond to.

I appreciate that. First of all, having served as the Attorney General of the state of California, the work that I did is a model of what our nation needs to do, and we will be able to do under a Joe Biden presidency. Our agenda includes what this administration has failed to do. It will be about not only instituting a ban on choke holes and carotid holes-

I would like to go through-

But I want to talk about the connection between what Joe and I will do in my record, which includes I was the first statewide officer to institute a requirement that my agents would wear body cameras and keep them on full-time. We were the first to initiate a requirement that there would be a training for law enforcement on implicit bias because yes, Joe Biden and I recognize that implicit bias does exist, Mr. Vice President, contrary to what you may believe. We did the work of instituting reforms that were about investing in re-entry. This is the work that we have done and the work we will do going forward. And again, I will not be lectured by the Vice President on our record of what we have done in terms of law enforcement and keeping our community safe and a commitment to reforming the criminal justice system of America.

And a commitment to reforming the criminal justice system of America.

So I'll tell you. Joe and I are particularly proud of the coalition that we've built around our campaign. We probably have one of the broadest coalitions of folks that you've ever seen in a presidential race. Of course, we have the support of Democrats, but also independents and Republicans. In fact, seven members of president George W. Bush's cabinet are supporting our ticket. We have the support of Colin Powell, Cindy McCain, John Kasich. Over 500 generals, retired generals and former national security experts and advisors are supporting our campaign. And I believe they are doing that because they know that Joe Biden has a deep, deep seated commitment to fight for our democracy, and to fight for the integrity of our democracy, and to bring integrity back to the White House. We believe in the American people, we believe in our democracy, and here's what I'd like to say to everybody. Vote, please vote, vote early, come up with a plan to vote, go to Iwillvote.com. You can also go to JoeBiden.com.

We have it within our power in these next 27 days to make the decision about what will be the course of our country for the next four years. And it is within our power, and if we use our vote and we use our voice, we will win. And we will not let anyone subvert our democracy with what Donald Trump has been doing as he did on the debate stage last week, when, again, in front of 70 million people, he openly attempted to suppress the vote. Joe Biden, on the other hand, on that same debate stage, because clearly Donald Trump doesn't think he can run on a record because it's a failed record, Joe Biden on that stage said, Hey, just please vote. So I'll repeat what Joe said. Please vote.

First of all, I love hearing from our young leaders. And when I hear her words, when I hear your words, Brecklin, I know our future is bright because it is that perspective on who we are and who we should be that is a sign of leadership, and is something we should all aspire to be.

And brings me to Joe, Joe Biden. One of the reasons that Joe decided to run for president is after Charlottesville, which we talked about earlier. It so troubled him and upset him like it did all of us, that there was that kind of hate and division. What propelled Joe to run for president was to see that over the course of the last four years, what Brecklin described has been happening.

Joe has a longstanding reputation of working across the aisle, and working in a bipartisan way. And that's what he's going to do as president. Joe Biden has a history of lifting people up and fighting for their dignity. You have to know Joe's story to know that Joe has known pain. He has known suffering. And he has known love.

Brecklin, when you think about the future, I do believe the future is bright. And it will be because of your leadership, and it will be because we fight for each person's voice through their vote. And we get engaged in this election, because you have the ability through your work and through, eventually, your vote, to determine the future of our country and what its leadership looks like.

Good to be with you.

Yeah.

OK.

Hello.

Well, first of all, going back, the fact is that we -- the president was informed how dangerous this virus was. And all the way back in the beginning of February, I argued that we should be keeping people in China.

And we had set up in our administration a pandemic office within the White House, there were 44 people on the ground. I suggested we should be seeking, and I didn't hold public office, I was a former vice president, I suggested we, in fact, ask -- to have access to the source of the problem.

And to the best of our knowledge, Trump never pushed that. All those 44 people came home, never got replaced. In addition to that, I pointed out that I thought in February, I did a piece for "USA Today" saying this is a serious problem. Trump denied it. He said it wasn't.

We later learned that he knew full well how serious it was when he did an interview with George Woodward -- I mean, excuse me, Bob Woodward. And at the time, he said he didn't tell anybody because he was afraid Americans would panic.

Americans don't panic. He panicked. He didn't say a word to anybody.

Then I wrote a piece in March about what I thought we should be doing to take hold of this, using the -- there's an act that was passed a long time ago that allows the president to go into a business and say, stop making this and start making that, and took a long time for him to even institute that to get ventilators and so on.

And so, the point was, he missed enormous opportunities and kept saying things that weren't true. It's going to go away by Easter, don't worry about it. It's all going to -- when the heat -- when summer comes, it's all going to go away like a miracle. He's still saying those things.

Not back then.

No, in January and February, no, that's correct. There wasn't.

That came at the end of March, and then I laid out a detailed plan relative to school openings in June and July and talked about -- but you got -- by that time, the science was becoming clearer and clearer of how this was spreading so rapidly.

But the president kept denying that. If you notice, from March on, I stopped doing big meetings, I started wearing masks, you know? So, it was at a time when the science was saying and his key people, Dr. Fauci, were saying, you should be taking these precautions.

So, what we should be doing now, there should be a national standard. Instead of leaving this up to -- remember, the president said to the governors, well, they're on their own. It's not my responsibility. The governors can do what they need to do. Not my responsibility.

It is the presidential responsibility to lead. And he didn't do that. He didn't talk about what needed to be done because he kept worrying, in my view, about the stock market. He worried if he talked about how bad this could be unless we took these precautionary actions then in fact the market would be done.

And his barometer of success of the economy is the market. Thirdly, what we didn't do is the president had an opportunity to open and allow schools and businesses to stay open if he -- they got the kind of help they needed.

So the Congress passed a couple trillion dollars worth of help and what happened was most of that money -- significant portion of that money went to the very wealthiest corporations in the country, didn't get to the mom and pop stores.

So you had one in five, one in six minority businesses closing, many of them permanently, people being laid off. And then what happened was when the first tranche of -- the first round of money for unemployment -- enhanced unemployment passed -- went -- went by, he didn't do anything. He didn't do anything.

And to the best of my knowledge, and I mean this sincerely, I can't think of -- I've been around for a lot of presidents and you know a lot of presidents in a crisis -- I don't ever remember one never calling the House and Senate Republicans and Democrats together.

But that wasn't the context. They said would I lock down the -- the economy is science said so. I said I'd follow science. What I -- but I don't think there's a need to lock down.

Sure.

Well, you can contain the pandemic by being rational and not trust the economy. For example, I laid out a plan how you can open businesses. You can open businesses and schools if in fact you provide them the guidance that they need as well as the money to be able to do it.

What's happening now is we know, for example, if you can open a business and you could have a sign on the door saying safe to come in, that's why people aren't going anyway when they're open.

And say because you have social distancing and you have plastic barriers when you go to the cashier you have separators between the booths, you don't have large crowds, you reduce the size of the number of people you can have in the restaurant.

You make sure there's testing. That's a really critical piece that he didn't do, testing and tracing. And you make sure that people are equipped going to schools. You know we initially said -- the government initially said they're going to provide masks for every student and every teacher.

And then they said no, no, no, no; FEMA said that -- the president or whomever said no, no that's not a national emergency. Not a national emergency. We need fewer -- we need more teachers in our schools to be able to open, smaller pods.

We need ventilation systems change. There's a lot of things we know now and I've let -- I laid them out in some detail. Now again, when I say I laid them out, I'm not an office holder. I'm running for office, it's not like I'm still vice president or I was a United States senator pushing this.

So I don't want to say I, I, I. But we did lay out exactly what needed to be done. And take a look, we make up 4 percent of the world's population, we have 20 percent of the world's deaths.

We're in a situation where we have 210 plus thousand people dead. And what's he doing? Nothing. He's still not wearing a mask and so on.

Sure.

Thank you.

Hey, Kelly, how are you?

Two things. Number one, President Trump talks about things that just aren't accurate about everything from vaccines; we're going to have one right away, it's going to happen and so on. The point is that if the scientist -- if the body of science is saying that this is what is ready to be done and they're -- it's been tested and they've gone through the three phases; yes, I would take it and I'd encourage people to take it.

But President Trump says things like, you know, everything from this crazy stuff he's walking away from now, inject bleach in your arm and that's going to work. No, I'm not being a bit -- I'm not being facetious though. I mean he actually said these things. And now Regeneron is the answer. That's going to cure everything.

There's 500,000 doses. We got a couple -- you know, we have a -- more than a few million people.

You know, and so -- and most of the -- if you notice, most of the companies who are developing these vaccines are working. They're making real progress.

I meet with four leading scientists at least twice a week, in the beginning, four times a week, giving us the detail on what kind of progress is being made. And, right now, they do the right thing. When they run into a serious problem, they halt the test. They don't continue until they figure out what the problem was.

They're not there yet. And most scientists say that it's not likely to have a vaccine that would be available until the beginning of next year, into the spring of next year.

And, in the meantime, what I worry about is the same thing with Regeneron, which is -- which is a useful antidote -- not antidote -- a useful tool.

But what's happening is, there is no plan to figure out how to distribute it, how many -- we have 500,000 vials of it. Well, we don't have all the testing equipment. We don't have all the ability to get it to the people who need it.

And what we should be doing now -- and, allegedly, it's happening, but I have not seen it yet, nor the docs that I talk to have seen it -- there should be a plan, when we have the vaccine, how do we distribute it?

The answer is, depending on how clear there's -- vaccines, they say, have a very positive impact, and they are going to affect positively 85 percent of the American public.

There's others that say, this vaccine is really the key. This is -- this is the golden key.

It depends on the state of the nature of the vaccine when it comes out and how it's being distributed. That would depend on.

But I would think that we should be talking about -- depending on the continuation of the spread of the virus, we should be thinking about making it mandatory.

Well, you couldn't. That's the problem, just like can't enforce -- you can't enforce measles. You can't come to school until you have a measles shot. You can't.

But you can't say, everyone has to do this. But you would -- just like you can't mandate a mask. But you can say -- you can go to every governor and get them all in a room, all 50 of them, as president, and say, ask people to wear the mask. Everybody knows.

If they don't, no, not fine.

Then I go to every governor -- I go to every mayor, I go to every councilman, I go to every local official, say, mandate the mask, man -- say, this is what you have to do when you're out. Make sure you encourage it being done.

Look, George, you and I know -- and I think you do, too, as well -- the words of a president matter.

No matter whether they're good, bad or indifferent, they matter.

And when a president doesn't wear a mask, or makes fun of folks, like me, when I was wearing a mask for a long time, then people say, well, it mustn't be that important.

But when a president says, I think this is very important -- for example, I walked in here with this mask, but I have one of the N95 masks underneath it. And I left it in the -- in my dressing room -- the dressing room -- the room I was in before I got here.

And so I think it matters what we say.

And we're now learning that children are getting the virus, not with as serious consequences, but we haven't -- there's been no studies done yet on vaccines for children.

So, there's a long way to go, but we can make progress in the meantime and save lives.

And the last point I'll make, if you listen to the head of the CDC, he stood up, and he said, you know, while we're waiting for a vaccine -- and he held up a mask -- you wear this mask, you will save more lives between now and the end of the year than if we had a vaccine, than if we had a vaccine.

It is estimated, by every major study done from the University of Washington to Columbia that if, in fact, we wore masks, we could save between now and the end of the year 100,000 lives.

And avoid lockdown, yes.

You don't have to lock down if you are wearing the mask.

Thank you.

I hope I answered your question.

I know it.

That's right.

I carry this card with me.

When I said the tax -- the Trump tax cuts, about \$1.3 trillion of the \$2 trillion in his tax cuts went to the top one-tenth of 1 percent. That's what I'm talking about eliminating, not all the tax cuts that are out there.

And, by the way, if you just take a look, we reduced the corporate tax rate from 35 percent and Democrats and Republicans who were in office thought it should come down to 28 percent. He reduced it to 21 percent.

You have 91 out of every -- of the Fortune 500 companies not paying a single solitary penny. If you raise the corporate taxes back to 28 percent, which is a fair tax, you'd raise \$1 trillion 300 billion by that one act.

If you made sure that people making over \$400 grand pay what they did in the Bush Administration, 39.6 percent, you would raise another -- this goes up to, let me get to the exact number here. About another \$200-- excuse me. \$92 billion.

So you could raise a lot of money to be able to invest in things that can make your life easier, make you change your standard of living by making sure you have affordable healthcare, by making sure you're in a situation where you're able to send your kind to school, and if you have a student debt, you can deal with it. Making sure that your home, that you can pay your mortgage.

We have 29 million people right now . . .

Sure.

Absolutely.

That's a great question.

Moody's did an analysis of my -- detailed analysis of my tax plan and my economic plan. They said I will, in four years -- Moody's. Wall Street. Said I will create 18.6 million new jobs, good paying jobs, number one. Number two, and I'll -- the GDP will grow by a trillion dollars more than it would under Trump, and seven million more jobs than under Trump'

And the reason is, when you allow people to get back in the game and have a job, everything moves. Everything moves. Right now, you've got the opposite.

You had, last year, during this pandemic, you had the wealthiest billionaires in the world, and the nation, they made another \$700 billion. Seven hundred billion dollars.

He talks about a V-shaped recovery. It's a K-shaped recovery. If you're on the top, you're going to do very well.

And the other things I'm -- and if you're on the bottom or if you're in the middle or the bottom, your income is coming down. You're not getting a raise. I should -- I don't know what you're doing. You may get a raise.

Hope you're a billionaire, I -- but, but all kidding aside, it's about growing the economy. And, George, the way out, the reason why I'm so optimistic about economic recovery, more than I've ever been, is we have these four crises happening all at once and one helps the other.

For example, we're going to invest a great deal of that money into infrastructure. And into green infrastructure. We're going to put 500,000 charging stations on new highways we're building, and old highways we're building. We're going to own the electric market.

You know as well as I do, from your days -- you know, in the old days, where the president has -- spends about \$600 billion a year on government contracts, everything from making sure they have aircraft carriers to automobile fleets for the -- in the United States.

If you make -- make -- and we can -- and it's not in violation of any international trade agreement, made in America. If you actually insist that, whatever that product is, made in America, including the material that goes into the product, we -- it's estimated we're going to create somewhere between another 4 million and 6 million jobs just by doing that.

But what's happening now under his trade policy, a lot of this is going overseas. You get a benefit from going overseas, if you have much of it being made overseas. So, if you send it overseas, you get a 10 percent tax increase on your-- on the product.

If you make it in America and you bring it back, you get a 10 percent growth. If you bring back a company and you're going to open up an old facility, you get a 10 percent tax credit for all you invested. That actually works, George.

No, well, I've got to get the votes. I got to get the votes. That's why -- you know, the one thing that I -- I have this strange notion. We are a democracy. Some of my Republican friends and some of my Democratic friends even occasionally say, "Well, if you can't get the votes by executive order, you're going to do something." Things you can't do by executive order unless you're a dictator. We're a democracy. We need consensus.

I hope I answered your question.

Don't jump, Cedric. You look like you're way up there.

Good evening.

Well, I'd said, first of all, as my buddy John Lewis said, it's a sacred opportunity, the right to vote. You can make a difference.

If young Black women and men vote, you can determine the outcome of this election. Not a joke. You can do that.

And the next question is, am I worthy of your vote, can I earn your vote? And the answer is, there's two things I think that I care, that I've demonstrated I care about my whole career. One is in addition to dealing with a criminal justice system to make it fair and make it more decent, we have to be able to put Black Americans in a position to be able to gain wealth, generate wealth and so you look at what that entails and it entails everything from early education; that's why I'm supporting making sure that when you have Title One Schools as you know schools with the least tax base to be able to support their schools, I increased the funding for them from 15 to \$45 billion. That allows every teacher in that school to make up to 60,000 bucks and the problem now is they're leaving the schools, they're not there, we're short about a million-and-a-half teachers, a million-and-a-quarter teachers.

Number two, every three and four and five-year-old will go to school; school not daycare, school. And all the great universities including the one you've gone to, go to or went to, in fact talks about in the last eight years what's happened, what happens when you let them go to school they make up rapidly whatever shortcoming they had in terms of their education prior to that. They've not heard as many words spoken, etc., etc.

What happens is that the studies show that 58 percent will increase by 58 percent their chance of going all through 12 years of school and going through successfully. We'll also provide for the ability to bring in social workers and school psychologists. We have one school psychologist in America now for every 1507 kids; it should be one to 500, not just in schools that are poor but in all schools because we learn that for example drug abuse doesn't cause mental illness; mental illness cause drug abuse. But failure to get hold of people and deal with their anxieties.

In addition to that I'd provide for \$70 billion for HBCUs for them to be able to have the wherewithal to do what other universities can do because they don't have the kind of foundational support they need and so that would allow them for example like we did in our administration, the president allowed me to go down and we awarded a cybersecurity laboratory, ability to compete for a cybersecurity laboratory. The federal government spends billions of dollars a year on universities because they are the best kept secret or where most of the major inventions come out of and so that school now will be able to produce young Black women and men who are going to go into a field of the future that's burgeoning; cybersecurity. And that's what's going to help a great deal. In addition to that if you're a young man about to graduate and you've graduated from school and you want to own your first home and you're, well it's awful hard to get the money and depending on the background, excuse me, your economic background is to get a downpayment so we're going to guarantee first-time home buyers a \$15,000 downpayment for first-time home buyers.

In addition to that, what all the studies now show and I've been arguing this for a long time is young Black entrepreneurs are just as successful as white entrepreneurs or anyone else, given a shot. But you can't get the money. Where do you go to get the startup money? So what President Obama and I did, we had a program, we took \$1,500,000,000 and we invested it in all the SBAs around the country, in the state SBAs, Small Business Associations and that generated, \$30 billion came off the sideline because if you have a guarantee of \$200,000 for your new startup enterprise, you're an entrepreneur, you're going to be able to attract if it's government money, there's a guarantee you'll be to attract another \$100,000. It generated \$30 billion.

Now I'm changing that program and I'll get this done without much trouble I believe in the Congress from \$1.5 billion to 30 billion. That'll take \$300 billion off the sideline and grow because you know and for example if you in fact and I were the same age and we split our differences and we were the same age and we went to the same builder to buy us each the same home but my home was in a white neighborhood on one side of a highway and yours is in a Black neighborhood; same exact home. Your home will start off being valued 29 percent less than my home, yet your insurance for that home will be higher. You'll be taxed more for it.

We've got to end this. That's what got me involved in politics in the first place; a thing called "redlining." We can change so much and we can do so much to change the circumstances to give people a real opportunity --

Well there's a lot more if you want to, if you're going to hang out afterwards I'll tell you more.

But I really mean it. It is the key. Look, this is the way every other, how do most, like my dad, he lost his job up in Scranton and it took him three years to be able -- he moved down to Delaware to Claymont (inaudible), a little steel town. And sent us home to our grandpop to live with him.

We finally got back, we lived in apartments. Became Section 8 housing much later, it wasn't -- it was just normal apartments. But it took him five years to be able to buy a home.

Well, we bought a three-bedroom home with four kids and a grandpop living with us but it accumulated wealth. You built up wealth.

That's how middle-class folks make it. They build up wealth.

Then he was able to borrow a little against that to be able to help get us to get to school, those kinds of things.

It's about accumulating wealth. And it's very -- you're behind an eight ball. The vast majority of people of color are behind an eight ball.

And it's the same way what's going on now with all this money that's been voted.

What's happened? You got the bank, if you're a Black business man, and I -- and the president fired the only inspector general to oversee all this help coming from the congress. And what happens?

You go in and they say oh, do you have an account here? No. Do you have a credit card? No. Have you borrowed from us before? No.

We bailed these suckers out. They're not liable for any of the money but they still won't lend it to you. We've got to change that.

It's about accumulating wealth.

Well, first of all, things have changed drastically. That crime bill, when it voted, the Black Caucus voted for it, every Black mayor supported it across the board.

And it didn't -- the crime bill itself did not have mandatory sentences except for two things. It had three strikes and you're out which I voted against in the crime bill. But it had a lot of other things in it that turned out to be both bad and good.

I wrote the Violence Against Women Act, that was part of it. The Assault Weapons Ban and other things that were good.

What I was against was giving states more money for prison systems that they could build, state prison systems.

And you have 93 out of every 100 people is in a state prison not in a federal prison because they built more prisons.

I also wrote into that bill a thing called drug courts.

I don't believe anybody should be going to jail for drug use, they should be going into mandatory rehabilitation. We should be building rehab centers to have these people housed.

We should wipe out -- we should decriminalize marijuana, wipe out the record so you can actually say in honesty have you ever arrested for anything, you can say no.

Because we're going to pass a law saying there is no background that you have to reveal relative to the use of marijuana.

And so there's a lot of things. But in addition to that, we've got to change the system.

I joined with a group of people in the house to provide for changing the system from punishment to rehabilitation Along with a guy named Arlen Specter, who you may remember --

I wrote the Second Chance Act.

Exactly right.

Yes, it was. But here's where the mistake came. The mistake came in terms of what the states did locally.

What we did federally, we said -- you remember, George, it was all about the same time for the same crime.

What I had done as chairman of the judiciary committee, I took the ten circuit courts of appeals, took some really brilliant lawyers working for me in judiciary, we did a study.

And we determined what happens if for the first, second, third offense for any crime in the criminal justice system at the federal level. If you're a Black man, it's the first time you commit a robbery, how long would you go to jail on average, if you're a white man, how long?

Black man would go to jail on average 13 years, white man, two years. I go down the list of every single crime.

So we set up a sentencing commission, we didn't set the time. Every single solitary maximum was reduced in there.

But what happened was it became the same time for the same crime. So it said you had to serve between one and three years. It ended up becoming much lower. Black folks went to jail a lot less than they would have before. But it was a mistake.

Yes.

Yes. If, in fact, they're involved in community policing not jump squads. For example, when we had community policing from the mid-90s on till Bush got elected, what happened? Violent crime actually went down precipitously.

Remember the significant rise in violent crime that was occurring the late 80s into the 90s. It went down and fewer African Americans were arrested because you had the requirement - the cops didn't like it, they didn't like the community policing, because you had to have two people in a vehicle, they had to get out of their cars, they had to introduce themselves to -- who owned the local liquor store, who owned the local grocery store, who was the woman on the corner.

And what they would do, George, that they'd actually go and give people their phone numbers. The cop would give the phone number.

So, if Nelly Smith was on the second floor where drug deals took place and things happened below her, she -- I mean, her apartment, she could call and say, it's Nelly and there's something going on here and they'd never reveal it was her, because they know if she knew that, in fact, they reported, they would never report. She -- they never report.

So, it actually started to come down. What happened? They eliminated the funding for community policing.

Community policing doesn't mean more people coming in in up-armored Humvees and swarming like that.

When they did, it turned out by the time we got to the late '90s, the crime had come down so much, and the mayors and everybody asked the question, where do you want me to spend the money? They say, well, only 1 percent thought violent crime was a problem. It was as high as 22 percent.

You have to change the way in which they put -- one of the things I'm going to do, George, is what -- is set up a national study group made up of cops, social workers, as well as made up of the Black community and the brown community to sit down in the White House and over the next year, come up with significant reforms that need to take place within communities. You have to bring them together.

One of the things I've observed is, you know, the neighborhood I grew up -- I grew up in Claymont, you either became a cop, a firefighter or a priest. I wasn't qualified much to do any one of them. But here's the deal, all kidding aside, most cops don't like bad cops.

They don't like it.

And so, what happens is, they get intimidated into not reporting.

So, one of the things we do is there has to be transparency available. We have to be able to do -- go in at the federal level, be able to go in and check out whether or not there's systematic problems within police departments. If, in fact, a cop is -- needs to be tried, it's not the prosecutor in the community, in the district or there, you've got to go outside the community to get another prosecutor to come in and handle the crime.

There's a lot of things we've learned and it takes time, but we can do this. You can ban chokeholds, you can -- but -- but beyond that, you have to teach people how to de-escalate circumstances, de-escalate.

So, instead of anybody coming at you and the first thing you do is shoot to kill, you shoot them in the leg. There's ways -- you have to do more background checks in terms of whether or not the person coming in passes certain psychological tests.

And the last thing I'll say, and I'm sorry, but it's really, I think, really, really important, is you have to be in a position where you are able to identify -- identify the things that have to change and one of the things that has to change is, so many cops get called into circumstances where somebody is mentally off. Like what happened not long ago, that guy with the knife.

That's why we have to provide -- within police departments, psychologists and social workers, to go out with the cops on those calls, those -- some of those 911 calls, to de-escalate the circumstance, to deal with talking them down.

But we can't -- cops are kind of like schoolteachers now. You know, schoolteacher has to know everything from what -- how -- how to handle hunger in a household, as well as how to teach you how to read. Well, cops don't have that breadth, and there's a lot of things we can do.

We shouldn't be defunding cops, we should be mandating the things that we should be doing within police departments and make sure there's total transparency.

I don't know if I answered your question but --