

**DEMOCRACY CORPS
GROUP 4
SEATTLE, WA
COLLEGE MEN, 32-49
INCOME OVER \$50,000
DECEMBER 13, 2001, 8:00 P.M.**

Dan. I'm from Kirkland. I've got a 2 year old and a 6 month old. And I'm program engineer at Microsoft.

Kevin. Live in Edmonds. Married with a 3 year old.

Peter. I live in Kirkland. Have 3 kids, 4, 6 and 9.

John. I live in Redland. I have a 1 year old and a 4 year old. Work for Microsoft.

Matt. Live in Woodinville. Work at Boeing. My baby is in the Navy.

Joe. My wife and I have 2 children, 11 and 17. We live in Clay Hill. And I own my own business, doing valuation of properties.

Will. Two kids, 8 and 5. Live in Seattle. And I'm an asset manager.

Jason. I live in Midland. And I have a 4 year old and a 20 month old. Work at Boeing.

Lee. I have married, 1 son, 3 years old. I'm a network engineer for a dot com.

Doug. I got 3 kids, 12, 18 and 20. And I work for AT&T Wireless, project manager.

MODERATOR—START GENERALLY, THINKING ABOUT THE COUNTRY, EVERYTHING GOING ON RIGHT NOW, ARE THINGS MOVING IN THE RIGHT DIRECTION, THE WRONG DIRECTION, WHAT DO YOU THINK?

From an economic standpoint I guess one could make the argument that things might get a little worse before they get better. Certainly not as good as they were a year and a half ago.

MODERATOR—IS THAT THE ARGUMENT YOU WOULD MAKE?

That is the argument I would make, yes.

MODERATOR—DO YOU LIVE HERE?

No.

MODERATOR—SO, YOU'VE BEEN FLOWN IN TO DO THIS?

Yes.

This state has been hit more so than the rest of the economy has. We have the highest unemployment of any other state. We have the greatest layoffs of any other state. So, we're getting hit more than any place else is. We'll probably have another 3 or 4 months of going down before we go anywhere. Probably until early spring at least. The state economist is predicting we have another 2 years before we come back up out of it.

The Boeing layoffs will go no less than June, 5,000 going out the door tomorrow.

Everyone in the country is worried about the economy, worried about the war. I mean, there's certain things you can't, you can't get away with, you can't get away from, so. I mean, the economy hasn't bothered me or my job yet, until yesterday when 10 people were going to be laid off in our office. But it's just something, 2 years ago you could change your job, quit your job and find another one. It's tough. It's very tough.

It's also worth noting that this is really cyclical. I went through layoffs at Boeing in the '80's. And then 2 years later it's really booming again. So, I think one of the good things about the economy here in this state there's a lot of upside potential with Microsoft, Boeing, with all the industries still here. While I do think the economy is poor here now I think it will be good opportunities here in the future, even more so than there might be in other states.

The economy is not the only thing in the question though. I would say, how are things going in the country, I would say, based on September 11th events that, obviously the country is still reeling from the shock from being attacked like that. But I also see that there's a great, what, pulling together, you found more people talking to strangers based on those events. I'd say there's a little bit better unity going on now than there was 6 months ago.

And it's encouraging to see, everybody donating to charity and coming out to help people. So, even though things are bad there is a lot of good going on. And the approval rating for President Bush is the highest, something like that, so things like that are encouraging at the same time things are going on.

I was listening to NPR yesterday, hearing that Bush is now basically backing out of the anti-ballistic missile treaty. It concerns me some. And he's back on the, trying to find a missile defense. Obviously his goal is, well, if terrorists had a missile they would have used it against us. Used our own planes. It concerns me that they're going down that route. It might have ramifications in the future.

Well, there's just been so much focus on the war and the economy; it's 2 things you know. I mean it seems like all the little things people are complaining about kind of been pushed aside, so. And I think the things with the war are progressing. Sounds like we're making progress in that direction. All the events that have happened since September 11th have been in a good direction. Of course the economy is not. Everything else, not really caring about it, it's a good thing, too, not worry about the little stuff.

Well, I just think that the awareness has gotten better overall. Because I mean, you were saying about, I'm more concerned about raising the taxes for gas rates. I don't want more taxes but I think there's also more patriotism. I just think overall people are going to get smarter and be more protective of themselves but also be more open and have more unity for the country. One thing I've seen is, my dad fought in WW II and he always put his 48 star flag out for years. But seeing all the flags come out, I just, I just think everybody is getting more aware. I mean 20 years when Boeing was the only thing around here and Boeing dropped. The famous sign was, whoever the last one out of Seattle turn the lights off. But Microsoft is in here. Nintendo. There's other major corporations in here that can keep the area going. We're getting hit but we're going to get hit but in the long-term we'll survive.

I think it's the best thing right now is the patriotism because of September 11th. The things that concern me are all the things they're trying to do to keep the economy going. I mean, dumped interest rates as low as you can. There's not much more that the fed can do. And they're going to have to increase the debt ceiling.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE BIGGEST CHALLENGE FACING THE COUNTRY TODAY?

I would say the economy. Because look what they did on September 11th, they were going after the financial district of the US. The key is to keep the economy strong. If it takes a hit it takes a hit but you just got to keep things going.

I have to agree in the near term, the economy.

MODERATOR—ANYTHING ELSE BESIDES THE ECONOMY?

I think security. Terrorists.

The war so it doesn't become a drawn out issue. Becomes another Viet Nam can come back and hurt us.

MODERATOR—HAS YOUR OWN THINKING CHANGED AT ALL SINCE SEPTEMBER 11TH, THE WAY YOU APPROACH THINGS?

No.

It hasn't. I don't see from my perspective things are that much different. We've had a faltering economy for over a year anyway, since this 4th quarter last year. The security of the country hasn't changed at all and I don't think the airport security is going to help any of that one iota. With the way that they came in, they can still do the same thing. What they just indict a couple dozen airport personnel in this airport somewhere?

Salt Lake.

You know, the method that's being used is ineffectual so I don't see anything that they're doing. Congress says they passed this airport security but most of it won't even go into affect until, oh, at the earliest, this summer. Put a few, you know, National Guard, all it is, is PR. It doesn't really do anything. If it helps confidence, confidence is a big deal to the economy, so that's good. Most of us aren't involved in the war and there's no declared war, which I think is a mistake. I think they should declare something if they're going to do it. You can't put any War Powers Act in to affect if they don't.

I think it's changed. I mean, before September 11th I would have gotten really mad if I had to be at the airport 3 hours early. It's, I mean it's something I'll have to live with now. So, I can't say in any major way it's affected me but in the little things. We put out our flag now. We went how many years without putting out the flag? It's just something that doesn't do much but it makes me feel better.

MODERATOR—WHAT COMES TO MIND WHEN YOU SEE THE FLAG?

Pride.

Patriotism.

Seeing all the flags now. I think when I see a flag, for me now having lived through what happened on September 11th, I'll always think of that when I see a flag, 30 or 40 years from now. And maybe other people that have gone through other wars think of those when they think of the flag, for me it was that, it's what I'm thinking of.

MODERATOR—SHIFT GEARS A LITTLE BIT. THINKING ABOUT THE ELECTIONS FOR CONGRESS NEXT YEAR, WOULD YOU PREFER TO SEE A CANDIDATE WHO'S FOCUS IS ON TERRORISM AND SECURITY ISSUES OR WOULD YOU PREFER TO SEE A CANDIDATE WHO'S FOCUS IS ON THE ECONOMY AND DOMESTIC ISSUES?

I'd prefer the economy. I think we're taking measures to protect ourselves. But we can't go completely blinders.

I'd like to see the economy first. I'd like to see the executive branch take care of the security and the terrorism and let congress handle the economics and the social issues.

MODERATOR—ANYONE DISAGREE WITH THAT?

It takes one general. We don't need a whole congress full of generals telling everybody how to do it.

I just want the best person, who I think is the best person to represent us be in there. That's my major concern. I mean, they have to look at the big picture and the big picture is, our area and then you have the country. But then like the executive branch handles the security outside. It's got to be our well-being and us and I want the best person in there.

In the House we have what, 11 representatives, what is it, that represent a quarter million people in this state, each person does. I'm looking for the person who's going to represent me the best. Here. And then go to Washington. Not the other way around.

MODERATOR—[DISTRIBUTES PACKETS, GIVES INSTRUCTIONS]. LOOK AT HANDOUT NUMBER 1, WRITE DOWN THE GOOD THINGS THAT COME TO MIND WHEN YOU THINK ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH. THEN FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 2, WRITE DOWN WHAT DOUBTS, WORRIES YOU HAVE ABOUT HIM.

He seems to be more involved. This is after September 11th. Initially he seemed to have more of a hands off approach.

I think he has a lot more respect from pretty much all of America now. Before September 11th he was, in my mind I just kept picturing him as the character on Saturday Night Live because I didn't see a lot of difference. But I think that's changed a lot. I think with that respect he can be a better leader.

I've been impressed with how he's taken action, it's been really action oriented after the September 11th bombings. He didn't sit around and waste a lot of time. He did the smart thing and rallied support and took action. He didn't strike out blindly. He took a little bit of time and thought the actions out and went after a particular target.

I like that he trusts the people that he has surrounded himself with and that he's able to delegate and they go out and do a good job. He seems to have chosen good people, cabinet.

I like his morals. I think he's a very moral guy. Along with everything else, especially his leadership after September. I feel he's got good morals.

The best thing he did was the people he put in his cabinet. I thought he did a good job after September 11th with his speeches to pull the country together.

That was good.

I think one thing that's kind of interesting is that, one of the things that he was knocked for early on which was this kind of regular guy approach. Actually, now that he's been in office, it's worked for him. I don't know how many people have had a chance to see some of the interactions between him and Putin, but they're back slapping in a way that our leaders have never done with a foreign dignitaries.

Out on the ranch.

That and they were in front of a bunch of school kids, had a joint speech and they were joking around. You can tell that there's more than just political obligatory hand shaking. He really has a knack for getting to know these people. There seems to be a reciprocal feeling on the other side. And I think at the end of the day that works great for the country.

I agree with John, I think he's surrounded himself; he's picked the right people. Before September 11th he was trying to get away from the key to the election. And then he puts himself in the position, he's got the right people and they can move on, he's running the country that way. I think also he's doing, he's trying to keep the country together. Whoever he's got, he's got some people that are advising him correctly. He's making some good decisions. I'm not saying he's going to make every one perfect. He's going to tick off people. But hey, this is the United States, we're noted for that, so.

To me a real strong effort to reach out to the American Muslims immediately afterwards, trying not to alienate them but to keep them in the American fold.

MODERATOR—GO TO HANDOUT NUMBER 2, THE DOUBTS, WORRIES ABOUT GEORGE W. BUSH.

I don't like his association with big money. In particular, Enron.

He's not alone in that, but yes, that is unfortunate.

Was that because he was gullible, like everybody else or

I think they took a lot of money when Enron was at the top of the list. And I think it showed last year in the west coast power crisis where he failed to act on any type of government controls and holding off that Enron from taking those huge windfall profits off the energy. He should have acted in a presidential manner last winter.

That's my number 1 thing, his energy policy; I don't have a problem with him as a person. I think he's at least honest and he's going to do what he thinks what he thinks he needs to do. I disagree with policies he has. One of which is his energy policy. I don't think, I think it continues the course of big oil, gas companies and I think it does, I don't like to see that the thought that they're having about opening up the wilderness areas in Alaska, I don't like that. I think there are ways that if he wants to lead that very big area it does take innovation to give us another alternative energy source and a lot of government research to make it happen. I think that would be a wonderful thing for him to do. But I don't see him taking that direction, so.

I just see him focusing more on the war and military issue than coming back and focusing on the economy.

I think one of things that I thought was really great is his ability to take action internationally in this time of crisis. Might be something that could be bad for him in a situation where we don't have a war or it's not a crisis. It's not a situation where it's kind of firefighting take action kind of situation, is he going to be able to be creative and come up with the right domestic policies? That's a little more worrisome to me.

The environment. My biggest concern is the environmental policies. He does seem to be more connected to big companies and with them than the environment, so.

Health care policy.

MODERATOR—ANYTHING IN PARTICULAR YOU'RE THINKING ABOUT?

We need something here. I mean health care is eating us up.

From a fiscal standpoint, and the only reason I didn't vote for him during the election, was because of his waffling on the right to life issue. I personally tend to be fiscally conservative and socially liberal. That's something that he kind of really hemmed and hawed on and didn't come down on one side or the other. And I think that's a negative.

I hope he doesn't succumb on this, social security. I would like to see him continue revamping it. Hopefully making it privatizing part of it.

My concern is big business and forgetting the little people. I mean, listening to everybody, it's just, a lot of this stuff, it's all been hereditary for years and not just Clinton's administration, I mean for years. So, it's just, it's hereditary. When I went to school I was always, I was taught that the president is more on the foreign issues and then that's why we have the congress and the senate, to run the country itself. He has to lead in that way but he can't, any president should just not be, this sucker goes all the way back to WW II if you look about it. And that's my thing. It's a tough job for anybody.

Bureaucracy of governing a third of a billion people that are the most prosperous in the world you know, hell of a job.

MODERATOR—LEE SAID HE'S WORRIED HE'S NOT DEALING WITH THE ECONOMY, DO YOU GUYS SEEM TO AGREE THAT THE ECONOMY IS ON ITS WAY DOWN, AT LEAST IN THIS AREA, DO YOU TRUST BUSH TO DEAL WITH THE ECONOMY?

I trust that he's going to deal with it. But is it going to benefit us or is it going to benefit business.

Well, we all are business in some way or another here.

Well, but Boeing thinking of shipping jobs out to China and everywhere else where they can build it cheaper.

Well, we've let our industry slip out of the country over close to 30 years now; it's just no single administration's fault, the government's fault.

The economy is not a presidential issue. The president doesn't control the economy. The economy is cyclical. If you happen to be the guy sitting in the office during an up time everyone thinks you're a great economic president. If you happen to be the guy that's sitting in the office when things go the other way, that's an unlucky break as well.

The amount of policies they get, that he's able to, he's administration. He administers what congress puts through. The amount of legislation that he can get through congress is, what is it, between a tenth and a third, that he can actually implement.

[Many voices speaking at once]

Don't you think though with all the military action that's going on there will be this push to spend more money on military, increasing the national debt? I mean does he have no affect on us.

He influences it with the policy I think.

It still has to go through congress to be improved.

Well, he did get his tax rebate out to us. That was just him.

I can't think of much that he has directly done for the economy. I mean that he has done. Except that's not his area. And I don't believe, I mean, cutting the interest rate, that. I don't believe he has that much control over Greenspan and things like that. He's, I mean, he's as high as you can go but, you know, what he touches is all done by other people. And I don't know, I personally don't know how much he's saying, get me a tax rebate through and make sure that it's this amount. It's, I want a tax rebate. And then, I mean, I can't think of very much he's, that he's personally done.

Well, government is mostly run by people who aren't elected. That's the problem. The thing that he can do is, leadership. He can be somebody who people have confidence in. And as they feel more confidence that he's going to lead them, whether he does or not, then there's benefit to the economy.

MODERATOR—BUT YOU DON'T THINK HE HAS THAT MUCH INFLUENCE ON THE ECONOMY SO SHOULD PEOPLE HAVE CONFIDENCE THAT HE'S GOING TO BE ABLE TO AFFECT THE ECONOMY?

In a way, yes. Like we've all acknowledged, he's selected the cabinet. And then cabinet members run the bureaucracies that are affecting the economy.

He appointed the cabinet. The cabinet was selected by the congress.

With what was allowed.

Right. But still, as Harry Truman said, the buck stops here.

Yeah, that's true.

The economy during his watch, it's his problem.

That's right. That's right.

MODERATOR—WANT TO TALK ABOUT A FEW SPECIFIC ISSUES. FIRST ONE IS THE ENERGY POLICY. THINK ABOUT THE ENERGY POLICY IN THE COUNTRY TODAY, WHAT CHANGES DO YOU THINK NEED TO BE MADE?

Get rid of deregulation.

I think they need to fund more research in to alternative sources, solar and that sort of thing.

But big business is buying the patents. I mean they have patents for more efficient engines and the oil companies are buying them up. So. The big business, just been around for eons. It's supply and demand. You cut it. I remember in the '60's and '70's getting up at 5 o'clock in the morning to get in line for my 5 gallon of gas, it's just ridiculous. And these guys are sitting on it. I went, my wife is a nurse and we went down to nursing conference down in New Orleans about 2 weeks after September 11th and the price of gasoline in New Orleans was a \$1.23. I almost died right there. It's just, the taxes and the big business. It's just ridiculous. Somebody has got to put a stop to it.

Right. You've got these companies, what, what is it called, Chevron and Texaco and all these companies are merging, yet you got congress beating on Microsoft because they're, they won't, they're getting too big. But congress, all over these energy companies.

Well, Lee is concerned with the war and the cost of it and stuff like this, and when you sit there and watch the news and they're selling a \$500 hammer or toilet seat on board a military, I mean it's ridiculous when you can go to Home Depot and get it for a lot less. I mean it's, we're fooling ourselves, it's a vicious circle.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 3, STATEMENTS ABOUT ENERGY POLICY.

PRESIDENT BUSH AND THE REPUBLICAN CONGRESS HAVE CALLED FOR THE IMMEDIATE PASSAGE OF LEGISLATION TO REFORM OUR ENERGY POLICY. THEY SAY THE LESS DEPENDENT WE ARE ON THE OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST THE MORE SECURE OUR NATION IS. WE NEED TO INCREASE ENERGY SUPPLIES TODAY THROUGH EXPANDED DOMESTIC PRODUCTION. OUR NATIONAL SECURITY REQUIRES THAT WE OPEN ALASKA'S ARTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE TO OIL DRILLING, SUBSIDIZE THE DEVELOPMENT OF CLEANER COAL TECHNOLOGY AND BUILD NEW POWER PLANTS. DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE NEED A LONG-TERM ENERGY SECURITY PLAN THAT REDUCES OUR RELIANCE ON OIL FROM THE MIDDLE EAST. WE NEED TO USE AMERICAN TECHNOLOGICAL KNOW-HOW TO DEVELOP NEWER, CLEANER ENERGY SOURCES, WIND AND SOLAR AND TO BUILD A MORE ENERGY EFFICIENT CARS AND APPLIANCES. WE CAN SECURE OUR ENERGY SUPPLY USING

CLEAN FUELS LIKE NATURAL GAS WITHOUT DRILLING FOR OIL IN
THE PRISTINE ARTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE.

Where is most of natural oil coming from right now, Canada.

MODERATOR—IF YOU GUYS HAD TO CHOOSE ONE OR THE OTHER THAT YOU
AGREE WITH MORE, HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD CHOOSE THE FIRST
STATEMENT? MATT, YOU WOULD CHOOSE THE FIRST ONE.

HOW MANY WOULD CHOOSE THE SECOND ONE? OK.

I would have to choose the first one.

MODERATOR—OK, SO IT'S 3 FOR THE FIRST ONE AND 7 FOR THE SECOND ONE.

Lesser of two evils.

MODERATOR—SEVEN OF YOU TOOK THE SECOND ONE, TELL ME WHY?

From my understanding the quality of the oil coming out of the Artic isn't as good as what's
coming out of the Middle East.

I think newer, better sources of energy, not dependent on oil. The amount of oil we'll get out of
Alaska is a drop in the bucket compared to what we buy from the Middle East. So, it's just kind
of, it's not going to do anything. Technology, where we are in technology, we're not that far
from being able to have, we already have hydrogen fuel cells. There's a lot of technology out
there that could reduce our reliance on oil. If we drill in Alaska 20 years down the road we're
still going to be in the same boat, buying oil from the Middle East.

I think we have technical know how to develop these other sources.

I agree with him. Taking oil from Alaska is like taking the path of least resistance. And we're a
smart country, we can figure out some alternatives. I remember back when there was a lot of
research going on with wind energy and geothermal, all these other technologies, that used to be
really hot, and now nobody talks about it anymore.

MODERATOR—THOSE THAT CHOSE THE FIRST ONE, WHY?

I see the first one as a near term solution. For the time being we need to increase our supplies. If
we have to drill in Alaska, build up our stockpiles. Especially now with the price of gasoline low
we can stockpile and if it spikes hopefully keep the price down a little bit. And I see the second
one as a longer term solution. Which we could do but, so they have hydrogen, the ability to have
hydrogen powered cars, but is everybody willing spend 50 percent more to buy a new car? And
what happens to all the people that have gas stations now and where do you put whatever kind of
station you need for hydrogen. So, I don't think that's feasible, that it would help us in the near

term because of economic issues as we change, get rid of gas stations to whatever kind of filling station we need, that sort of thing.

I think there are technologies that convert natural gas to things that fuel cells run on. There's already other filling stations out there. I don't think the technology would be that hard. It would have to be a change, the country mindset.

It isn't the technology, it's the infrastructure. There would have to be convenient filling stations for the alternative energy source along the highway. A way to get your car filled up for Mom and the kids to get from point A to B, cross country, using these alternatives and that's what we're talking about. Monopoly break that isn't likely to happen without. But it's also the guy that's running the filling station, too, and it's his own business and that's what he's got 2 million dollars invested in that property. And if he walks away he's got contamination to clean up that will make him and all his family go broke. There's a bigger puzzle here than just saying that Texaco or Chevron's problem. It's the whole infrastructure of making it happen. And we're a long ways away from critical mass in making it happen.

MODERATOR—WHAT'S IT GOING TO TAKE TO MAKE IT HAPPEN?

Well, critical mass is about 20 percent. It has to be around 20 to 25 percent changeover in an economy in its total. So, you know, that's a long way off. We've had a democrat in office for 10 years who never had an energy policy. Who said all these things but they never put anything through. Never made any progress. So, that's why I don't have any faith in the second issue.

One thing somebody said was change their mindset. But if you look there are electric cars now, the hybrid cars, but nobody is buying them. So, everybody wants something different but they're not buying into the solution we have now, so.

The technology, I work with it every day, it's not there. I think the key word that they used in the democratic statement, develop newer. That's, like he said, that's long-term. It's not going to provide a solution next year. It's going to be a ways down.

MODERATOR—SHIFT A LOT, GO FROM ENERGY POLICY TO SOCIAL SECURITY. HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING THAT'S GOING ON WITH SOCIAL SECURITY, THAT THEY'RE TALKING ABOUT IN WASHINGTON?

They're talking about not making it, not going to a private savings accounts as part of what your money goes towards.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU GUYS THINK ABOUT THAT IDEA?

Letting people manage their own retirement. I think some people will do great. A lot of people, you know, I wouldn't trust them to do it, you know.

That's the concern I have, that, is that, the perception that the media gives is that it is a one-size shoe fits all people. The method that is effective is that there are many alternatives for those

people who would like to manage their own, taking a piece of social security and there's a way for people who don't want to manage their own to keep it in the status quo. I've read several methods for doing just that, that would continue it through.

I do have thoughts. From a personal standpoint, I'd like to have control of my own. And unfortunately, left in government hands you're never going to achieve the kind of returns that you're going to need for it to even be around when those of us in this room are going to need it. You've got to put a mechanism in place that is going to provide the ability to increase that social security kitty at a greater rate than what we have in place now. Unfortunately, and I agree with him, I think the majority of the people out there probably aren't sophisticated enough to be able to take on that responsibility. Unless, maybe you only get a portion of the kitty that is allotted to you that you could go ahead and manage on an individual basis. I think, this past couple of years was a classic situation. Two years ago everybody thought that they were the best money manager, stock picker in the world. You could throw a dart at the wall, you were going to make money. And it's been a very sobering experience for a lot of people in the last couple of years.

A lot of people had money in Enron.

You can, I can point to a dozen companies that's in worst situations.

It's just risk management. Even if you're sophisticated there's still, there's risk that are inherently...

Of course there is. If there were no risks we'd all be rich.

...should social security contain that risk?

Social security has a different risk.

Obviously if it doesn't change it's not going to be there, so.

That's the huge risk. I mean you can be so conservative that you grind it to nothing.

MODERATOR—IS PRIVATIZATION, IS LETTING PEOPLE INVEST SOME OF THEIR OWN, IS THAT THE ONLY SOLUTION? ARE THERE OTHER SOLUTIONS?

My ideas, if you give me half of my social security to invest on my own, and I lose it in the stock market, or I put it in a trust or something and things don't work out, what are you going to do? What's going to happen? It's a great idea but you know, Will may be able to manage it and Lee may be able to manage it, the rest of us may lose our shirt, then what happens?

Welfare?

Yeah. It's not, I mean I don't, maybe I don't trust the American people enough overall to do it. And again, in my mind, you can give them anything you want. You can say, you can invest it in stocks. You can invest it in CD's. Or you can invest it in, you know, the house next door.

What's it invested in now?

It's not. It's in the general fund.

Correct. But like I say, if I give the money to you and let you do your own, you start living on \$500, it's, you know...

If I'm stupid I die.

...correct, but then I'm still going to have to, if I do good I'm still going to be supporting you because now you're on welfare.

That's exactly the problem with it. Even if we go to a total privatization, America will not allow those people to go without.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 4,

PRESIDENT BUSH'S COMMISSION ON SOCIAL SECURITY JUST RELEASED A REPORT CONTAINING THREE OPTIONS FOR PARTIALLY PRIVATIZING SOCIAL SECURITY. THE COMMISSION SAYS THAT UNDER EACH OF THEIR PLANS FUTURE RETIREES CAN EXPECT TO RECEIVE BENEFITS AS LEAST AS HIGH AS THOSE RECEIVED BY TODAY'S RETIREES OR GAINING THE OPPORTUNITY TO BUILD SUBSTANTIAL WEALTH THROUGH VOLUNTARY PERSONAL RETIREMENT ACCOUNTS. THEY SAY THIS IS THE ONLY WAY TO ENSURE THE LONG-TERM FISCAL HEALTH OF SOCIAL SECURITY.

And it's tabled for one year for comment. The policy. They have not put a policy out.

Have they taken into account that people are living longer?

Have to assume that.

I don't assume anything. I mean, one of the problems is, people are living longer. This thing has been doomed for 20-some years.

And we have to look at the baby boomers rushing madly towards social security. They're not going to be enough people working to be able to put it into the pool.

To be honest with you I don't look at social security because I don't think it's going to be around. Unless they do a major revamp. But I'm not disagreeing about having it stay where it is or not having somebody else try to manage it themselves. But to be honest with you I'm not looking towards it.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO YOU GUYS THINK ABOUT THIS STATEMENT?

How can they guarantee that I'm going to receive the same, the same benefits as today's and they're still going to give me money to build more wealth. It sounds too good to be true to me.

Because, the biggest thing I can see the difference in the way we have, the non-system that we have now, where we just have a general fund, we pay out from the general fund, social security, is that you will have an actual account. Whether it's managed by managers or by the government or by yourself or whatever, it's actually money that's actually put in to an account separate from the government. The government can't go in and take a dip out of it. I mean it's general fund now. That's the difference. That's the biggest difference that I see in at least attempting to do something in this direction.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 5, ANOTHER POINT OF VIEW ON THIS,

DEMOCRATS SAY THAT PRIVATIZATION WOULD ENDANGER THE RETIREMENT SECURITY OF THOSE THAT NEED SOCIAL SECURITY TO MEET THEIR BASIC NEEDS AND DESTROY THE PROMISE OF GUARANTEED BENEFITS FOR MILLIONS OF TAXPAYERS. DIVERTING FUNDS TO PRIVATE ACCOUNTS WOULD CREATE A 1 TRILLION DOLLAR HOLE IN THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND IN JUST THE NEXT DECADE. THIS WOULD REQUIRE DRASTIC CUTS IN BENEFITS AND INCREASE IN THE RETIREMENT AGE. AND THE COMMISSION'S REPORT IGNORES THE FACT THAT THE CURRENT BUDGET TAKES HUNDREDS OF MILLIONS OF DOLLARS FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR TAX CUTS.

Didn't Chile go through this about 15 years, where they changed over from a policy of social security about the same we have ours? And they changed it over to a completely private. And those people that wanted to stay with the old policy were allowed to and those that wanted to change over. They went through 10 years; it's all going to be a collapse to our older generation that can no longer work. And 15 years later apparently it worked. Much smaller economy and doesn't have GNP obviously, population is much different. I've not heard enough about it to know whether it relates as well. But there may be samples. It's the common, to the doom and gloom.

Well I think, it makes me uncomfortable, diverting all the money out of the social security into people's private accounts. I would just feel more secure knowing that, everybody's throwing money in and everybody's going to get the same thing. I have confidence in our economy and if they wanted to invest, you know, the pot in the stock market, whatever, that's fine. But I still think if you start taking money away from it to put it in private accounts the thing is likely to dry up a lot faster than if it keeps going in there.

My only concern is, it's one phrase, this would require drastic cuts in benefits and increase the retirement age. Are we borrowing against it already?

MODERATOR—THAT'S WHAT IT SAYS ON THE BOTTOM.

Yeah. I mean I don't, I don't, you can't screw the people that are relying on this right now.

No, you can't.

There's people that have worked and they're expecting these benefits. They're close to retirement or they're at retirement age now, you can't, you can't just tell those people, change the policy because they've been counting on it for 30 years.

Yeah, if they're going to do it, it's got to be, you know, either you get a portion or it's a choice or at a certain timeframe from then on you have this choice to either the government takes care of it or you can manage it yourself. But I agree, and people have been waiting for it for years. You can't do that. So, there's got to be a compromise between the two.

Especially for people that didn't have other retirement options when they were working like 401k and all these investments.

Boeing has a great 401k but I've worked with people that in 20 years have never put a dime in it. They're looking towards social security.

But they were promised social security, right?

They had that choice and that's the choice they made.

MODERATOR—LET'S SHIFT AGAIN, THIS TIME ECONOMIC POLICY, LOOK AT HANDOUT NUMBER 6,

GEORGE W. BUSH SAYS WE NEED TO REVITALIZE OUR ECONOMY WHICH REQUIRES PUTTING MONEY BACK IN THE HANDS OF INDIVIDUALS AND BUSINESS INVESTORS. WE MUST MAINTAIN OUR PLANNED TAX CUTS AND ENACT FURTHER TAX CUTS TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY AND EXPAND INVESTMENT. TO ACHIEVE THAT WE NEED TO RESTRAIN AND CUT FEDERAL GOVERNMENT SPENDING WHILE CONTINUING TO MEET OUR COMMITMENT TO SOCIAL SECURITY AND FUND OUR EDUCATION AND DOMESTIC SECURITY INITIATIVES. DEMOCRATS SAY THAT WE HAVE IMPORTANT NEEDS AS A COUNTRY AND MUST RENEW OUR ECONOMY. WE SHOULD CANCEL MOST OF THE MASSIVE TAX CUTS SCHEDULED FOR NEXT YEAR. ALMOST HALF OF THE MONEY GOES TO THOSE EARNING OVER \$375,000 A YEAR WHICH IS IRRESPONSIBLE IN THESE TIMES. BY CANCELING THESE MASSIVE TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHIEST WE CAN CONTINUE TO CUT MIDDLE CLASS TAXES, RESTORE THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND AND SUPPORT OTHER NEEDS LIKE PRESCRIPTION DRUGS, EDUCATION AND IMPROVE DOMESTIC SECURITY.

First of all there's no social security trust fund, so.

MODERATOR—FIRST I WANT TO GET A QUICK SHOW OF HANDS. IF YOU HAD TO CHOOSE ONE STATEMENT OVER OR THE OTHER, HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD CHOOSE THE FIRST ONE? 2.

HOW MANY PEOPLE WOULD CHOOSE THE SECOND ONE? 5.

THREE NO VOTES.

The second one.

I don't know, I'd probably go with the first one, but.

I would, I'd go with both of them. No, I would go with the first one but anyone making over \$375,000 a year, you have, you're making a ton of money, you have to pull your weight.

MODERATOR—SIX OF YOU PICKED THE SECOND ONE SO WE'LL TALK ABOUT THAT ONE FIRST, WHY?

What did anybody here do with the \$300 tax cut? I mean I'm not, I'm certainly not saying I didn't want it, but. I mean if all I'm going to do is say, what is best for me, then I mean, then my daughter is going to have nothing to grow up to. And yes, we have to take a longer look, I mean we have to have a vision that's longer then what's going to happen to me in the next, you know, in the next 4 years. I don't care who is president. I want to be taken care of. I want, I mean, I'm not counting on social security. But I want somebody to be thinking not what's good for Enron, I want, what's going to be good for me.

Tax cuts don't really, I mean it's nice, I like getting the money but I'd rather the government and the president were just spending the money that they do have coming in efficiently. Making sure that we're not wasting money that we do get right now. I think there's a lot of things that can be improved.

(End side 1)

...did an analysis that upper class, 375,000 people are getting larger tax cuts. And it's just hard for the middle economy person to deal. I just agree with, I think the canceling the massive tax cuts for the wealthiest, we can continue to cut middle class taxes to some extent and still restore social security. I think those statements were correct.

I just think, I agree with what Lee said. And I think, I mean European countries pay 2 and 3 times as much in taxes as we do. I don't think that a big tax cut is what we need. I think we just need to work on spending our money wisely.

MODERATOR—THOSE THAT PICKED THE FIRST ONE, WHY?

It's not a tax cut. They over collected. I mean if I charge you \$1,000 to do a service for you but it only cost me \$600 and I decide to give you the \$400 back because I overcharged you, are you going to give it back to me because I can do something better with the money? That's essentially what this is. They collected too much money to run the government. They are responsible for giving it back. I think it is a crime that they are giving it back over a 10-year period.

The money we got this year was for next year's taxes.

I think the fact that we have a debt shows that they haven't collected enough, enough, you know.

The debt comes from WW II. What are you going to go do, go get England and France to pay it off with interest? I don't think so. That's where the debt is from. It's been doomed since the '40's. My tax money went straight to college tuition; I didn't even see it, so.

We could take up a fund for all those people who want to pay more taxes and those that don't want to pay more taxes get the refund.

The first sentence in the first one gets me. I don't think a tax cut is going to revitalize the economy. It's not. Like the \$600 we all got back didn't do anything for the economy I don't think.

Most of it went back to big business.

Yeah, I just don't think it's going to stimulate economy.

Well, but it also paid the sandwich shop guy and the carpenter that did some work on your house.

They showed that most of those things went to pay off things that were already bought. It didn't go to new things.

I think, they made a big issue of it and we got some, they overcharged, we got some money back, we got it. I think a lot of our problem is the media in the first place. I'm surprised tonight, KIRO or KING announcing storm 2001 second, phase 2, they're selling commercial space, so. I just, I truly, it's in the middle. And that's not the answer you want.

MODERATOR—TOUCHING ON WHAT WE'RE TALKING ABOUT HERE, THE BUSH ADMINISTRATION RECENTLY ANNOUNCED THAT THE BUDGET IS GOING TO RETURN TO DEFICIT IN THE NEXT YEAR AND THAT IT WILL REMAIN IN DEFICIT THROUGH AT LEAST 2005. WHAT DO YOU THINK ABOUT THAT? GUT REACTION.

Well, the amount of government spending related to the war effort is huge. And it is a component of it. And the fact that all of us around the room here and the companies we may work for may be bringing in less income which brings in less tax base means the top line is not as big as it was in previous years. The bottom line is not, or the expenses are not being adjusted accordingly, it's going to go down. Add to that the problem with the war, not the problem, but

the expense associated with it, and it creates a situation I don't think anyone foresaw in the time period, it's an accurate statement.

I feel like I need to study it more but, especially with the war expenses and everything, I do think it should cause everybody to rethink some of what they've been thinking if they're going to have to go into deficit spending in order to make up some of those things, we shouldn't be doing tax cuts at the same time.

MODERATOR—YOU'RE NODDING. DO YOU AGREE WITH THAT?

Like I said, my son is in the Navy and the military is not in the best shape. Not, it's the best in the world, but they've just come out there and said they're no longer going to try and fight a two-front war, they can't do it and they don't have it. We've got to win. Ten to twelve carrier groups right now and at any given time 2 or 3 of them have to be in port. We've got three of them sitting off, in the Indian Ocean. We can't spread them think enough. Military is going to need, every time a situation comes up like this, cost us money.

You know, I like to think that I kind of understand government. And I wouldn't mind if they did deficit, did some deficit spending when necessary, when the economy takes a downturn, they've got to make an adjustment. But I have no faith that they will spend the money wisely. I mean Edmonds wants to spend \$40,000 to prosecute a guy that took a totem pole out of the garbage can so they can throw it away again. I mean, like I say, show me that they're spending my money correctly. I mean, I can't spend deficit. I can't run a deficit. My wife would destroy me. I mean, I, just tell me they're doing the right thing and they're not pissing it away on a \$50 dollar hammer and the stupid. And they got a study for every stupid thing that you can think of. I know it's not stupid, probably not stupid to some people but I think I could manage it a lot better than they could.

I would think in this day and age with technology we ought to be able to go in and just look at what they're doing. But it seems we still can't do that.

They have the good old boy mentality. They have they're little agenda clubs back there. The states get so much money for this and that and it's just...

We ought to require them as a country, have full disclosure.

...are you saying they should be accountable?

MODERATOR—IN LESS THAN A YEAR THE ECONOMY HAS GONE FROM REPORTED RECORD SURPLUSES TO A DEFICIT. OBVIOUSLY THERE'S A COMBINATION OF FACTORS, THERE'S NOT A SINGLE ONE. WHAT DO YOU THINK IS THE BIGGEST REASON?

My first statement would be that it's related to September 11th, but I don't think so.

We have an economy problem.

MODERATOR—IT'S THE ECONOMIC SLOWDOWN YOU THINK?

Yeah.

It was coming before September 11th.

MODERATOR—IT'S THE ECONOMY. ANOTHER THING THAT'S GOING ON, A LOT OF TALK IN WASHINGTON IS ABOUT THIS ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE. HAVE YOU GUYS HEARD ANYTHING ABOUT THAT, WHAT IT IS THEY'RE FIGHTING ABOUT, WHERE IT STANDS, ANYTHING?

I remember hearing about a tax holiday but that's no longer on the table. Beyond that I haven't heard too much.

We're in the northwest; we're on the frontier. The short wave.

The tax stimulus package, I mean, if you, the room has been consistent, they don't want to give money to big government, that's the biggest big government giveaway then anything. I think you're much better off giving the money to every person here and letting us choose how to spend it then you are in some, you know, big chunk of change thrown into the general pot out there.

At the state level isn't that what Lock wants to do with all this tax increases, gas taxes, put that in there so that we can hire people to build new roads?

No. To hire people to study new roads.

MODERATOR—IN WASHINGTON, D.C., HAVE YOU HEARD ANYTHING AT ALL?

No.

No.

I keep hearing economic stimulus package but I never hear any details.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO THE NEXT PAGE.

REPUBLICANS IN CONGRESS SAY WE DON'T NEED MORE GOVERNMENT SPENDING, WE NEED TO GET MONEY BACK INTO THE HANDS OF THOSE THAT WILL INVEST IN OUR ECONOMY. THEY SAY WE MUST SPEED UP TAX CUTS PASSED EARLIER THIS YEAR TO GET OUR ECONOMY MOVING AND PASS FURTHER TAX CUTS INCLUDING TAX CUTS FOR BUSINESSES HIT HARD BY SEPTEMBER 11TH WHO NEED MONEY TO INVEST AND CREATE JOBS. DEMOCRATS IN CONGRESS SAY WE MUST ADDRESS OUR IMMEDIATE NEEDS INCLUDING REBUILDING AFTER TERRORIST'S ATTACKS, HELPING

THE NEW UNEMPLOYED, FUNDING NEW SECURITY PROJECTS AND INCREASING SUPPORT FOR EDUCATION. RATHER THAN PERMANENTLY CUTTING TAXES FOR THE WEALTHIEST WE SHOULD MEET OUR OBLIGATION WHILE PROVIDING INCENTIVES TO BUSINESSES AND INDIVIDUALS TO INVEST THIS YEAR.

HAVE TO CHOOSE ONE OR THE OTHER.

HOW MANY PEOPLE CHOOSE THE FIRST STATEMENT? 3.

HOW MANY PEOPLE CHOOSE THE SECOND STATEMENT? 5.

It was here before September 11th. It was here a year ago before September 11th. But these guys are sitting there with blinders on and they're idiots.

MODERATOR—PICK ONE?

If I had to pick one I'd have to go with the first one. But it's not right.

MODERATOR—YOU PICKED THE SECOND ONE SO WE'LL TALK ABOUT THAT ONE FIRST, WHY?

I think, it's not the whole thing; I don't like parts of the second one. The thing, it's fairness and taxes to me. I think the middle class is still paying the bulk. I think the tax cuts the republicans will do will be tax to their benefit, the 300,000-tax bracket and above, and the general population it most affects of the tax cut the republicans will do.

MODERATOR—WHAT DIDN'T YOU LIKE ABOUT IT?

I think they're using, I just think they're using September 11th in a way that's just...

Emotion.

...yeah. Using it as a media bite instead, and not focusing just on issues. Just a rallying cry.

MODERATOR—THE REST OF YOU THAT PICKED THE SECOND ONE, WHY?

The first one, I'm kind of fan, the check went out there and you get the people the money and they'll keep the whole thing going. But I think the people are kind of nervous after everything that's been going on before September 11th and now after September 11th. I don't think people are going to go out and buy things. And they'll probably hold onto the money rather than go out and spend it. I think people are just going to take it easy for a while.

Kind of the same thing. And kind of goes back to an earlier one we talked about, I don't think that putting the money back in the hands of all of the people is going to stimulate the economy. I

don't think it's going to achieve what the republicans say it's going to achieve. I'm also a little uncomfortable with the degree of tax cuts to the higher income brackets.

MODERATOR—THOSE THAT PICKED THE FIRST ONE, WHY?

Because you made me.

MODERATOR—THERE'S GOT TO BE MORE TO IT THAN THAT. WILL, WHY DID YOU?

I do think the trickle down theory is one that works. I think the more you put money into people's hands the more likely they are to spend it. What made this country what it is, is innovation. And to innovate takes cash. And you need to pump cash into the system to make the system accelerate and run. And I think we got a situation where it's coming to a slowdown, the last thing you want to do is clamp on the brakes. It's very uncomfortable situation because the natural inclination from a safety standpoint is to put on the brakes. But I don't think in the long-term that's probably going to be the best answer.

Can I ask a general question?

MODERATOR—SURE.

Do you all work for somebody? Do any of you have your own businesses. Just you. You have your own business. Just curious.

MODERATOR—HOW DOES THAT IMPACT?

Well, what's the biggest part of your taxes in your business, social security?

Biggest part for is federal income tax.

And you're not a big business are you?

No.

Neither am I. State, not too bad?

Not too bad.

MODERATOR—THAT'S GETTING A LITTLE TOO DEEP, YOUR POINT?

My point is, you know, the group seems to think that they're aren't small businesses out there who wouldn't be benefited by tax cuts.

MODERATOR—WHAT DO THE REST OF YOU THINK, WOULD SMALL BUSINESSES GET IT, THE BENEFITS OF TAX CUTS OR NOT?

My feeling is they're more directed at the big business than small business. I don't know that I can see that they're tax cuts would directly affect small businesses. I think again, I don't trust that they can make, the tax cuts fairly across all the taxes, the places they need to do it. Big business, small business, big tax payers, small tax payers, middle class. I always feel that the republicans are going to have more of the upper class tax cuts.

You also got to remember that the largest segment of the population who doesn't pay tax, even though they are working, they fall below a tax rate.

The bulk is paid by the middle class still.

The bulk of the sheer volume of money that goes to the federal government is paid by, I don't know what it is, 5 percent, of the population.

I looked at the numbers and that's not what I saw. The bulk of the money is coming from the 100 and 200 class.

MODERATOR—LET ME THROW A HYPOTHETICAL AT YOU. OBVIOUSLY THEY HAVE DIFFERENT IDEAS ON WHAT THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PLAN SHOULD BE. IT'S GETTING CLOSE TO THE END OF THE YEAR. LET'S SAY THEY CAN'T REACH A COMPROMISE, THEY GO HOME WITHOUT A STIMULUS PACKAGE, WHAT THEN?

[Many voices speaking at once]

It's nothing new. So, they're going to go home.

I think it's a disservice if they didn't say, OK, we haven't come to an agreement therefore, there will be no more talk about it. So, before Thanksgiving I heard about the tax holiday and then I never heard anything about it again. So, and they said it would probably be immediately be the first after Thanksgiving, the first week of December. I think it was a disservice to both consumers as well as to people that sell cars or whatever because we never heard about it again maybe people are holding off on purchases. So, keeping everybody in limbo is a bad thing. I think can't come to an agreement we should just say, OK, whatever.

There's been in the past recessions and that there's been the economic stimulus packages that had, I would say, had absolutely zero effect on the economic condition. If they go out without doing anything, the economy is going to correct itself at its own time regardless of what the bureaucrats do.

How old is the country, 200-some years?

You said these economic stimulus packages are in response to September 11th? I mean, that's, again, Lee, like what Lee said, they're using September 11th to try and pass things that are, that aren't, and it's not going to help 5 years down the road by blaming everything on September 11th. That's only going to last for so much longer. Democrats say, funding new security projects.

Well, I mean, how far can you fund, will funding security projects pull, it will pull certain parts out of the dumps but it's not going to do anything for the majority of people. It's both parties. It's both parties are doing it. These are the crappiest two that you've given us to try and pick. Neither one of them are worth anything.

The fairness in tax thing, I understand it. Small businesses are hit hard. My dad had his own. He complained every day how much he was out. I understand. That's why I'm afraid. Because they will not address the small business, the republicans, that's my concern. I think they will still address the upper 800 plus tier and big business.

MODERATOR—LET ME ASK, AND TELL ME IF I'M WRONG, YOU SEEM TO BE SAYING THAT NOTHING IS BETTER THAN SOMETHING GIVEN THESE OPTIONS?

No. No. No. You asked us to pick one. And the republicans and democrats, they both want the same thing. But if a republican says thunder then the democrats are going to say lightening. And they're going to fight over it and nothing is going to happen. Or they will fill it so full of pork that you're not going to know. It's going to be an economic stimulus package that includes a freeway to a certain senator's house so he has a direct drive to the state capitol. I mean neither one of these are going to, neither one of these are very good options in my opinion. And one of the things I didn't like about George Bush is, I don't think he's working both sides of the aisle. It's, I'm a republican. If I'm going to say it and every republican better follow me. And the democrats say, I'm a democrat, I'm not going to, you know. I can't believe that everybody that I vote for is this far apart on every issue.

You say you don't vote for a party you vote for an individual?

I like to think that I do. I mean this is the first time I voted for a republican that's a better one, I've always been with the democrats before. But, yeah, I try to vote for the person. And it's easy in this state.

I have to agree with you. That's what I vote for, the person. But unfortunately they have this damn baggage called the party behind them.

I vote for the person and if he doesn't do it in the years he's in, get his butt out and get someone else in. I mean that's the process. But the guys that sit there for ever and ever. It's a circle.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 8, AND GO STRAIGHT TO 9, [DESCRIBES SCALE].

THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE SUPPORTED THE PLAN THAT WAS SUPPOSED TO STIMULATE THE ECONOMY BUT INSTEAD OF TRYING TO HELP THE ECONOMY THE PLAN INCLUDED BILLIONS OF DOLLARS OF NEW GOVERNMENT SPENDING INCLUDING HUNDREDS OF PORK BARREL PROJECTS FOR INDIVIDUALS IN CONGRESS.

-3? [LAUGHTER] WHAT HAVE YOU GOT?

Minus 2.

I mean you got to look at the plan, too. The pork is jobs. It's spending money.

MODERATOR—GIVE IT A MINUS 3.

Individual members of congress...

MODERATOR—PORK BARREL PROJECTS.

...yeah.

MODERATOR—IS THERE ANYTHING ELSE? IS THAT IT? IT'S ALL ABOUT THE PORK BARREL?

It's the clincher.

That's it.

Not being fiscally responsible. That you will be held accountable.

MODERATOR—LET'S GO TO THE NEXT ONE,

WHILE THE WHOLE COUNTRY WAS COMING TOGETHER TO SUPPORT THE PRESIDENT AND RISE ABOVE PARTISANSHIP, THE DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE WAS VOTING IN A PARTISAN BLOCK AGAINST THE PRESIDENT'S ECONOMIC PROPOSALS. THEY EVEN HELD UP THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS PACKAGE WHEN THE ECONOMY WAS IN NEED OF EXTRA HELP.

-3? 2. -2? 2. -1? 2. 0? 3. +1? 1.

THOSE OF YOU WHO GAVE IT A MINUS 3 OR 2, WHY?

Partisan block. He's not voting his mind he's voting his party line.

The first line, I'm assuming that I'm part of the country that's coming together to support the president and I believe the economic stimulus package, whatever it might be, is good. And therefore, as someone who is supporting partisan to block it (inaudible).

MODERATOR—MINUS 2'S, WHY?

Well, I think in a time of crisis, national crisis, one would hope that partisanship (inaudible) so I'm assuming that it is that extreme. The reason I didn't go to a negative 3 is because economic

stimulus package, without more parameters around that, could be a bad package, could be a good package, so.

I would just hope, the partisan block, I mean I have something against that.

MODERATOR—THE REST OF YOU, WHY, NOT SO IMPRESSED WITH THIS ONE?

I would say it's, I mean I don't care for the partisan block, but I still think there's some sense if there's a value or a reason why they're doing it. It may not be completely evil. I would go toward that direction.

Same here. Giving them the benefit of the doubt of having a good reason why. Although the partisan part, that's why I went negative, because of the partisan block.

MODERATOR—WHY DID YOU GIVE IT A PLUS 1?

I think they, it goes back to September 11th. And I think that there was a reason to, not all the facts were out there. And he was just, whoa, stop, you know. And you got to view the big picture, do the big picture all the time.

MODERATOR—LOOKING BACK AT HANDOUT 9 AND HANDOUT 10, WHICH ONE WOULD MAKE YOU LESS LIKELY TO VOTE FOR THE DEMOCRAT?

HOW MANY SAY HANDOUT NUMBER 9? ALL RIGHT. NO NEED TO TALK ABOUT THAT.

HANDOUT NUMBER 11,

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE VOTED TO USE 160 BILLION DOLLARS FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND TO PAY FOR BIG TAX CUTS FOR THE WEALTHIEST. SHOULD BE LISTENING LESS TO SPECIAL INTERESTS AND MORE TO THOSE THAT COUNT ON SOCIAL SECURITY TO MEET THEIR MOST BASIC RETIREMENT NEEDS.

-3? 5. -2? 4. -1? 1.

THOSE THAT GAVE IT A MINUS 3, WHY?

It seems so black and white. The big tax cuts for the wealthiest. That he's not listening, that he's listening to the special interest and not everybody that voted for him.

The money is coming right out of social security.

I don't believe in the tax cut in the first place. And I don't believe in taking it from social security.

Yeah, I agree. I don't want a tax cut out of social security.

MODERATOR—THOSE OF YOU MINUS 1 AND 2, WHY? MATT, WHY ONLY A MINUS 1?

I was debating. I was almost a minus 2. I didn't like, what I didn't like about it was, should be listening to those who count on social security. I didn't like that comment. He should be listening to other people and not just one particular block. Like he said, it's very black and white. The wealthy got social security, how about the middle class?

MODERATOR—DO YOU AGREE WITH THIS NOTION THAT THE TAX CUTS ARE COMING FROM THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FROM? NO. WHY?

General fund.

MODERATOR—DO THE REST OF YOU AGREE WITH THAT?

No.

MODERATOR—THAT THE SOCIAL SECURITY FUND IS THE SAME AS THE GENERAL FUND?

I think that part of it is social security surplus and the other relying on debt surplus help on some of it out of the general fund.

MODERATOR—DO YOU THINK IF IT MEANS GOING INTO THE SOCIAL SECURITY TRUST FUND THAT THEY SHOULD NOT CUT TAXES?

Yeah. I guess.

Yeah.

Keep their hands out of social security trust fund, that's what it's called. It's not tax cut money.

MODERATOR—YOU WOULDN'T AGREE THAT'S WHERE IT'S COMING FROM?

My understanding of it is that it's really a paper entry anyway. That's exactly what it is. Again, it's coming out of the general fund.

MODERATOR—FLIP TO HANDOUT NUMBER 12,

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE RUSHED TO GET FUNDS TO THE AIRLINES AND INSURANCE INDUSTRY TO USE 75 PERCENT OF THE ECONOMIC STIMULUS FOR CORPORATE TAX BREAKS BUT THE CANDIDATE DIDN'T THINK IT WAS IMPORTANT TO HELP THE ORDINARY PEOPLE WHO LOST THEIR JOBS AFTER SEPTEMBER 11TH,

MANY OF THEM WERE INELIGIBLE FOR UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE.

-3? 2. -2? 6. -1? 1. 0? OK.

THOSE OF YOU WHO GAVE IT A MINUS 3 OR 2, WHY?

Look out for big business. And I know that they pay a lot of us. Come on, the airline industry, they can't control themselves any time, any day...

Before September 11th.

One of the most fiscal irresponsible industries there is.

...correct. Give away fares for \$39 and then cry poverty.

They gave them the tax cuts and the loans and they turned around and still laid off all their employees without even a warning notice because it was a national emergency. They cut them off right at the knees.

Plus the airlines, I mean some of the airlines were already were living day-to-day with hardly enough cash to keep going. September 11th just put them over the edge.

I work for Boeing so I have an interest in keeping the airlines healthy. I think in the next year you're still going to see a lot of airlines, few go under, even with the money.

What about the people that lost their jobs after September, who aren't ineligible for unemployment, go get a job.

Why would they have been ineligible?

Yeah, why would they have been ineligible? Any congressperson has to address those who are the constituents, those that are eligible. Constituents are also those that might not be but, I don't know, it's a nebulous kind of thing. Question the whole thing.

MODERATOR—WHY WERE YOU A ZERO?

It's the picture versus the individual. This wasn't a situation where 1 or 2 airlines might go out of business. That happened routinely in the course of every decade. This was a situation where the entire travel industry was threatened with collapse. And the domino effect of that would have had devastating effects on the overall economy. The reason for it wasn't to keep the guys that were working for the airlines in their jobs, the executives getting big bonuses. That may have been a byproduct of what took place. But the reason it was done was to try to mitigate as much as possible the heavy economic devastation that this could have brought on the economy. And insurance companies, it's a similar situation. Insurance companies spread risk. That's what they do. If the insurance companies are gone and there is no one to take care of me if my house burns down then the grander problem is much bigger.

MODERATOR—LOOK AT HANDOUT NUMBER 13,

THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE GAVE INTO THE SPECIAL INTEREST LOBBYIST AND SUPPORTED A PERMANENT TAX BREAK 20 BILLION DOLLARS AND ENCOURAGED COMPANIES TO INVEST IN FOREIGN COUNTRIES RATHER THAN IN THE UNITED STATES DURING OUR ECONOMIC CRISIS.

-3? 5. -2? 3. -1? 0? 3.
THOSE THAT GAVE IT MINUS 3, WHY?

My answer is go to the representatives themselves. That they're willing to cave in to special interest that means they're not serving their constituents, that's nobody I want. The rest of it is fluff.

MODERATOR—SO, IT'S JUST THE FACT THAT THEY GAVE IN TO SPECIAL INTEREST LOBBYIST REGARDLESS OF WHAT THEY CAVED IN ON?

Yeah. Yeah. They're not representing their constituents.

Just the contributors.

[Many voices speaking at once]

Not necessarily the contributors. It's the lobbyists.

MODERATOR—WHAT'S THE NATURE OF THE TAX BREAK?

The amount, the dollar amount, but the special interest, cave in to special interest was first.

We need to invest in our own country to get the country going, not outside.

MODERATOR—THE REST OF YOU?

I somewhat agree with that. But I also think that we can't be isolate. This is a global economy. I don't think we can be isolated and look at a single economy, the US economy.

Yeah, if you put the picture of us stimulating some other country and they can create trade and export and all that, yeah, sure, that's not what I would vote for this person.

MODERATOR—LOOKING AT HANDOUTS 11, 12 AND 13, THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE, WHICH ONE MAKES YOU LEAST LIKELY TO VOTE FOR THE REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

HOW MANY SAY NUMBER 11? 6.

NUMBER 12? 1

NUMBER 13? 3

THOSE THAT PICKED NUMBER 11, WHY?

Pork.

Seems crazy, 160 billion.

[Many voices speaking at once]

Fairness in taxes.

MODERATOR—THINKING ABOUT ALL THE THINGS WE TALKED ABOUT TONIGHT, WHAT'S THE BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE?

Generally they're fiscally more conservative.

I would guess, I'm not a republican, I guess, I would say smaller government. They want to put more government in our hands.

I agree with his statement.

MODERATOR—HOW ABOUT DEMOCRAT, BEST REASON TO VOTE FOR A DEMOCRATIC CANDIDATE?

They care a little more about me.

The environment.

Social responsibility.

They want, going back to your first question, they want to satisfy everybody. And I think they over emphasize it. That's why I would do a republican. But then on the other side, it goes back, I want to know who's going to do the best job. If it's a democrat, I mean if their going to do the best job for me where I live then that's it.

More concerned about the general population.

MODERATOR—IF THE ELECTION WERE HELD TODAY, WHICH WOULD YOU CHOOSE AND WHY? THANK YOU VERY MUCH.

(End tape)