

Michael Chaney:

Please join me in welcoming governor mitt Romney.

[Applause] >>

Governor Romney:

Thank you, Michael. It's a honor to be here this morning and to see so many friends and to see so many participants in the economy of New Hampshire and Massachusetts and all of New England. I appreciate the work you're doing. I'm going to take a few moments and address you and let you take a lot more moments and ask me some questions. Do I that with some trepidation, of course. I've begun having a series of town hall meetings, if you will. The term town hall meeting has already been taken. My staff had to come up with a different title, a different thing. They said let's call it "ask mitt anything." The problem is that they suggest to people they should do such a thing. Some of the questions I get are a little extreme. Do I my very best to answer. I have warned that do I not know the answer to all things. That came to me at a very young age. Ways working on my uncle's ranch in Idaho when I was 15 years old. I was wandering away and met a rancher who was raising sheep. I said, if I can guess the exact number of sheep in your herd cane have one? He said yes. I said 2,512. He said unbelievable. So I picked up my sheep to take him away. He said, wait. If I can guess your name can I have my sheep back? He said, you're that Romney kid. I said how do you know? He said, put down my dog and I'll tell you I do not have the answers to all things. I began moo career in the private sector. My life has not been in politics. This has not been what I expected I'd be doing in my life. As a matter of fact, when I was a boy I used to ask my dad about his life and his career. I loved cars. And my thought was always that someday if I were really lucky I could be head of the car company. That's what I really forecast for myself. But dad now and then would talk about politics. And he said, mitt, I have advice for you. Don't get involved in politics if you have to win elections to pay your bills. You don't want to ever have to worry about what you're saying in terms of meeting your mortgage payment. And don't get involved in politics until your kids are raised. Because kids can think they're special and not like everybody else. And I listened to his advice. Thought to myself I'll never become financially independent and I thought kids would always be in our life. But surprisingly our business was more successful than I had ever imagined. The kids were out of the home. I got asked to go out and run the Olympics. Not politics. But to run for the governor of Massachusetts was a shock and improbable step to take. The responsibility to actually serve and hopefully make a difference is something that weighs very heavily on me. There is a family tradition of giving at a time when you're able to. And I do -- I do take some heart in a conversation I had with a fellow in New York City. His name was Ezra zilkah. He's Jewish. He was born in Baghdad. Not a great place to be born as a Jew. Born sometime ago there. Immigrated here in the 1950's, as I recall. He became very successful as a businessman in New York City. We were talking about American politics and what's happening to the country. He said, mitt, what concerns me today about America is that politics has become a profession, not a duty. And I definitely fall in the category of those who serve out of a sense of duty. This is not my profession. My profession was working in the private sector, was building a business. I started off as

a consulting business, which I was a young guy in and worked my way through that organization and began a venture capital company, which became more successful. I learned a lot as I went along. Answering questions in each segment can be somewhat challenging. I remember as a young consultant, I had just graduated from business school and only been out two or three years, as I recall, when I was asked to take out an assignment at a company that makes long underwear. The John Morgan Knitting Mills. I was sent to Pennsylvania. Mr. Morgan was in his 70's or so. He wanted to spruce up his company, make it more successful and prepare it for sale. He was nearing retirement age. I was sent there to do this job and I took a junior with me. There was someone more junior than me who hadn't gone to business school. We came into John Morgan's office, sat down. He was reading some papers. He looked up from the papers and he stood up. He was a big guy, like 6'5", 6'6". He put both hands in the air. Men, men! I needed men and they sent me boys. That sort of puts you on your heels as to how you're possibly going to be able to help him in a setting like that. The improbable course of my career continued, as I got involved in venture capital and either starting a business as an entrepreneur or acquiring a business. Acquiring a business from someone else is kind of a gutsy thing to do. One of the last companies I helped acquire was Domino's Pizza. Not by the slice. We bought the whole company. And you think about the likelihood that you're going to make money as an investor when you're buying a business, in this case from Tom Monaghan, the guy that opened the very first Domino's Pizza store. He opened the first one, built it himself, and built it to a multi-thousand dollar outlet chain, billions of revenues. I'm sitting there writing a check. He's decided now is the best time to sell and he's gone out and hired a bank to shop at everybody in the world. We're the poor guys who said we'll pay more than anybody else. What's the likelihood you're going to make money at that? Not very good. Both from the consulting experience, which ended up being successful, and then the venture capital and private equity experience, which ended up being pretty successful, I learned there is an approach to solving tough problems and to taking advantage of opportunities other people don't see. And the approach is not very complicated. It begins by saying, assemble the right people. Build an extraordinary team of leaders. Whatever endeavor you're embarked upon, bringing in people who have different backgrounds, different perspectives who are willing to debate with one another, who are deliberative and thoughtful, bring in good people. Tom Stemberg of Staples used to say to me, you always want around your flat side. I didn't know what he meant. He said everybody has a flat side, some things they don't do so well. You want to bring in a team that rounds the flat sides of the other members. That was number one. Number two was gathering the data. Don't just work from opinion but actually go out and gather information. Learn what's going on. Learn about the customers and the competitors and the challenges and differences in currency rates. Look at what your suppliers are doing and understand the cost structure of your business. Every piece of data you can get. In consulting I used to call it wallowing in the data. In the first days of an assignment, consulting assignment I'd go to a client and say, I want to see all your data. They'd say like what? I'd say all of it. Let me have access to everything you have. Back then it was boxes and boxes. Now you'd probably sit down with a computer and get it done easily. But let me see all the data. Why? Because my team and I want to look at it, analyze it, see if there are relationships, see if we can learn something from the history and relationships that exist in the data. Then third, with the right people and the right data we looked to see

if there were hypotheses, if there were possible answers, if we could develop together a strategy, a course of action that would take advantage of opportunities, solve problems, and then once we set upon that strategy we benchmarked how we were doing. We'd implement it; see if we were making progress according to milestones. If we got off those milestones or benchmarks we knew we made a mistake, it was time to go back to review our strategy or if we were implementing it. That was the process. And it worked in the private second to. I wondered would it work in the Olympics. I got there and found the Olympics was like any big enterprise. It has some difference in the way you worked with people. My board was 53 people. That's a little large. They were all appointed by politicians so that meant they were looking for different things than a board that was appointed by shareholders. But we were able to get the job done. Then I came back to Massachusetts and wondered again, will that approach of leadership, and will that work in the private sector? And it worked gangbuster. In part because it's not done very often in the private public sector where you actually bring in people of differing backgrounds. You may know that I had a number of what I called super cabinet secretaries. Cabinet secretaries responsible for other multiple cabinet secretaries. I think there were probably four or five in total of these super cabinet secretaries. Two of them were in the opposition party. Doug Foyer announced he had sued Massachusetts more than anybody. I put him in my cabinet. I wanted someone with critical thinking and knew where we were making mistakes. Number, two data. When people came in with a problem I wanted data, not just opinion. At the very early days of my administration, this guy Tom Stemberg from Staples came into me and said, Mitt, if you want to help people you'll find a way to get everybody health insurance. And I said, Tom, I can't do. That because I'm not willing to raise taxes and that's what it would take. And I'm not willing to have a government take over healthcare. That's what else it would take. Then he said, I hear you. But if you want to help people find a way to get everybody health insurance. So I said goodbye to him, a little frustrated that he was obviously so ill informed. As time went on what he said began to wear on me. I said, you know, if this were a problem in an enterprise that I owned and ran, a business; I know what I'd do. I'd bring in a team of people that had different backgrounds, I'd start gathering data, start looking for relationships and see if we could come up with something. That's what I did. I got the head of a consulting firm in Boston. I got my old part capital, an investment banker were J. P. Morgan, a woman, Jamie Gillespie from the Olympics. I got actuaries. We'd meet and got no progress for a year. Couldn't see our way out of the problem. We gain gathering data. We had a professor from M.I.T., John Gruber who began gathering data about who didn't have insurance. Everything we saw was wrong. We thought the people who didn't have insurance in our state were people who were largely going to be minority, single moms, and that this was going to be a group that no insurance company would want to touch. They'd be uninsurable. Government would have to provide all their care. What we found out the majority of people were majority single males. And they were easily insurable. They were generally healthy. The reason they didn't have health insurance is they didn't think they needed it. We began saying some of the things we thought were simply wrong. Long and short of this was. You know, either being from Massachusetts or a neighbor of Massachusetts, we found a way to get everybody health insurance which did not require a new tax structure or new taxes, did not require the government getting more into healthcare. It actually allowed the government to get out of one portion of healthcare. So

the approach, the approach which I saw in the private sector very much works in the governmental sector. Oh, there are some differences, too. There's opposition that happens from time to time. You have to work differently. But the approach works well. I just know that federally our country faces some extraordinary challenges. And you know. That and also some amazing opportunities. In our political speak almost always about the challenges: Iraq, Iran, and violent jihad. For good reason. Those are right in our face and the most threatening things happening in the world today. A nuclear Iran is a very frightening threat to the world order and to peace and to our survival as humanity. And so they're a huge threat. But that's one challenge. We face other challenges. The emergence of Asia as a competitor is tough. A lot of you in manufacturing know that as you see jobs increasingly being competed for overseas. We're spending too much money. Our entitlements are out of whack. We're using too much oil. You heard the comments we talked about last night. Republicans talked about those challenges. Don't forget as well, we can deal with those problems. We can overcome them all. Americans always rise to the occasion as long as the leaders of the country tells the American people the truth, lays out the track that we have to follow to overcome the challenges, and then actually leads. Don't also forget that in addition to all those challenges, we now have opportunities of a generation or of a century. I touched on this real to get fleshed out in the days that come. That is the emergence of Asia is frightening news to one degree, for those of us who compete with Asian companies. It is also very exciting news. Because 1 billion people are having come in the work force over the last decade means 1 billion new consumers into the world market place. And we've had very little access to those consumers in the past. Now they're interested in buying medicines, medical equipment, software, and hardware. They're going to be interested in energy products that reduce co2 emissions. They'll be interested in fuel technologies, material science, some of the leading-edge technologies which we have they're going to want. We're going to have the opportunity to participate in a rapid growth part of the world. This can be the new frontier for the 21st century of America, the new economic frontier. Where we become more familiar with the broad expansion of Asia, we sell products and services and technologies and provide to our workers here and our entrepreneurs here whole newmarket places. If we just focus on the United States alone, we're only going to grow at 1, 1.5, 2%? Not even that fast, 1, 1% a year? If we pull up the drawbridge like our democratic friends are saying, pull up the drawbridge. We don't want to compete. We're going to grow at the rate of the American population. If we want to instead grow at high rates as we always have we're going to have to open our eyes to the world and keep on pursuing the vibrant policies that have led us to lead the world time and time again. Well, I'm going to take a breath here and take a turn from you to ask some questions. I'm excited about the future. I'm optimistic about what we face. Because I know we will overcome our challenges. We always have before. I have seen the heart of the American people. They rise to the occasion time and time again. I'm also excited because I see these opportunities. I see a chance for us to do something which our grandparents would have thought to be unimaginable, which is not only to compete in the Americas, not only to compete in Europe as we do, but to be able now to compete across the entire globe and to have Asia, with the extraordinary population of Asia, and the interest in so many things American, culturally in Asia, to have that open to our markets and to our technology and to our innovation and to our fundamental and core beliefs, that's a very exciting thing to me. With that I'm going to

say thank you for the chance to get together with you this morning. Your interest in politics in New Hampshire is something the entire nation ought to respect. I do. You sift through the candidates in a very personal way. You see, I know that a lot of people think that Iowa and New Hampshire play too key a role and maybe we should let a "more representative state" be the first in the nation. I disagree with. That I value the fact that Iowa and New Hampshire are able to take the time and have the interest to get to know the candidates on a personal basis. I have seen most of you before. You will see all of the candidates for president. You will make your decision not based on who has the best 30-second ad with the best announcer's voice that comes over the air. You will instead make your decision based on having looked in the face of the candidate for president and shaken his or her hand. That is a service the nation needs. You will know our character, whether we're real or phony. And it's a service that is valuable to this country. Thank you so very much.

[applause] >>

Governor Romney:

Now I see that there are a couple of microphones over there. So I guess the cameras here want to pick that up. If you have the microphone you can pass where it's going to go. >>

Welcome to New Hampshire. >>

Thank you. Good to be here. I spent the night in Wolfeboro last night. >> Lovely place.

I'm dick Stevens with the New Hampshire technology council. Last night's debate focused on three issues, one was Iraq and more appropriately what's the response to a global, religious-based terrorism. Second was conservatism and who is more conservative than the other candidates. And the third topic was religion. And it struck me as in listening to all the conservative candidates that there's a lot more in the religious agenda that doesn't fall into the standard conservatives, less government, lower taxes, promote business agenda. New Hampshire's a technology state. We've got a lot of scientists and engineers here and a lot of other smart people. And we hear that the world is flat and it's only 8,000 years old. How do we take you as a group seriously?

How do you take we as a group seriously? I think what you have in the group of people who were there a group of individuals that I think almost to a person, maybe one or two exceptions, who unlike the democratic party recognizes that we are facing global jihad. That was the first issue you mentioned. It's a huge distinction between our debates the one of two days before. The two days before you saw hope but not based on reality. To have a candidate for president like John Edwards say that there is not a war on terror, that's just a bumper sticker, who speaks a complete lack of understanding of what's going on in the world. It means he is not reading what's happened in Indonesia, or Nigeria and Thailand and Pakistan and Tanzania and Kenya and Egypt and Morocco and Madrid and London and in New York and in Boston and in Virginia. It means he thinks that somehow that this is all just about the United States. And as soon as we come home and

prosecute these people everything will be fine. There is war going on within the world of Islam. It's not just a clash of civilizations. It's a clash within a civilization. And the effort within that civilization is pretty straightforward, which is a narrow slice of radical, violent jihaddists of two very different types, shia and Sunni, are vying to take over all the governments of moderate Islam and replace them with the religious leadership. If that were to happen, and if an achminajad type leader, you would have a hitlerian circumstance again. The idea they would stop where they are and not continue to expand is not realistic. They talk about taking all land that has not been Muslim. That means England and France, too. Evil doesn't know a border. We have to recognize this is to us and to civilization broadly, a threat. That's the huge difference between us and the democrats. The second difference is, the republicans by and large understand how the economy works. We understand something that most people don't. I think if you were to ask the democrats at their debate, what happens with corporate profit? When you hear that a corporation is profitable, where does it go? I think most of them, if they had a multiple-choice answer would say, corporate profits go to pay executive's bonuses. You'd say, well, I got some news for you. Corporate profit is what's reported after the bonuses have been paid. So none of it goes to pay bonuses of executives. You'd say, oh, well then it goes to pay shareholders. Do you know what a small slice of corporate profit goes out to pay dividends? It's tiny. Most corporations in this room I would guess don't pay any dividends. Where do corporate profits go? To pay working capital and so the business can go. The best news the country can have is that corporate profits are growing and doing well. That means they can invest in growth. That's one of the great things about this country. We have concerns about oil profits, not because they're so profitable as much as from the fact they're not reinvesting it in capital and growth like they ought. To that's a real to us. And of course we're concerned about the money made by the nations that own the oil. Finally with regards to the religious issue, there may be some who try and project a particular brand of faith as they think about the course of America. I don't know that I saw that at all last night. There may have been a circumstance of it. I didn't hear that myself. I think the fundamental values of religious faith are shared among the people who were on the platform. That's a value that suggests that there is a creator, that we're all one family. I think that's a healthy value for us to recognize that people in Africa who are suffering are all part of our family as opposed to just saying; we don't care about anybody out there. Sometimes I'm dismayed by the fact that we appropriately recognize we have 3400 plus servicemen in our nation that have been killed in Iraq but we don't mention how many people in Iraq have been killed. I think we should mention the total casualties. It's very, very large indeed. As many as 100,000 more. We're a family of humanity. I think that's something that flows from religious conviction. There are other things that I think that flow from that conviction. One of them is that we should serve others, care for others. One is that liberty is a principle above and beyond practical at, that god has endowed humans with inalienable rights including our liberty. This is something we should value and promote elsewhere. Those are values I think that are part of a religious foundation that in my view are a meaningful part of America's discourse. But when it comes there's probably not as big a difference on religious values as there is on a war on jihad and what makes our economy work. And if we're going to win the war on jihad and take the advantage of an opportunity, the economic frontier of the 21st

century, we're going to need to have a republican president. Thank you. Good question. I'm going to let the guy with the microphone decide where these questions go. Go ahead.

Unknown Questioner:

>> The reputation of the United States has suffered in recent years on the international stage. There's even been some recent studies that have shown that majority of the world now hates Americans. Do you see this as a critical issue? What do you intend to do to address it? >>

Governor Romney:

Thank you. I do think that we have suffered over the past several years for a number of reasons. I think you probably know what they are. I think our entry into Iraq was seen by many as being a unilateral decision; it was not done on a collaborative basis. There were many nations that went along with us. But there were a number of others that were critical of us. We obviously have to reserve for ourselves the right to do what we think is in our best interests and in the best interests of others. And we took that action. But I think there has been the perception that we have not been as open and participative with other nations as is our normal approach. And I think what's going to have to happen, when a new president is elected, is to engage in an effort to build much closer ties to the nations of the world. There are a few countries, and a few people that have demonstrated themselves as being so evil that we will cut off our engagement with those countries. In my view, Achminajad and Castro are two of them. With most of the others, even those that are doing authoritative and outrageous acts like Putin in rush yeah, I don't want to cut off talking. I want to keep talking and keep the dialogue going and see if we can't pursue some of these nations and pursue human rights and open economies and the like. But I believe it will be couple on the next president to be incumbent to be active and let our other nations know they're welcome in the white house and our aid is of value to them in the world. We want to establish closer ties with our European friends, particularly now with president Sarkozy in France. I think it's interesting that whole world is looking to lower their taxes and the democrats are looking to raise ours. Sarkozy can be a blood brother, if you will, in this effort. We can't beat our chest about it by any means. But there is a great opportunity for America to reach out to the world and to establish closer working relationships. One of the ways I want to do that, by the way, is in something I call a partnership for progress and prosperity, which is bringing all of the nations of the world together. Not the U.N. The U.N., it plays a role. But the U.N. Has been really a disappointment. I mean, the U.N. Has not sanctioned. The U.N. Human rights council has not sanctioned Sudan for human rights violations. There's genocide going on there. They haven't sanctioned Sudan. They have, however, sanctioned Israel I think nine times. The organization is broken. But we need to bring together the civilized nations of the world to work together to ask nations like Jordan and turkey and Egypt, how do we help moderate Islamic states have stronger underpinnings of stability and democracy so that these states can lead in the effort to defeat the jihad? Because we can't go around the world fighting the jihad everywhere ourselves. They're going to have to do it. Ultimately they're the best course. So these kinds of efforts to rebuild our relationships on a personal basis and then to link in important and meaningful entities and alliances like this partnership I'm describing I think will rebuild that trust. And something else I think is important to

remember for those that get a his discouraged whenever you go somewhere. Whenever you saw miss universe, the clips of miss universe being hosted in Mexico and the crowds booing because she was American. And you see that and you think, gosh, what's going on there? And I've asked a couple of my friends that are from outside the country. What's going on? What's the attitude? They're saying, we're a little angry with you right now. We're angry at how badly you've messed up Iraq and other things that anger us, the perception you're unilateralists and you don't care about what anybody does. Fundamentally you want to know in our heart of hearts we want a strong America, we believe in America. Whenever things are really tough we know we turn to America. I had a meeting with a small group of people at the home of the consul general of Israel that was in Boston. And the former prime minister of Israel came to Boston, shimon peres. One of them said what do you think about the conflict in Iraq? He said I want to put this in context. In the annals of history America is unique. In history whenever there's war, the nation that loses has to give up land to the nation that wins. And he said, one nation in the history of the world has laid down hundreds of thousands of lives and taken no land for itself. That was during this last century. First world war and the Second World War. America took no land from the Germans, no land from the Japanese. America, all America takes is enough land to bury our dead. America fights for freedom, for freedom-loving people like ourselves and our friends around the world. That fact is not lost on the people of the world. America is loved fundamentally, our people are loved fundamentally. But we can do a better job reminding people we will work with them to build a stronger and safer world. Thank you.

Unknown Questioner:

>> Good morning, governor. >> Good morning. >> Thousands of our children here in New Hampshire do not have access to quality early learning or childcare programs. And thousands more are unsupervised when they get out of school in the afternoons. Could you tell me what you would do to help ensure that our youngest, most vulnerable citizens are safe and cared for while their parents are at work? >>

Governor Romney:

Yeah. There are a couple of things. One, I'm a big believer in effective long school days. And I was with governor Schwarzenegger in California. He told me about a program they're which I thought was a very good one. We've tried to pioneer this in our state as well of Massachusetts. They did it there, I think through ballot initiative. That is that they have a program that schools can apply for to get funding for after-school programs to keep the kids in school until 4:00, 5:00 in the afternoon. I think it's a good idea. By the way, they don't have the teachers stay all day. They instead have groups like boys and girls clubs or others that come into the school, manage sport programs, study halls, cultural learning programs and so forth that they have school in operation throughout the entire day. I think that's a great idea. And encourage that as a philosophy generally. With regards to early education programs, of course, I'd like to look at the data and see which of those are successful and which are not. In my own state I looked at some of the head start data. And I must admit to not having been very impressed that head start was

accomplishing a great deal more than just childcare. And childcare is fine. It's a good service for adults. But in terms of actually educating kids and preparing them for the demands of a school, it didn't seem that they were making the kind of progress you'd hope for. So I want to look and see what kind of progress they're actually going to make. One thing I will note, that is the most important work that goes on for the future in America is the work that goes on in the four walls of the American home. In my state I was concerned when I saw the number of kids being born out of wedlock. It is really tough to have an after-school program and a before-school program of moms if there's just a single parent trying to manage their life and their kids' life. There are some fabulous and remarkable single moms and single dads and grandparents raising kids. But it is nonetheless a huge advantage if you have a mom and a dad with the nurturing of a child. And I think it's important for us to do our very best to encourage kids to finish high school and then after high school if they fall in love to get married, and after they're married to have babies. And we somehow have gotten that upside down in the last couple of decades in this country. Let me note in that regard, I was meeting with some teachers in one of my cities and asked them how they could tell me kids in their schools are going to do better or worse and which kids are going to be the best kids? They said, well, it's pretty simple. We don't have any failing kids if the mom and dads show up at parent-teacher nights. If the moms and dads are concerned about their child's education the kids are just fine. I resolved to myself at that point, I want people to get married before they have kids and two to be involved in the education of their child. I'm still fighting for something didn't get passed by my legislature yet. The idea is this: most of our schools in Massachusetts are doing superbly well. As a matter of fact, a state average school is ranked number one in America. So doing pretty well on average. But about 10% of our schools are leaving a lot of kids behind. Mostly our urban schools but not all. And I said, I'd like to have a proposal, a provision in Massachusetts that the parents of the kids in the bottom 10% of schools, that those parents must attend a parental preparation class before they send their child off to school for the first time, where they learn about the education culture here, they learn about what good after-school programs are available in their community, what preschool programs and childcare programs are available to them that they learn about what TV to watch, what TV not to watch, they learn about discipline in school, homework in school, parent-teacher night. I think we need to make it clear that parenting is integrally involved with teaching and that teachers and parents are partners in this effort. Getting back to your original question, making sure that we have funding for a longer school day is in my opinion a very high priority. Thank you. There's the man with the microphone.

Unknown Questioner

Good morning. >>

Governor Romney:

Good morning. >>

Unknown Questioner

Speaking of families, and back to the military, what would you propose or what are your thoughts on strengthening the military families? For young enlisted family, they actually

qualify for food stamps. And we're going to start experiencing troop fatigue and people not re-enlisting or people not stepping up to enlist, officer and enlisted. What are your thoughts on military families? >>

Governor Romney:

There are two things at least we're going to have to do to strengthen our military and support our military families. One is increase the number of men and women in the military. One of the reasons we've had so many active tours of duty, people going back into combat settings, which is probably the toughest thing on a military family there is, is that we have too few troops. And therefore the rotations are faster as they go back into combat settings. We need to therefore increase our military by at least 100,000. Following the collapse of the cold war, bill Clinton and others spoke about a holiday -- excuse me, they spoke about a dividend, a peace dividend. And we got the dividend but we didn't get the peace. There is still evil in the world. They reduced our military in the years that followed by some 500,000 troops. We're going to have to add back at least 100,000 and probably more so that when we have a combat setting we don't have the kind of rotations that make it so hard on our families. Secondly, we're going to have to improve the benefits associated with being in our military to attract an additional 100,000 or 200,000 men and women. We're going to have to improve those benefits. By the way, that does work. A g.i. Type bill does work when you're looking to recruit people. In our state we had our national guard was losing enrollment every year. After several years of that happening, the legislature and I got together and proposed and put together a bill, which was ultimately called the welcome home bill. I called it the Massachusetts g.i. Bill but we changed the name to the welcome home bill. And in that bill we said, if anybody signs up for the National Guard in our state, they get four years tuition and fees free in any Massachusetts public institution of higher learning. That then took our enrollments up 30% the next year. So we need to make sure that we have benefits programs that are consistent with the needs that our people have. And I believe that -- you know, I hate to say it but evil exists in the world. You go back to the very beginning, can killed able. There has been evil from the very beginning of time. And I believe there will continue to be. I don't know how long this violent jihad will go on. But if you look around the world and see what's happening, you have to say to yourself that America must remain strong. The best peace ever known in this world has been a strong America. I believe we're going to need additional troops, we need to spend additional funding on the equipment our troops need on the battlefield and we're going to need to spend the additional money our veterans need and deserve when they come home. That's the other point I want to make. There's been such a shift in veteran's expenses. I think I can get the numbers pretty close to right. During the second world war, either the first or second world war, for each soldier killed there were two that came back that were badly injured. Two. And so the cost of the veterans system had to deal with those two per death. Now it's 16 come home for every one killed. Which talks about our fabulous medical system out there to get people, get them treated and so forth. We're doing a great job. But it means we have 16 people coming home. For every one you hear about that's been killed. Another 16 have come home with major injuries. That means our veterans care system is going to have to be up to snuff to make sure our soldiers are getting the kind of care and treatment they

deserve. Thank you. Great question. I think I'm going to have to let you folks go to work. I could keep you here all day and make sure you never get anything done. Why don't we take one more question.

Mike Harrington:

Mike Harrington following up on a question asked earlier about the diminution of our global standing. I hope I'm paraphrasing you correctly, but I think I heard from the early south Carolina debate your advocacy for the retention of Guantanamo bay and the enlargement of the capacity in an effort to suggest also negating efforts to provide appropriate legal advice is at least what I heard as a sound bite or part of that particular debate. Could you, just out of my puzzlement looking at the global problem, address that issue further as to the basis of those comments, if I'm accurately conveying what you said.

Governor Romney:

Thank you, actually, I think some people see Guantanamo bay as a source of America's arrogance. I see it as a source of America's resolve. I believe that people recognize that we are in a global fight against terror and that there are people who are trying to kill members of their own society and our society, and that bringing them to this country and treating them like criminals as opposed to like violent war perpetrators is a mistake. When the mastermind of 9/11 was picked up, the first thing he said to the people in the C.I.A. Who got him was, i'll see you in new york and you can talk to my lawyer. That's what he said. Well, we saw him in Guantanamo bay where he did not speak with his lawyer. And instead, over a long period of time was questioned. And through the questioning that was given to khalid sheik Mohammed, the head of the C.I.A. Said we were able to stop and infiltrate numerous attacks on this country and others. I believe in having a process where we don't take these guys who are blowing us up, who are not part of any army or nation. We don't bring them into New York, assign them a counsel because they can't afford one themselves so one is afforded to them and they come into our court system. That is not the way that wars are fought. We are -- again this is a distinction between ourselves and the democrats. They believe this is a criminal activity that we need to give them lawyers and bring them into the courthouses. That's not what's going on here. Look around the world. And look how people who are dealing with this issue are dealing with it. And in my view we need to have a place where we can bring in very, very dangerous people to interrogate them, to learn what we can. Of course we're not going to torture them. We do not torture. I have to be honest with you. It made me somewhat angry when I heard people keep talking about we has to stop American torture. That is not what we do. We do not torture people. But we do take these people. And I've been to Guantanamo bay, as have relief agencies from all over the world. I think the number is in the hundreds of visits that have been made by various organizations without complaint. It's a very -- I took the head of my prison system down there. We took the head of my prison. She said, "I have some advice for you." she said, "it's too laxs down there. You've made it too open, too much congregation space. It's too dangerous. You

guys are being too nice down there." the food down there is unbelievable. This is not this gulag. This is a modern prison which treats people with dignity and respect, where we have interrogators -- by the way, I won't go through all the techniques but I spent some time with kofer black who used to be in charge of the cray's counter terror network for the C.I.A. He said the best information you get from the people is to have good cop, bad cop. You work with people over a matter of months and months. You don't torture them or do anything like torture. You don't get the best information. The only time you use those aggressive interrogation techniques that don't rise to the area of torture is if someone thinks there's a bomb going off in the next 24 hours. Then you can't use the old slow process. You have to use something not as good but that's all you got. That hasn't happened there that I know of there. But I believe it's important for us as we look at our posture around the world to reach out to the world, to talk to the world, but not to cower. I think we gain the greatest respect and admiration of the world when we're shown as being strong and having resolve and strong leadership and not backing away anytime some of the mainstream media said, oh, you ought to do this, or some nation says, no. Here's what we're doing. Here's why we're doing it. We're going to work with you and collaborate with you on the things that are most important. That's my own view. This is quite a time. Every time you run for office or you see a politician get up and run for office, they tell you it's a critical election. This is a critical election. Maybe they're all critical. I don't know. But we're at one of those junction points in American history, one of those inflexion points where we're either going to take a turn where the leadership of our country will be Nancy Pelosi, Hillary Rodham Clinton, where you will have single payer socialized medicine where the government is going to take over healthcare. 70% of your economy will be managed by the government. And it will be creeping but they'll take it over. Where there's going to be increasing effort to pull up the drawbridge so we don't compete overseas. We're going to talk about all these excuses to try to keep from trading overseas, which means the opportunities to sell products overseas will be restricted just as much. As you know, we're enormously successful as a society because we do trade overseas. But they're going to try to reign that in. They're going to be taking this country in a very different direction. They'll see the jihad as an effort that's on over there. So if we just bring everybody home we won't worry about what's going on over there. They're going to be weakening our military. I say we're for strong military, strong economy, strong families. If democrats are elected we'll have a weaker military. Why is that? They'll have to bring down military spend to go fund their social programs. We'll have a weaker economy for the reasons I mentioned in terms of competing globally, and because they'll have to raise your taxes. One thing you saw in the democratic debate. I think every single candidate said they will raise taxes. And if they raise taxes on anybody in this country, that means less money going into innovation, into technology, into new businesses, and it means more money going into government for programs. That will slow the economy. And then with regards to family and family values, I'd say the same thing. So this is watershed election. And I need all your help and all your money. With that, thanks so much.

[applause]

Michael Chaney:

Thank you, governor Romney. And that concludes this morning's program. We'll be back to you with future candidates in the weeks ahead. Take care. Captioning performed by Ins captioning www.Inscaptioning.com >>

New Hampshire public television is proud to be a partner of this politics and eggs broadcast and a video archives project. Politics and eggs is a project of the New Hampshire political library and the New England council, with support from b.a.e. Systems. Clean harbors environmental services. And fidelity investments. Captioning performed by Ins captioning www.Inscaptioning.com