The original documents are located in Box 119, folder "Medicare" of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Digitized from Box 119 of The Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library

January 23, 1976

SUBJECT:

MEDICARE IMPROVEMENTS

Stuart Auerbach's piece in the <u>Post</u> this morning cites a Senate Finance and House Ways and Means analysis that the President's estimates for the number of Medicare recipients who would benefit from his hospital ceiling proposal would be only 25,000 (We said 1 million.), and the number of beneficiaries of the "catastrophic illness" provision would be only 1.5 million. (We said 2 million.) The report was supposedly based on Social Service Admin. figures.

How do you account for this numerical discrepancy? Do you claim that your figures are more correct than the Social Security Administration's?

GUIDANCE: First of all, the President firmly believes that we must protect the elderly against the devastating cost of prolonged hospitalization, and that this is the most efficient means of aiding these people. (If Senator Kennedy has a better idea, why doesn't he come right out and say it?)

> The numbers used in the President's proposal came from the Social Security Administration, and the S.S.A. stands by those figures. In fact, Auerbach did indicate that if the President's proposals were adopted, our numbers would be accurate, but that statement is buried in the body of the article.