

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual collections.

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: 1980 Campaign Papers,
1965-1980

Series: XV: Speech Files (Robert Garrick and Bill Gavin)

Subseries: A: Bob Garrick File

Folder Title: 1975

(Copies of Press Conferences and Statements) (2 of 2)

Box: 431

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digitized-textual-material>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

<https://www.reaganlibrary.gov/archives/white-house-inventories>

Contact a reference archivist at: **reagan.library@nara.gov**

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/research-support/citation-guide>

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Charlotte, North Carolina

Q. Governor, in New Hampshire this morning you said you'd be delighted to release financial and medical records. When do you plan to do that, and are you planning to include a copy of your 1974 Income Tax Return?

A. I don't know whether it will include that. The question, if I remember it, was precisely, would I submit any financial records that indicated whether there was or was not a conflict of interest in any way, and my health record. The health records, yes. The other, based on that where there's a conflict of interest, I still believe that even in public life there are certain areas of privacy that anyone is entitled to, but I will do whatever is necessary with regard to conflict of interest or anything that the public has a right to know.

Q. Governor, yesterday in Washington you included big business along with Congress, but bureaucracy, lobbyists and big labor, as being those forces which brought us our problems. Exactly how has big business brought us our troubles?

A. Well, many big businessmen today, I'm happy to say, or those in the management of so-called big business, the corporations, are very much aware that they themselves, in an effort of self-preservation, as government has grown bigger, instead of fighting back, have accepted government regulations and government involvement in them to the place that there's almost an interlocking bureaucracy in many instances today. A bureaucracy of business which is now involved with representing business in the dealings with the government bureaucracy. And, as I say, I'm happy that they're showing an awareness that this has been going down a road of appeasement.

So this is what is on my mind, of where they, too, must recognize that they're going to have to answer the question themselves, that do they believe in the marketplace, do they believe in free enterprise enough to walk away from even those regulations which, in many instances, have been distorted to prevent entry of competitors into their field.

Q. Governor, in the wake of yesterday's incidence in Miami, what is happening, in your opinion, to this country? The current wave of assassinations, crime. Is it indicative of the modd in this country? What in your opinion does it show?

A. Oh, I think still it's a kind of heritage of the 60's and the disturbances we had. We do know that there's an estimated 15,000 people who are dedicated to terrorism, who call themselves terrorists, associated with roughly some 21 different sects or organizations. Now, I'm sure that they're for real and that they do have terrorist tactics in mind. But I think that kind of a climate generates something of the kind we saw yesterday. Now, obviously, the threat could not have been that physical in as much as he was carrying a toy gun instead of a real one. It was symbolic, and there's nothing more that I can comment now on him, because he has been charged and so therefore that puts it into the realm of the courts, and I'm not going to take any chance of saying anything that's going to impede justice there.

But I think that this is what we're seeing that, in addition to the normal thing you can expect of people, abberations of one kind or another, who sometimes cause tragedies and then crime, basic crime, we have this demonstration complex, this thing of take to the streets to make your wants and your desires known. You know, if all of us would face up to it and respond and call it what it is, there isn't really anything in this country that requires demonstrations. The greatness of this country is that the very structure of the country and the Constitution has made it possible

for the people to have redress of grievances and to make their wants and desires known through orderly channels to government. But I think that we just have to put up with this and recognize that it goes along with the present-day climate.

Q. Governor, do you have a choice for a running mate?

A. Not, it's pretty early for that. I still believe that while a Presidential candidate, if he becomes the candate, the party does him the courtesy of asking his recommendations or hwat he would like, but still the party should make the choice.

Q. Governor, you said a moment ago that there really wasn't anything in this country that requires demonstrations because of other ways of solving the problem. Do you think that blacks in the South needed to demonstrate to get the right to vote?

A. Well, you've asked a very difficult question there and a very complicated one because I happen to be of a generation where I think the first change began. When I was young, and the age of those young people in the band out there, I have often stated publicly that the real tragedy was then that we didn't even know we had a racial problem. It wasn't even recognized. But our generation, and I take great pride in this, we were the ones who first of all recognized that and then began doing something about it.

I have called attention to the fact that when I was a sports announcer, broadcasting major league baseball, most Americans have forgotten that at that time the opening line of the official baseball guide read, "baseball is a game for Caucasian gentlemen," and in organized baseball no one but Caucasians were allowed. Well, there were many of us, when I was broadcasting, sportswriters, sportscasters, myself included, who began editorializing about what a ridiculous thing this was and why it should be changed.

And one day it was changed. When the first bombs were dropped on Pearl Harbor, there was great segregation in the military forces. In World War II this was corrected, and it was corrected, very largely, under the leadership of generals in the Pacific like MacArthur and General Eisenhower, Commander-in-Chief in the European Theater, and in the Navy. One great story that I think of the time that reveals the changes that were occurring was when the Japanese dropped the bombs on Pearl Harbor. There was a Negro sailor but whose total duties involved kitchen-type duties and cooking and so forth who cradled a machine gun in his arms, which is not an easy thing to do, and stood in the end of a pier, blazing away at Japanese airplanes that were coming down and strafing him, and that was all changed. And we went on with those developments.

I am not sure that violent demonstrations accomplished anything, probably actually contributed to the prejudice of some people who were able to say, "see, I told you so." Demonstrations of the orderly and the peaceful kind are entirely different. Yes. there are times when people must organize and raise a flag, but I suppose I should have added to demonstrations the word "violent" and the taking to the streets and the stoning of buildings and this sort of thing. But, anyway, the progress had already been underway, and thank God for it because I think everyone in this country and in every section of it agrees that we're better off.

Q. Why should North Carolinians vote for you in the North Carolina Primary as opposed to an incumbent President?

A. Well, I'll hope to make that clear in the coming days of the campaign when I'll state what I believe, the programs I believe should be implemented in government, the course that I think government should take, and I suppose the other candidate, or if there're other candidates, they'll do the same. Then the people can make their own decision as to why they should vote for me if they approve of what I'm proposing.

Q. Governor Reagan, getting back to the question of demonstrations, how do you feel about demonstrations that are not violent but are illegal in terms of laws that are on the books, such as sit-in's in this very state in the early 1960's?

A. Well, there're illegal and there're illegal possibly because they actually violate the rights of others. Government exists to protect us from each other, and the sit-in's, the occupation of someone else's property, the preventing of others from going about their regular business, that's illegal because it is an invasion of the rights of other people.

Q. Do you think they were wrong to demonstrate with sit-in's in North Carolina?

A. I think the sit-in's or the demonstrations...there can never be justification for breaking the law. There are ways by which you can demonstrate your cause without violating the rights of others.

Q. Governor Reagan, have you written off the black vote in this nation?

A. Written off the black vote? I sure haven't. As a matter of fact, I think that one of the education programs that's needed is to show the minority communities, and particularly the black community, that they have far more to gain from Republican philosophy than they do from that of our opposing party. If I had written off the black vote, I would not have done what I did in California as Governor. I appointed more members of the black community in California to executive and policy-making positions than all the previous governors of California put together. I appointed them, not only because there was simple justice in it, but because they were damn well qualified to do the jobs.

Q. Another question, am I mistaken you proposed cutting federal spending by about 90 billion dollars by requiring individual states to pick up much of the federal burden in the areas of welfare, aid to education, housing,

community development and medical improvement systems. How will the states be able to do this, especially the poorer states? For a fact, North Carolina will run the risk of deficit spending the next fiscal year. How can North Carolina afford these programs?

A. Well, because the 90-billion-dollar figure was based on what would be the reduction at the federal level, based on the '76 budget. If those programs, which I believe should properly be administered at the local and the state level, were returned to local and state authority. I also stated at the time that obviously this would not be a net gain because the local governments would then have taxes of their own to take over this service. But the reduction at the federal level, which is confiscating so much of the tax dollar, that the local governments are virtually prohibited from increasing taxes because of the burden on the people already. But if you had that reduction at the federal level, there would be leeway, then, for local governments if they wanted to implement those same programs to take them over. Part of the gain would be because I think there are a number of federal programs that local government would not even bother with because they are not rendering a service to the people. But also there would be additional gain in that those programs in our own experience in California we're convinced can be run more economically and at lesser cost than they can at the federal level.

Q. Governor, do you think that the court decisions on equal public accommodations and schools were a result of demonstrations in the South?

A. I don't know whether they were a result of demonstrations or not, but if we're talking about busing, all of us, I think, have come to the realization of the great majority of the people in this country, of both races, that whatever the intention might have been, they haven't done the job. As a matter of fact, the Washington Post recently published a poll indicating that less than nine percent of the black community and

four percent of the white community approved busing. Now that leaves you 90 to 95 percent of the people in this country, of both races, who know that that's a failure. Coretta King has recently come out with a statement against it. A number of others, including our own Superintendent of Education in California, who is black, have come out opposing busing.

Q. Governor Reagan, a survey last week of GOP chairmen in North Carolina, of the 80 that were contacted, 39 percent favored President Ford and 31 percent favored your nomination. What does that say to you?

A. Well, that says to me that that's a pretty good chunk for a fellow who wasn't a candidate at the time.

Nofziger: One more question, gentlemen, and then we're going to have to close this off because we're running late.

Q. Governor Reagan, you say you don't want to cause a split in North Carolina's Republican Party. Yet, how can divisiveness in the party be avoided with the Governor so strongly supporting President Ford?

A. Well, all I can cite is our own California experience where we have campaigned now through several elections. Ever since we learned our lesson in the great debacle of 1964, we have maintained a united party because we simply go forward on the basis that I described, of candidates campaigning not against each other in the sense of calling names or being critical of each other, but stating what they believe, going forward in that way and then the theory being that the rank-and-file membership of the party makes their decision who should be the standard bearer on the basis of the case each one presents. And, I don't believe there's any need for this to be divisive. Gerald Ford and I have known each other for a great many years. I'm a friend of your Governor, Governor Holzhauser, I certainly defend his right to support the candidate of his choice, but I am equally convinced if I should be the victor that Governor Holzhauser would support me, just as if my opponent is the victor, I will support him.

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Charlotte, North Carolina

Q. Governor, in New Hampshire this morning you said you'd be delighted to release financial and medical records. When do you plan to do that, and are you planning to include a copy of your 1974 Income Tax Return?

A. I don't know whether it will include that. The question, if I remember it, was precisely, would I submit any financial records that indicated whether there was or was not a conflict of interest in any

Crossfiled Under:

Business 1-2

Crime 2-3

Blacks 3-4, 5

~~Social Security~~ 5

Federal Spending 5-6

Discrimination 5-6

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Manchester, New Hampshire

Q. Governor, since your political objective has to be to knock Gerald Ford out of the box, really to demolish him, how can this be called a sweet, gentle, gentlemanly exercise?

A. Well, again, I have to explain what my own theory or belief is about a primary, and I think it's a belief that's held by a great many people in the party, that you obviously recognize that basically you have certain beliefs together or you wouldn't be in the same party. You stand up and you literally campaign against the opponents, against the opposing party. You present your case, your beliefs, what you think should be done. The other candidates in your party do the same thing. It's like an audition; the rank-and-file membership of the party makes the decision as to which one of you should carry the party banner. And in so doing, they not only approve the individual, whomever they select, they've approved the views that he has presented. You unite then behind the winner. The purpose of this is not just a case of sweetness and light; it's a very common-sense purpose. And we saw the reverse of it in 1964. The Democrats didn't have to think of anything. All they had to do was repeat what Republicans had said about our candidate, other Republicans had said about him in the primary. No Republican should ever say anything about another Republican in the primary that the Democrats could then use against that opponent, if he became the candidate.

Q. Aren't you just talking about the rhetoric, though? I was addressing myself to the substance of the campaign. You challenge the President and you're really out to destroy him, aren't you?

A. No, no. The substance of the campaign...the other day one of you asked me some questions similar to this and about how you could have differences. Now, this particular individual had been along the trail and heard me say the same thing about three or four times in speeches to different audiences and wasn't even aware I pointed out and I said I've differed with the President in my speeches. I've differed when I say what I believe should be done with regard to Cuba and Panama. I never mentioned him. I never pointed a finger at him and said he is wrong and shouldn't do this. I said this is what I believe should be done with regard to those two particular incidences.

Now, he in turn will campaign as to why he thinks something else should be done on them, and the people will make the decision as to whom they think is right. And, yet, it isn't necessary to attack anyone on that. You simply say this is what I believe. Sure, there will be disagreements. I disagreed at the time that he signed the tax bill. As a matter of fact, I described that I thought that he gave a fine veto message up to the last sentence.

Q. But, Governor, aren't the personal qualities that the man has have something to do with deciding you to be a major opponent? What do you think of Gerald Ford and his brand of leadership?

A. Gerald Ford and I...I think we have a friendship that's gone back over the years. We've shared the campaign trail many times on behalf of Republican causes and candidates. The people, again, will make that assessment. That's not for me to make or for him to make.

Q. Is he qualified to be the President?

A. He's President.

Q. Governor Reagan, now you've been talking yesterday at various stops about how the people were tired of the intrusiveness of the federal government. How do you feel about the revelations of the FBI and CIA activities, particularly the FBI's pursuit of Dr. Martin Luther King?

A. Well, I've heard charges...I haven't, I must confess, been able to keep up with everything, as many of you know who have been on these speaking trips that I've been on. You don't get very much of a chance to see the paper or to hear the news, and you have to wait until you get home and try to catch up. So, I can't say that I have followed all of it, but what little bit I have been able to see is that there are charges that have been made. Now, we'd ought to be very careful. There's been an awful lot in this country lately of the charge being taken as the conviction. And we'd better wait until we know what the answer is, all the charges have been sifted, and we know whether they're true or not. To see a headline that someone proposed that Martin Luther King commit suicide, and then you find out that the man didn't say that at all; he quoted some message or letter that had phraseology that someone had interpreted as meaning that. He himself said that he did not believe that, that was what the intent of the letter was. This was the man making many of the charges.

I'm concerned about what might turn out to be hysteria with regard to both the CIA and the FBI. The FBI is more than just a police agency that's supposed to go and investigate a crime, if someone's committed a crime. One of the things that the Commission I was on was to investigate whether the CIA had passed over the jurisdictional line and was invading the province of the FBI with regard to domestic counterintelligence. Now, counterintelligence is a little different than just crime fighting. Counterintelligence means that organization is supposed to be checking to see if there is subversive movement domestically that is threatening the security of the United States. Now this means that organization has to go very quietly about the business of investigating someone whose actions might indicate that he has that kind of motive. If it turns out that he doesn't have that kind of motive, then no one ever hears anything about it,

it just goes away. And I think over the years the FBI has done a remarkable job of that.

I think back to my own experience in Hollywood back in 1947, when there was no question about the plot to take over the domination of the motion picture industry for subversive purposes. A number of unions had been infiltrated and taken over. There were front organizations that ostensibly had one cause but really had another. And I know the FBI's involvement, somewhat, in that, in trying to determine, was there a subversive force, a fifth-column type of force at work in this country. And, yet, they didn't go running out to publish stories that we suspect someone of anything of that kind. And before we let hysteria take over, I think that we'd better make sure that we have all the facts and that they have not been doing what they were supposed to do. Granted, there'll be errors in that.

Q. Governor Reagan, as a member of that Commission, did you hear about infiltration on Capitol Hill at the time Barry Goldwater says there was?

A. Ah, Lordy, I'm trying to remember...You see, we were limited in what we were supposed to investigate. There were things that came to our attention that we did pass on but did not go through with the investigation, such as the alleged assassination plots and so forth. Our assignment--

Q. Do you recall anything about the (unintelligible)?

A. No, I'm just trying to recall because I do remember that it came to our attention that there has been a tripling or quadrupling of Soviet espionage and counterintelligence in the United States in the last few years at the very moment when we ourselves were trying to restrict ours. But I do not believe, I do not recall any specific reference, to Capitol Hill or anything of that kind.

Q. What would be the emphasis of the FBI in your Administration? Would it be espionage investigation, infiltration of U.S. troops by aliens, or would it be crime fighting, the underworld investigation and that sort of thing?

A. Well, if I were in that position, I can assure you that the Administration would never suggest that any of the organizations do anything that was contrary to the purpose for which they were established and certainly would not ask them to engage in any illicit activities.

Q. Is Gerald Ford part of the buddy system that you referred to yesterday?

A. Well, I specified Congress and big business and big labor and the bureaucracy. I think, however, that after many years in Washington, it isn't easy for someone perhaps to make the changes that have to be made. There are personal relationships involved, long association with many agencies and bureaus and departments, and maybe that's why there should be a limitation on how long somebody sticks around in government.

Q. Mr. Reagan, if he were reelected--or elected--would that be four more years of business-as-usual as you referred to yesterday?

A. If he were reelected? Well, that's up for him to state. Again, I'm going to say what I think should be done.

Q. Were you suggesting a limitation on Presidential terms or a limitation of holding federal office? You said that maybe they'd been there too long.

A. Well, when I said that it was a speculation. Many of those things have been advanced. There have been proposals, as you know, by members of the legislature that perhaps there should be a limitation on the number of terms. There have been many proposals recently of a single Presidential six-year term instead of the present four and seek reelection. All of those, I suppose, are aimed at the idea of trying to get around the problem of people, for example, Congressmen elected every two years, constantly running, constantly doing the job with one hand, but with the other hand, working toward the next election.

Q. Governor, you said yesterday that you want to see detente continued even though you want us to be stronger militarily, but then you were critical of the Vladivostok Agreement. How would we maintain detente if we repudiated that SALT agreement, said it was too favorable to the Soviets, we wanted to renegotiate it, which, I gather, is what you're talking about.

A. Well, the renegotiation is one in which, as Mel Laird himself said in his article, the Soviet Union approaches a negotiation of that kind with regard to the emphasis on wording. And then they try to find places where they cannot be accused of actually subverting, of just violating the agreement, but they stand up innocently and claim that no, this is what they meant by the choice of words. Therefore, what they're doing is within their...I've had a little experience with that on the domestic scene back in that same 1947 period. I've also had some experience just with bureaucracy in that. In our welfare reforms, you'd be surprised how many times you come forth with a regulation or a change that you think is going to help do the job, and somehow when it comes back to you the next day, the word "shall" has become "may." And you don't know how that got changed or who changed that one little word. It sounds like nothing at all, and what are we making such a fuss about. But to the bureaucrat, the difference between a regulation that said, "you shall," and one that said, "you may," is all the importance in the world.

But they, as Mel Laird said, are cheating in a number of areas on the basis of what they claim was their intent and the wording, and it gets into the language difficulty if when you translate the document into English and into Russian, and then they say, "well, no, look at ours," and the way it's translated here is one of those "shall" and "may" things. The result is they are on the way, and in their eyes, legally, or at least they are claiming legally, to go out ahead of us. They have a great superiority, particularly in nuclear weapons. I think we have to be realistic, and we have to be hardnosed about that. And, frankly, I think we'd get along better with them if we're hardnosed about it.

Q. Would you repudiate the SALT agreement?

A. I think that if we're going to continue in that line it's got to be renegotiated, and it's got to be negotiated in a manner that recognizes this characteristic of theirs.

Q. Governor, would you be willing to release your medical records to show the American people that you are physically fit to serve; and, secondly, would you be willing to make some sort of financial disclosure to show the American people that you have no conflicts of interest in terms of your politics and your financial holdings?

A. The answer to both questions is "yes." I would be delighted to show them my medical record.

Q. Governor, here in New Hampshire the environmentalists' opposition to nuclear power plants, to oil refineries, and the interstate highway expansion (unintelligible). Would you just give us your view toward this kind of project and this kind of problem?

A. Yes. Every year that we delay the building of nuclear power plants to make up the growing shortage of energy we are adding about 1½ percentage points to the unemployment rate. It now takes 11 years to build a nuclear power plant in America because of government regulations. It only takes four in Europe and Japan. But more than that, it is a source of energy we must have.

The President of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology was telling me about his concern over the division, on his own campus, between these eminent scientists about the hazards of nuclear power. Now, first of all, we've got to find out one thing. There's a great mystic about nuclear power, and the American people have been led to believe that a power plant could become a bomb and blow up. This cannot happen. What can happen, possible--possibly--is some kind of a leak that might releast into the air radioactivity that could affect the surrounding territory.

But he was concerned about an institute like MIT having this kind of division in its own ranks, so he went to those who believe that it is safe, and he said, "what are the odds against a tragic accident in a nuclear power production?" They said, "once in a billion years." He then went to those who think it's extremely hazardous, and he said, "what do you estimate the odds?" And they said, "once in a hundred-thousand years." Now, you know, I'm not very concerned about the difference between an accident that's going to happen either once in a hundred-thousand years or once in a billion. And I don't think very many people should be.

But it shows the hysteria that surrounds this whole subject. Nuclear power that has been built, so far there is not one case of a fatality in the entire world due to radioactivity or to any kind of that kind of accident. You've had the usual accident you have in any industrial plant, of falling down stairs, or dropping off a ladder, or something, but nothing to do with radio activity in the entire history of them. You can carry this on to all kinds of safety factors. For example, the accident rate in mining uranium, which the nuclear power plants would use, is less than one-tenth the accident rate for mining coal, to develop power through steam-generating plants with the use of coal. So I think the environmentalists are off on a kick that somebody better expose pretty quickly.

Q. Governor, it's been reported that you have stated you could cut the federal budget 90 million dollars. Is that a correct statement, and, if so, how would you go about it?

A. I gave a recommendation in a speech and said that there were roughly six areas of government that right now did not properly belong at the federal level and that those areas should be transferred to the state and local level for administration. Now, if they were, this would reduce, on the basis of the 1976 budget figures that we presently have, the cost of the federal government 90 billion dollars.

I did say, however, that, in some of these programs transferred, the states and local governments would undoubtedly have to raise some of their taxes, but there would be leeway then for them to do this if they were going to carry on the same programs. There would be leeway for them to do it at the local level because of the reduction of the federal government's pre-emption of the tax dollar. It is the big villain taking the most of it. And, at the same time, I pointed out, I'm quite sure that many of those programs would be dropped if they were given over to the states or local governments. And, I'm quite sure also, in my own experience in California that any of those that were maintained would be run at far less overhead, administrative overhead, than they are run on the federal level. The higher up you get in the echelons of government, the higher you find the cost of delivering a dollar of goods or services to the people of this country, and it's a tremendous overhead at the federal level.

Q. Governor, you have this 11th Commandment policy which says that you will not talk about other members of the party. Evidently, there are some other Republicans who don't feel the same way. It's been reported that Senator Percy has said that if you are the party's nominee, it will be the same as George McGovern in 1976; I would take it as being an overwhelming defeat for the Republican Party. Would you comment on that?

A. Yes, well I know this is a reference to the fact that I represent some kind of a narrow, right-wing segment of the party, and I'm not in the mainstream, I think is the term that's been used. Well, there's one argument against that. I was elected twice in California. Democrats outnumber Republicans three-to-two in the State of California. I won the first time by a million votes; I won the second time by more than 600,000. Obviously, there must have been a lot of Democrats and Independents who didn't think I was that far out of the mainstream.

Q. Governor, have you advised Mr. Loeb about your 11th Commandment? He's one of your chief supporters in this state, and in his editorial yesterday, which I imagine you read, contained language that was pretty straight and unmistakable. He said President Ford lacks the mental... well, he has a mental insufficiency. Isn't that talk devisive among Republicans?

A. Well, well, now just a minute. Mr. Loeb is a journalist, same as you are, and that is your province to comment on both sides, whichever way you want to. You want me to start matching some of the quotes I can from some of the publications others of you represent because I don't come off too good in some of those. No, this isn't confined to the press. This is a common-sense thing. This isn't some buddy-buddy type of thing in which we say, "oh, let's all be sweetness and light among ourselves." What the 11th Commandment is, is practical. And that is that. If you honestly believe you are going to then support the choice of your party, no one knows in advance how your party's going to decide, you'd better not do anything in that process that then gives the opposition in the big game an opportunity to use your own party's words against that individual.

Richard Nixon for many years was castigated and held up to criticism because of his Senate campaign race against a woman running for the Senate in California and the fact that he had implied that she was a Communist sympathizer or something. What no one had paid any attention to was the fact that all Mr. Nixon in that campaign did was repeat what her Democratic opponent had said about her in the primary, and he called it to the attention of the poeple. I just don't think that anyone should do that in a party, because you may find yourself then having to eat your words because you may be supporting that person when the party has made its decision.

Q. Governor, would you tell us, please, if you can, when was the last time you talked to Mr. Nixon, Governor Thompson, and Mr. Loeb, and what did you talk about?

A. Well, now, the last time I talked with Mr. Loeb was some time ago, a telephone call, to explain to him, to tell him where I was in this whole process of trying to make a decision because he had been commenting in the paper about when was I going to decide. The last time I talked to Governor Thompson was just a few nights ago in Washington in which he helped Nancy get me on my way back to the hotel to get to bed, and that was kind of the conversation. The last time I talked to Mr. Nixon was the night before I announced, on Wednesday night, when I felt that I should call him personally, that it was a courtesy, and to call the President, and to call Nelson Rockefeller, and to make some personal calls telling people that night what I was going to do the next morning.

Q. What did he say?

A. Who?

Q. Nixon.

A. Just wished me well and said that it did not come as any surprise to him.

Q. Governor, in an effort to broaden your appeal to the middle part of the party, would you consider having Rockefeller or Percy or a moderate of that sort on your ticket?

A. I have a different view about this thing of balancing the ticket. I believe that instead of balancing the ticket, I think that anyone who is nominated by his party for the top spot has an obligation, if he can, to recommend someone who he believes would, if inherited the job, carry on the same principles and the same views as the man elected to President. I don't think it makes sense for a man to run for the Presidency, tell the people what he believes, what he's going to try to do, and then deliberately select someone or recommend someone who, if he had to take over, would do the opposite.

Q. Would that rule out Senator Percy?

A. Well, let's see what Senator Percy says in the coming campaigns as to what he believes. Funny thing is, you know, a lot of the labels and we get talking to each other and you get down to the facts, and it's as I've said about my own record in California. I'd be interested in finding out where some of these gentlemen differ with the things that we did. Would they criticize increasing the welfare grants? Would they criticize getting rid of cheaters? Would they criticize increasing the aid to education? I don't think there're very many Republicans who would be against those things.

Q. Governor, if you should lose the early primaries in New Hampshire and Florida, two of the more conservative states, would that re-evaluate your position; would you consider that an indication that you were not standing a good chance for the nomination?

A. Well, I can't answer that question. I think that a campaign is a constant process of re-evaluation. I think that as you go along in a campaign with your advisors and those around you and the people in the various local areas you are, as I say, constantly re-evaluating. I just couldn't answer that in advance.

Nofziger: Thank you, Governor.

Reagan: Well, could I recognize that one, the last one, who had his hand up?

Q. I want to ask you two questions on the budget. First of all, is it possible to balance the budget at the same time maintaining or...you talk about America being inferior militarily, what sort of money is that going to take and still be possible to balance the budget? Secondly, what are the six areas of the federal government that should be put into state and local (unintelligible)?

A. What should be the what?

Q. What are the six areas of the federal government that should be taken over by the state and local governments?

A. Well, Medicaid, welfare, community projects, education, I believe education should be restored, urban planning and development...oh, I don't know whether I've covered them all or not. Those would be the areas.

The answer to your other question about defense is defense spending, as I said the other day, that isn't something you choose to do. Defense is the one thing, the responsibility of the federal government in which you spend what has to be spent, whatever it takes to maintain the security and the protection of this country. As to whether the budget can be balanced or not, we have to balance the budget. We don't have any choice any more. The plain, simple truth is this country, if it didn't have a printing press, is worse off than New York City. And we cannot go on this way. This country has gone to virtually the maximum of taxation the economy can stand; it's gone beyond it, as a matter of fact, cannot sustain it much longer. It has gone to the place in debt that we no longer have any credit out farther ahead that we would have to fall back on if we were faced with an emergency such as a Pearl Harbor. When World War II came along, we still had a great untaxed capacity. We had not come anywhere near the rate of taxation. We still had a credit that we could call upon in bonding, way out ahead. We don't have that any more. There is no case of a choice about balancing the budget; it has to be balanced. It is impossible not to do it.

XXX

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Manchester, New Hampshire

Q. Governor, since your political objective has to be to knock Gerald Ford out of the box, really to demolish him, how can this be called a sweet, gentle, gentlemanly exercise?

A. Well, again, I have to explain what my own theory or belief is about a primary, and I think it's a belief that's held by a great many people in the party, that you obviously recognize that basically you have cer-

Crossfiled Under:

CIA 3

FBI 3-5

Detente 6

SALT 6-7

Nuclear ^{Power} ~~Plant~~ 7-8

Federal Spending 8-9, 12-13

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Chicago, Illinois

Q. Governor, how are you going to get people to vote for you if every time someone asks you a political question you say you can't answer that?

A. Well, I don't think I've said that every time. As a matter of fact, I've answered quite a few. I think you're probably referring the other day to a question that had to do with possible security matters and classified information, and I made the statement that to go into as much detail as the question suggested no one could do it unless he had access to that classified information. It happened to be with regard to national defense. I have some ideas about it, I think, and have expressed them publicly on a number of occasions. I think the B-1 bomber program should do forward; I think we should go forward with the Trident submarine program.

Q. When do you intend to start studying the New York situation?

A. Well, I think I have some understanding of the New York situation. Again, the manner of suggesting a specific answer is dependent on a number of facts, including what New York is going to do with regard to its own situation. My position is very simple and has been expressed a number of times that while all of us, I'm sure, should have and do have a great deal of sympathy for the people of New York, the people who have been the victims of this, the victims of their own political leaders going back over a period of as much as two decades, who did not know they were being deceived, that their city of getting into this situation. No one wants to see them suffer; but, before you can talk about helping New York City, there must be an assurance from within New York City that they are going to change the policies that have led to this.

Now the simple situation is you have a great city here, the City of Chicago. The City of Chicago spends roughly 700 dollars per capita on providing the essential services to the people. New York City spends 1446 dollars to supply those same services. There has to be something wrong and something being mismanaged in the City of New York to have that kind of a disparity, and it's an even greater disparity when you lump in all the cities of a million population or more in America. New York, for example, is spending \$272 per unit, per month, on picking up garbage. It costs about \$50 in the average large city. Public health...their costs are three times the average for other cities in the United States. Those things have to be solved before you can just step in and help and face the prospect that a few years down the road New York is in the same situation it is today.

Q. Could the citizens of New York expect anything more than sympathy with the election of Ronald Reagan?

A. Well, of course, yes. But as I say, it begins with New York City's evolving a plan and a program for correcting in the future what's been wrong.

Q. Governor Reagan, you are on record as favoring a strong national defense. At what point is an intelligence operation necessary to that defense and how far should such an intelligence operation go?

A. Well, I think any nation has to have a proper counterintelligence agency, certainly in a world that is as upset as this one is and with as many potential enemies that this one has. Maybe we don't have to do what the Russians have done. They have tripled or quadrupled their espionage and counterintelligence activities inside our country. They are monitoring, taping and sending back to Russia literally hundreds of thousands of telephone calls in America every week that are based on certain listings of phone numbers involving public officials, business officials, scientists, engineers, public figures and so forth. This we know to be true. I think that what you have to have is an adequate counterintelligence that keeps you as well informed as a nation possible can be to insure the security of this nation.

Q. An intelligence operation that we have had in the past with recent testimony before Congress was brought out?

A. We have had an intelligence operation; I was a member of the Commission that investigated it. We found there were things over the 28-year period that individuals had done, things that were excessive, that were perhaps improper. But they were scattered, they were not numerous, and in almost every instance we found that the Agency itself had corrected those.

Q. Governor, when do you campaign in Green Bay, in Wisconsin, and, if so, how many days do you plan to spend there?

A. As to campaigning in Wisconsin, I don't know. We haven't gone that far in the planning as yet. As to what it will be, I'll obviously be entered in every primary. Now my own personal participation, I'm sure, will vary. So far we know that we are going into the first of the primaries, New Hampshire and Florida and North Carolina, and I would assume, this being my home state, that I'd be active in Illinois, at least I'm looking forward to it.

Q. Let me ask you a question about national security. Who are your advisors on this question of national security?

A. Well, to tell you that I have put on a staff of advisors in national security as yet, no. On the other hand, I have had information and briefings because on a number of occasions while I was Governor, not only were Governors briefed, from time to time, but I went on four specific missions abroad, three to Asia and one to Europe, for the President, for the State Department. I am a Fellow at the Hoover Institute which certainly is a think tank of some distinction.

Q. Did you talk to former members of the Defense Department, former officials, recently?

A. I called Secretary Schlesinger, former Secretary Schlesinger, to tell him that I regretted his departure from the government and expressed my regrets about it because I believed he was a strong voice for the kind of defense posture that we must maintain.

Q. Would he have a place in your Cabinet?

A. No, this wouldn't be a thing that you would ask Dr. Schlesinger at this particular time, but I have known him, not known him too well, have been acquainted with him, and I believe that if I have a specific problem in which I think he could be of help Dr. Schlesinger would respond if I asked him.

Q. One other question, would you be in favor of a law which would make it illegal for anyone in this country to plot assassination (intelligible) foreign government?

A. Well, whether that is necessary or not, murder is murder. I think that none of us in this country supports the idea of assassination, and certainly I'm opposed to that idea.

Q. (unintelligible--question regarding such a law)

A. Well, I've never given it a thought as to whether we require such a new law. I would think that this administratively could simply be handled by those in charge, recognizing that that should not be part of our national policy.

Q. What makes you think, Governor, that you could carry Illinois if Senator Percy and Senator Ogilvie are against you?

A. That I could carry Illinois if Senator Percy and Senator Ogilvie are against me? Well, my intention is to take the case to the people. Now you've named two votes that I, obviously, don't have. But I imagine that I could find a few that I do.

Q. When did you and Senator Percy fall out on the 11th Commandment?

A. Well, I don't know that we fell out. I've heard some quotes that are attributed to Senator Percy. I did not hear him say those things, but I have in my possession a letter that was delivered to me just within the last few days from Senator Percy; and, while he recognized that we would be on opposite sides in this campaign, he respected my decision about the manner in which I would campaign, the 11th Commandment, and said that he would do the same. It was a letter of good will and recognition that we both belonged to the same party.

Q. Did yesterday's incident involving a toy pistol...does this change your thinking about gun control?

A. Did yesterday's incident change my mind about gun control laws? No, in the first place he didn't have a gun. Now, I'm not going to suggest a law to outlaw toys. No, I feel very strongly that some of the things being proposed in Congress, such as making it illegal for anyone to have a gun, that's about one of the more extreme proposals that's been made. To some of the others, that there's nothing in making it difficult for legitimate citizens to have a gun, that is going to keep the criminal from getting one. I think it's naive to think that.

I believe that California's pattern was a far better answer. In California we passed a law that anyone who committed a crime and was convicted of that crime, if he had a gun in his possession whether he used it or not, you could add five to 15 years to the sentence. We have since passed another law that says that no judge can find a man guilty of a crime, and if he had a gun in the commission of that crime, that he could be turned back out on the street on probation. He must undergo a mandatory prison sentence. He must be sent to prison by the judge. I think this kind of approach is the answer.

If you would think of the tremendous bureaucracy that it would take for some of the proposals they're talking about, and then recognize the fact that most people will use a gun in the commission of a crime, it is already in most states illegal for them to have a gun. Now, why do we think another law on top of the ones we already have would change that.

Q. Governor, Senator Percy said that he does not think you have an adequate understanding of the complex issues facing the nation on international (unintelligible)?

A. Senator Percy said he didn't think I had a sufficient understanding of the complex issues confronting the nation? Well, nine years ago there were a lot of people that said I didn't have an understanding of the complex issues facing California. And I found out that some of the issues weren't really all that complex. As a matter of fact, some of them were very simple. The problem is that for a lot of politicians they were just very difficult because they were difficult political decisions to make. And that's true of a lot of national problems, too. It's like an expression I've used in describing the process of balancing the budget. It's as simple as protecting your virtue; you have to learn to say "no."

Q. He also said that if you were nominated your candidacy would destroy the Republican Party.

A. That I would destroy the Republican Party? Well, again, this is not what he said in his letter to me so I'm going to abide by his letter. The Senator sent me a letter, and he didn't seem to think it would do that, and I don't see...it didn't destroy California when we adopted the 11th Commandment. The whole purpose of a primary is for the candidates within a party to submit themselves to their voters, let their voters decide who should carry the banner, and then all of us unite behind the choice of the party.

Q. Along that line, what type of a percentage to you think you need in the early primaries to show that you're competent enough to continue?

A. Oh, I haven't made any estimate of that at all as to what percentage I would need in the early primaries to keep my campaign going. I'm just going to enter them with the idea that I'm going to do my darndest to win.

Q. Do you think you have to have a majority, a big majority?

A. I don't know.

Q. Do you think President Ford is going to drop out if he has a poor showing in the early primaries?

A. Oh, I'm not looking forward to any idea that he's going to drop out. He's said he isn't going to do that, any more than I dropped out before I started when some of his campaign people were suggesting that that's what their strategy was, to make me to that.

Q. Governor, you voiced opposition to the ~~Equal~~ Rights Amendment. You stated that it might do some harm to the rights we already have. (rest unintelligible)

A. This is the ERA and why I said I was not in support of it. I want to get one thing very straight, and let's recognize this. I am for equal rights for all Americans, regardless of what their difference is, whether it is of sex or race or creed or ethnic origin or whatever. And if there is any place where there is any segment of our society whose rights are not now equal to others, then I think we should correct that. I happen to believe, however, and we have several examples of where we've done this with regard to the differences between men and women that this can be corrected by statute. My concern with the Equal Rights Amendment is based on studies that had to be made and legal advice I had when I was Governor of California, that a simple amendment is not as simple as it sounds... that the courts which must then interpret an amendment cannot say what they think or do not think, would be subject to certain decisions in which

that amendment could take away from women certain rights they now have, such as protective labor laws that recognize the physical differences between men and women in industry, in industrial-type jobs. This is just one example. There are a number of others, but we've had three statutes in the last few years, one just last year, that have corrected obvious inequities, the most recent being the one involving credit and the ability of women to get credit. And, I think that statutes is the way to go, and you'll find me gung-ho in support of any statute to correct any inequity that anyone can show.

Q. Governor, the credit ament, the statute equalizing credit did not cover every area...

A. Okay, if it didn't, then I think we ought to follow it up with more legislation.

Q. Did you consult with President Nixon before you announced for office?

A. No, I thought it was a courtesy to call him and tell him that I was going to make the announcement just as I called a number of people, some of them personal, some of them in public life. I called the President and told him.

Q. Governor Reagan, to follow up on an earlier question, you say you deplore murder of foreign officials by our intelligence organizations. To what extent do we have the right to meddle in the affairs of other countries with our intelligence operations?

A. Well, before you...you get this question and you know you get it an awful lot from young people on the campuses about what right do we have to be in another country. Before you can answer that question, you have to answer another one, and the other question is then, "what is the Soviet Union doing in that other country?" In most of the instances where we have intervened or where we have injected ourselves, it is because of the knowledge that the game plan of the Soviet Union has been one of subversion,

one by one, eliminating the free nations of the world, taking them over and leaving us isolated in the world.

Q. Are you predefending the CIA's cover operations in other countries, meddling in their internal affairs?

A. I am defending them when those operations are necessary to attempt to preserve a free country, an ally of ours, against a takeover by the Soviet Union.

Q. Governor, when you will actually campaign, you will not have (unintelligible)

A. Well, we haven't made plans as yet as to how extensive in the various primaries we'll be. As I've said, I hoped that I can campaign extensively in here. It's been a long time since I was back in Tampico, and the biggest regret I had was to discover that I was scheduled for a speaking tour at the time of the Tampico 100th Centennial, so I didn't get to go back there. I found out there was a great cause celeb that somebody solved for me while I was gone, and that is there were two building there in the downtown street of Tampico and an argument over which one I was born above, in the flat above the building. Fortunately, an old-time meighbot came through and gave them the right building. I was born over the bank. It didn't rub off, though.

Q. Who do you want as your running mate?

A. There's no way to choose at this point. There're any number of people who could be. I don't think the candidate alone should choose his running mate, I think that that's up to the convention. I think he can make recommendations, but I've given that no thought.

Q. Governor, although Mayor Daley is a Democrat, Republicans from time to time have sought meetings with him to seek his advice and perhaps support. Do you plan any meetings with Mayor Daley and what are your thoughts on Mayor Daley and his ability to run a city like Chicago?

A. Well, I don't have any plans, as I said before, that go so far as to meeting with Mayor Daley. I'd be very happy any time to meet with him, if he'd be happy to meet with me. But I gave you one indication that you could make your own judgment about his handling of the City of Chicago and that is that the per-capita costs here of running the city are less than half of what they are in New York.

Q. How is your financial backing coming along?

A. Well, I would say in a time when there's a great limitation on fund raising and when there hasn't been too much success in fund raising around the country, I think we've been doing very well for someone who wasn't a candidate. When I say "we," I now associate myself with the Citizens Committee which was operating independently of me and only with my permission, but no cooperation, and they were fund raising and being almost as successful as the only Republican candidate.

Q. How much will it cost for (unintelligible)?

A. I don't know how much it'll cost, but I know how little it has to cost. If I understand it correctly, and maybe the Senator will correct me if I'm wrong, I think that the campaign limitation for Presidential candidates is 10 million in the primary and another 10 million--20 million--in the general.

Nofziger: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen.

###

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN

November 21, 1975

Chicago, Illinois

Q. Governor, how are you going to get people to vote for you if every time someone asks you a political question you say you can't answer that?

A. Well, I don't think I've said that every time. As a matter of fact, I've answered quite a few. I think you're probably referring the other day to a question that had to do with possible security matters and classi-

Crossfiled Under:

U.S. Defense Policy 1

Urban Policy 1-2

CIA 2-3, 9

Gun Control 5-6

ERA 7

U.S. Foreign Policy 8-9

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN

November 21, 1975
Los Angeles, California

Q. Governor, you mentioned you would (unintelligible). How will you be able to campaign without having divisiveness in the Republican Party?

A. Well, because the same way that we did twice here in California. I believe that a primary is a case in which the primary candidates stand up and express their own views, their viewpoint as to what they would do, what their programs would be, what their beliefs are, and then the party makes its choice as to which one of them should carry the party standard, and everybody gets behind the party's choice. And I don't think that's divisive at all.

Q. Governor, do you think the President is more vulnerable in domestic policy or foreign policy?

A. Is the President more vulnerable in domestic policy or foreign policy? Well, again, I wouldn't know. I think that's something the voters will decide.

Q. Governor, yesterday you said you didn't have the answer to (unintelligible) defense budget. Do you have the answer now?

No. I think that was probably a bad answer on my part. I was simply trying to point out that because the manner in which it was asked seemed to be asking for details that no one could have who was not privy to all the information that the National Security Council and the Commander-in-Chief would have. This did not mean that I don't have some views on defense. I do not agree with the cuts that were made by Congress. I believe that former Secretary Schlesinger was right in his demand that the money be put back. I believe that we should be going forward with the B-1 bomber program.

I think we should be going forward with the Trident submarine program. They're integral parts if we are to be able to keep pace with Russia. And right now I think we're in great danger of falling behind Russia, if we haven't already.

Q. What are the ball-park figures (unintelligible)?

A. Well, this, I guess, is what you get down to in the point as to knowing the actual details of where we stand with regard to the information that we have on the enemy. As to a figure, it isn't a case of how many dollars you say in numbers. Defense is something in which you don't make a decision as to how much you can or cannot spend. You have to spend whatever is required to remain equal with the other most powerful nation in the world. There is no such thing as being second best; and whatever that takes, that's dictated by necessity. You don't debate whether it should be one figure or another.

Q. One of your critics described that you have a narrow constituency (unintelligible).

A. Well, this thing that I have a narrow constituency...I think that many of us, not just me alone, have remarked that California of all the states in the Union is probably the one that is most clearly identified as a microcosm of the United States. And, I didn't have a narrow constituency here in winning two elections in this state where we're outnumbered by Democrats three to two. And, if that's a narrow constituency, then California is different than I think it is.

Q. (question unintelligible--about the CIA)

A. Well, I was on the Commission, of course, that got into some of that and know something about that. I still believe, as I've said before, and as I think our own report said when we came in with our commission report, that there was wrong doing. Where there were excesses committed by those agencies, we found that, in most instances, they were corrected themselves

by the agency. And we believe, and I still believe, that of course you don't want excesses and you want them sticking to what their job is supposed to be, but at the same time I don't think we want a kind of hysteria that is robbing us of a counterintelligence capability in the world at a time when there is a counterintelligence capability being used against us by the Soviet Union, several times larger than it was just a few years ago.

Q. Governor, do you think that Senator Percy's investigation of the CIA (unintelligible)?

A. I think that the Congressional investigations have actually caused a deterioration of our capacity in counterintelligence throughout the world because Congressional committees just seem incapable of closing leaks and not leaking information that has caused us to lose sources of information throughout the world.

Q. Governor, originally you supported the Equal Rights Amendment here in California. Since then you changed your stand (unintelligible).

A. Yes, my capacity as Governor, what seemed, I think, to many of us, at first as a perfectly simple and a simple way to solve what problems there were, when I had to go deeper as Governor and when I had to seek legal advice, I received information that gave me to believe that while I want, and let me preface this, I want, as I'm sure any fair person wants, equality for everyone in this country. I don't want any segment of our society, least of all the half of our society that constitutes the womanhood of America, to be at a disadvantage or to suffer any inequities. But I had to believe in the legal advice I received that the Equal Rights Amendment, simple as it sounded, actually ran the risk of endangering what I think are some rights that women should have and that where there were inequities and there are inequities they can better be corrected by statutes such as the recent statute with regard to women's ability to get credit. It's just a case that I thought the Equal Rights Amendment was a broad approach to something that no one had bothered to look through to the ramifications of it.

Q. (question unintelligible)

A. Well, I'll tell you, as I just said up on the platform there, I can't shade what I believe on any subject with the idea as to whether it will or will not attract voters. I must stand on what I believe; and, if that attracts people of similar beliefs, fine, but I can't shade my beliefs for political purposes.

Q. Governor, how many primaries (unintelligible)?

A. Well, I think that anyone in my position would have to enter all the primaries. No decision has been made as yet. You can't obviously campaign full force in all of them; many of them overlap. So no decision has been made as yet as to which ones you will actively and extensively campaign in. As to the other part of your question, as to when I would feel, or if I should feel I should drop out, I couldn't answer that one for you, either. I'm going to go for broke and try to win in all of them.

Q. How do you feel about Senate Bill 1? (unintelligible)

A. Senate Bill .? Now wait a minute. Senate Bill 1. Now...what? I'm drawing a little bit...do you mean here or federal?

Q. No, to modify the Federal Code to (unintelligible).

A. Wait a minute, there's something about Senate Bill 1 that I must...I'm drawing a blank right now...that I remember there's something about that bill that if I recall is very upsetting and would change something drastically, and I guess I've been in the airplane too long. I can't bring it to mind right now. I think it has more ramifications than just codifying the code. It'll probably come to me about three minutes after we leave here.

Q. (question unintelligible--something about Vice President Rockefeller and the party's embracing extremeism)

A. Well, I don't know whether President Rockefeller was referring to me or not when he spoke about the party not embracing extremeism. Again, I point to the answer of the record here in California. I don't think there was any

extremism in that record, a record that vastly increased the level of minority employment in California state government, that brought common sense to the budget, that increased the welfare grants 43 percent, that made California literally the world leader in the treatment of the mentally ill. If that's extremism, maybe we ought to have more of it.

Q. (unintelligible) would you do away with Congressional investigations of the CIA, the FBI and any other unhappy (unintelligible)?

A. I can't dispute the right of Congress to investigate. But I think we can say that the record of Congressional investigations, in the last few years, has been one in which there did seem to be some individuals more intent on publicity than on probing. And the leaks were such that even while they were getting ready to investigate and our commission was still going forward with its investigation, the Presidential commission, we learned that several hundred sources of information worldwide had disappeared, had simply backed away from cooperation with our counterintelligence forces because they believed they were in danger from possible leaks, not from our commission but from up-coming Congressional investigations. Now I don't believe that this means that they have to stop investigating. Heaven help us, they're our elected representatives. But I think that they could probably review some of their own practices and do a better job. And I'll just give you one comparison. I don't believe any of you can point to any leaks from the Presidential commission that met over a period of months. But almost instantly that has been happening where the Congressional committees are concerned.

Q. Governor, do you think that your background in entertainment, your charisma, will make a difference with the press as it did before (unintelligible)?

A. No, I have a greater faith in the voters of America than that. Also, when I was in pictures, I had a greater faith in the audience than some of the producers did. As a matter of fact, I think the American voters today are a

little ahead of the politicians, and I guess they'll make their decisions on the basis of what they believe we all stand for.

Q. Governor, what is your opinion today about the gun incident that took place yesterday in Miami?

A. Well, it was one of great curiosity for somebody to run the risk of up to five years imprisonment to come up with a plastic toy gun and do what he did. I don't know. It was all very sudden. It happened behind me, and the next thing I knew, I was being politely hustled inside. Nancy was ahead of me. But there's no explanation that I know of, and I can't comment on it now because charges have been filed and so it's a matter for the courts. All I know is that he pointed this toy gun. It was, rather at first glance, realistic looking. It was the black type. It looked like the snub-nosed, about a 38. I've seen it described as a 45 automatic. No, it was the snub-nosed variety.

Q. Governor, do you feel that you are going to be able to get away without suffering the attacks that Barry Goldwater did in 1964 from the liberal wing of the Republican Party?

A. Am I going to get away without suffering the things that Barry Goldwater did from the liberal wing of the party? I think the Republican Party has learned a lesson. I can't believe that we're going to campaign in that same kind of personal way. Barry Goldwater was simply defeated because they created a straw man and portrayed him not as the man he is. Today he is one of the most respected men in our nation's capital in elective office by many of the people who were frightened to death of him from the things that were said about him. I hope that the 11th Commandment...the President assured me the other night when I call him to tell him that I was going to declare and I told him how I intended to campaign, and he said that was his intention to campaign the same way.

Q. Governor, what do you think of Senator Percy's remark yesterday that your nomination (unintelligible)?

A. Well, shortly after he made that statement, he had hand-delievered to me a letter in which he stated that while we would be on opposite sides, he accepted in good faith the manner in which I said I would campaign and that he would do likewise, and it seemed to express some good will, so I'm at a little loss to understand just what he might have meant by his statement.

Q. His statement was the fact that he feels that you have too small a constituency.

A. Well, that's the same question we had before, and, again, it wasn't too small a constituency in California.

Q. (question unintelligible)

A. Well, I've been in some 30-odd states in the last ten months, speaking to a great variety of audiences, not the least of them were political. The most of them were various kinds of gatherings. They ranged from campuses to business groups to various types of public forums, and I just don't think we're all that different here in California from the rest of the country.

Nofziger: Thanks very much, ladies and gentlemen.

Reagan: Will that do it? All right. Next time have a PA system. I'm worn out from shouting.

###

PRESS CONFERENCE WITH RONALD REAGAN
November 21, 1975
Los Angeles, California

Q. Governor, you mentioned you would (unintelligible). How will you be able to campaign without having divisiveness in the Republican Party?

A. Well, because the same way that we did twice here in California. I believe that a primary is a case in which the primary candidates stand up and express their own views, their viewpoint as to what they would do,

Crossfiled Under:

U.S. Defense Policy 1-2

CIA 2-3, 5

ERA 3

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information:
(Traveling with the Governor)
Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary
(In Los Angeles)
Peter Hannaford, Research Director
(213) 477-8231

FOR RELEASE:
9:00 p.m. CST
Saturday, December 13, 1975

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California,
to the Southern Republican Conference Banquet,
Albert Thomas Convention Center, Houston, Texas,
Saturday, December 13, 1975.

"It's a pleasure to be here this evening. We go back a lot of years and a lot of campaigns. I've spoken in most of your states and know that we share the same basic beliefs and philosophy of government.

"Those beliefs have persuaded me to enter this race for our Party's Presidential nomination.

"We are at a point where the basic tenets of our Republican philosophy must be restated with clarity and in positive terms. Eleven months from now, the people of America will make a choice between our candidate and one selected by the other party to represent its point of view.

"Too often in recent years we have glossed over the differences that separate our two parties. Too often the people have been offered only a choice between Tweedledum and Tweedledee. And there have been those who have unkindly said there have been times when the choice has been between Tweedledum and Tweedledum.

"Some years ago, I left the Democratic Party because it no longer stood for things I could believe in. The Republican Party did, and I hope it will continue to do so.

"A political party dies when it forsakes its basic beliefs. Our party will die if it becomes a 'yes, but' version of the Democrats -- a party that, instead of saying 'no' to the social tinkering and the excesses of the Democrats, says 'Yes, but a little slower', or 'Yes, but a little less', or 'Yes, but we can do those same things better'. The people of this nation are looking for more than that today.

more--more--more

"Daniel Boorstin, the historian, has said, 'What is the main difference between a political machine and a political party? A party is organized for a purpose larger than its own survival. A political machine exists for its own sake; its primary, in a sense only, purpose is survival.' Which do we want to be? You know the answer to that as well as I do. We've fought too long and given too much to settle just for survival. We have a purpose. It is nothing less than the survival of this way of life we call America.

"Since January, in more than 30 states I've talked to Republicans about a banner for our party -- a banner with bold, bright colors; no pale pastels. Not only Republicans, but disaffected Independents and Democrats will also rally to such a banner.

"I speak of colors, but you know that is a synonym for beliefs we will not compromise. Beliefs that will once and for all mark us as the party of the people -- the people who pay our government's bills, fight our country's wars, do the daily work that makes our society function, and who still have time and the desire to care for the less fortunate.

"We're the party of the small businessman. The party of the independent entrepreneur, the farmer, the self-employed, the worker who has used his job skill to earn his share of the American Dream for himself and his family. The party of the concerned school teacher and the PTA parent. Of those who care when Big Government intrudes into our lives and disrupts our businesses and busses our children and squanders our hard-earned wages; cheapening the dollar so that none of us can be sure of the future or of our ability to provide for ourselves and our families in our non-earning years.

"To put it in two words, we are the party of independents, spelled d-e-n-t-s, and independence, spelled d-e-n-c-e. The party of independent people who believe ardently in personal liberty and independence for all from the oppressive hand of government.

"These words have been both our strength and our weakness. Our strength, because our sense of independence has allowed us to endure. We lose some battles, but come back to fight another day. Our weakness because, as strong-minded individuals, we have often refused to pull together to win the big political battles we must win to keep our people independent of a government that continues to encroach on every facet of their lives.

"Another one of the bold colors in our banner must stand for a strong national defense and a foreign policy based, first and foremost, on what is good for the United States. Peace with freedom was not, and is not, an empty phrase; for peace without freedom is meaningless. And, freedom without peace means only that once again some foreign aggressor has mistaken our lack of military preparedness for an unwillingness to defend our freedom.

"As long as we are second to none in military strength, no one will risk attacking us. To be second in military power is the same as being last. No nation in all man's history that placed its faith in treaties and let its hardware go has ever lived to write many pages in history. A great and free society must also be a strong society. Appeasement leads only to war.

"For 25 years, the Roman Senator Cato concluded every speech with the line, 'Carthage must be destroyed'. Finally, he had his way -- Rome set out to war on Carthage. The people of Carthage were affluent, given to art, culture and sports. Theirs was the highest standard of living in the world and they wanted peace desperately. Envoys were sent to negotiate with the Romans. Finally, Rome relented on condition that Carthage send as hostages the sons of their 300 leading families. It was done. Then, Rome demanded all of Carthage's warships and weapons. They were delivered. Then came the final demand -- that the people of Carthage leave their city because Rome intended to destroy the city. Recognizing the enormity of history's greatest deception, the people of Carthage turned on their leaders and tore them limb from limb. Then they set out to build ships, spears and catapults.

It was too little too late. The people of Carthage were slaughtered, the city leveled and the earth plowed and sown with salt so it could never again be planted.

"It must be our commitment to spend whatever is necessary to remain strong; to consider our nation's own self-interests first in international dealings. Not at the expense of others and not without generosity to those who need a helping hand, but always with the realization that our self-interests must not be cast aside just for the sake of making a deal.

"This is not jingoism or gunboat diplomacy. It is common sense recognition of the need in a hostile world for self-protection. It means keeping the Panama Canal, which we have managed with fairness to all the world and which is essential to the defense of the Western Hemisphere against those who might have designs on us or intentions for global domination. In short, we bought it, we paid for it, it is sovereign U.S. territory and we should keep it. Our stewardship has been beneficial to all and none more so than the people of Panama, who, because of it, enjoy one of the highest standards of living in all of Latin America. The U.S. presently has plans for a billion-dollar modernization of the canal which would mean a great stimulus to the economy of Panama and an increased prosperity for the Panamanian people.

"All of this is being held up by a pro-communist dictator who seized power eight years ago by overthrowing the duly elected government of Panama. In eight years, there have been no elections and no civil rights. There has been instead censorship of the press, poverty for the people and totalitarianism.

"We have a sovereign right to the canal zone, affirmed by our own Supreme Court and acknowledged by an elected government of Panama. We also have a responsibility to the free world to keep that vital passage way out of the hands of a ruthless and irresponsible dictator.

"And, on the subject of dictators, in my opinion, it is not in our best interest, nor in the interest of freedom to ease our restrictions on trade and diplomatic relations with Castro's Cuba until we see positive signs that he no longer will allow his nation to be a convenient Caribbean outpost for the Soviet Union's military machine and that he will no longer plot trouble in the Americas and in new third world nations such as Angola.

"Speaking of Angola, it is ironic that the same Soviet Union that talked loftily of the rights of other nations at the Helsinki conference is today pouring millions of dollars worth of ammunition and supplies to communist forces in that newly-freed land. It seems to me the cause of freedom would be well served if we and our allies would grant recognition to the non-communist regime of Angola providing it with the legitimacy it needs in the eyes of its neighbors.

"We cannot abdicate our free world leadership even though it was not sought by us. Nor can we deny our interest in protecting the fragile peace in the Middle East. We are, and must remain, committed to a strong NATO alliance in Europe and to the fact that we are a power in the Pacific.

"To those who say we shouldn't be interfering in the problems of other nations around the rim of the Pacific Basin, the answer is -- in years past we did interfere and by so doing caused some of those very problems.

"It was in the days of Camelot -- the New Frontier -- that the U.S. used its power to force the anti-communist government of Laos to give in to communist insurgents and accept them as part of a coalition government. Now, in the long established communist pattern, the coalition is no more. Without regard to treaties and agreements, the communist Pathet Lao has taken over that country. Once again the curtain has come down on freedom.

"If now there is to be talk of extending an olive branch to Hanoi, well so let it happen only after there has been a full accounting of our men missing in action. And we might well ask assurance that the rights of our erstwhile allies will be guaranteed. Basic morality demands that we reaffirm our determination to stand by long-time friends and allies in Taiwan and South Korea.

"There should be a bold color on our banner standing unmistakably for fiscal integrity; an end to the cycles of inflation, recession, unemployment, then more and greater inflation. When it comes to the argument over whether we should have a Republican \$60 billion deficit or a Democratic \$80 billion deficit, I find there's no room for me on either side. Our goal must be a balanced budget. Oh, but we are told three-quarters of the budget is uncontrollable -- fixed by statutes passed by Congress. Well, statutes passed by Congress can be repealed by Congress; and since the Democratic majority in Congress shows no inclination to do this, then it's time to elect a Republican Congress that will.

"If the federal government won't put its house in order instead of debauching our dollars by running the printing press overtime, then how in the name of heaven can we demand fiscal responsibility from New York or any other city? Just the other day, the Council of Democratic Mayors went on record demanding federal help for all cities. That's like asking the captain of the "Titanic" for a lift. Three-fourths of the American people live in cities. Are they suggesting the other one-fourth can pay to provide city services for the three-fourths? In the meantime, the federal government spends a billion dollars a day and goes \$1-1/2 billion deeper into debt each week and grows like a fungus, on the assumption if it gets big enough it can manage the nation's business.

"We need a color in our banner that stands for the free market system -- free enterprise. For under that system, our country has prospered like no other in the world. And yet, for more than four decades, social engineers have tinkered with that system, claiming its imperfections can be eliminated by such tinkering. Others would forsake the tinkering and the free market system to plunge us into the idiocy of Karl Marx. Why do we even listen to them? If they are too obsessed with their economic tinkertoys to compare

our way with the examples we have of Socialist failure, they deserve no audience from us.

"Our English cousins have been going down the road of government intervention and socialism since World War II. Their nationalized, government-run industries -- steel, coal, natural gas and airlines -- lose about \$600 or \$700 million a year. Curiously enough, in the one area we are alike, we more than match them. Their post office loses about \$675 million a year, all on its own.

"But inflation in England is 25%+ and the rate of productivity in their government-run industries is the lowest of all the Western European nations.

"There is a more dramatic example for comparison which many of you have heard me tell before. Forgive me if I repeat it for those who may not be aware of it.

"If Socialism is the answer, we don't have to argue about it on theory alone -- the theory of Capitalism versus the theory of Socialism. We have our own country and we have a concrete example of Socialism. We have another great nation in this world. It has a land mass greater than our own; it's rich with natural resources; it has 250 million capable people; and for nearly 60 years they have been free to fully implement -- without hinderance or interference -- the principles of Karl Marx' Socialism. We could be just like them; but it would take a little doing on our part. We'd have to start by cutting our paychecks by 80%; move 33 million workers back to the farm; destroy 59 million television sets; tear up 14 out of 15 miles of highway; junk 19 out of 20 automobiles; tear up two-thirds of our railroad track; knock down 70% of our houses; rip out nine-tenths of our telephones; and then all we'd have to do is find a Capitalist country that would sell us wheat on credit so we wouldn't starve!

"One more word about the free market. Now I know that where most of you come from they don't grow wheat. And I know all of us worry about the price of bread.

"But let me tell you this: nobody would worry about the sale of wheat to Russia upping the price of a loaf of bread a penny or two if the taxing policies and the inflationary policies of the Congress and the federal government hadn't already run the price of bread out of sight. No matter how you slice it, the sale of wheat to Russia is not responsible for the high price of bread, it is the sale of sound, frugal Republican principles down the river by both parties that has increased those prices.

"In a hungry world, the government told the wheat farmers of America to plant from fence row to fence row, and then to sell their wheat on the open market. Well, they sowed and they reaped and hied themselves off to the market, but government had changed the rules somewhere between the harvest and the expected sale, and there they are, left with a surplus of wheat. Between weather, insects and other natural hazards, farming is a trade that makes a Las Vegas crap table look like a guaranteed annual income. The American farmer doesn't need government waffling and indecision added to his other troubles.

"This does not mean that we shouldn't re-examine our entire policy toward trade with Russia. We have walked the extra mile with the Soviet Union in pursuit of peace -- all the way to Vladivostock, to Helsinki, to SALT I and now to SALT II.

"And, if we can believe the respected journal, AVIATION WEEK, and the charges made by former Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird, the Soviet Union has apparently been violating SALT I; and there is good reason to believe we gave away too much at Vladivostock.

"In failing to let Andrei Sakharov, the Nobel Prize winner, out of Russia, they proved they had no intention of abiding by the spirit of the

Helsinki document. They continue to promote bloodshed and trouble in Angola and Portugal.

"Detente, it seems, has become a one-way street. If we are to have Detente, then let it be without illusions. George Washington, in his Farewell Address, warned, 'There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation'.

"We can exchange all the ballet dancers and opera singers we want, but Detente's success or failure will still be measured in terms of quid pro quo -- something for something.

"The Soviet Union continues to outspend us in armaments -- by 60% in nuclear weapons -- 25% in conventional. It is obvious they are building not a defensive force, but one designed for offense. In order to do this, they must forego production of consumer goods & even food for their own people. In other words, their vaunted economic system -- the utopia of Karl Marx-- cannot provide guns and butter. We, and our free world allies, should face the question of whether we are not contributing to the slavery of their people as well as danger to ourselves by bailing out their creaking, incompetent system when it finds itself in trouble. Would they, without our help, have to abandon arms building in order to feed their people or face the possibility of an uprising and revolution by a desperate and hungry populace? If the answer to this is yes, then we are faced with a question of national security and pure moral principle. If our decision is on the side of morality and security, we cannot ask the farmer to bear the full burden. We, as a nation, would have to think of his produce as a part of national defense and be prepared to offer a market for what he raises. Perhaps it could even be stored for future sale when and if the Soviet chooses real Detente and abandons its build-up of offensive weapons.

"We come to another color for our banner -- this one standing for a fundamental belief in our federation of sovereign states -- the belief that

government governs best the closer it is to the people.

"We have centralized in Washington control of a number of functions which, if they are to be performed by government at all, should be administered at the state and local levels. Among these, I would include welfare, medicaid, food stamps, education, community and regional development.

"It is not enough to say that under the leadership of the majority party we have the most irresponsible Congress in the memory of any one of us. A handful in both House and Senate valiantly fight a rear guard action against the excesses of the majority, but the tide of inflationary measures, unwise energy proposals and needless harassment of the productive sector, rolls on inexorably.

"The result is a fourth branch of government -- a permanent structure of unelected employees determining policy to a greater extent than most of us know. And this has led to an interlocking bureaucracy -- what I have referred to as the Washington buddy system -- that involves not only the Congress and government bureaucracy, but a growing body of employees representing other levels of government, labor, business and a host of special interests. As the federal government has expanded into new fields, these others have grown in numbers because of the necessity of dealing with the increasingly complex structure of government. Inevitably they find their personal interests are intertwined. If the federal bureaucracy is eliminated, there will be no need or place for them. And so they feed on each other.

"These are not evil men, but they are a part of a system and soon their original purpose becomes involved with perpetuating the system.

"As Parkinson said: Government hires a rat catcher and soon he becomes a rodent control officer. He's not about to eliminate the reason for his job.

"Let me give you a recent example. Early last month, a group of large corporations announced it would mount a major lobbying campaign to persuade Congress that we should sign a new treaty with Panama, giving away the canal. They are very frank as to why they are doing this. Their business interests in Central America have been threatened with sabotage and destruction if we don't give in to the military dictator's demands. Apparently the idea did not originate with them, but with our own State Department.

"Those within the framework of that buddy system strive to meet the nation's needs, but the system very often comes first.

"The transition from federal to state control should be phased and orderly, but I believe it should be up to the people of each state to say how much they wish to pay for such programs. Given the facts, I believe they will act with good sense and compassion.

"These programs can be better and more cheaply administered at the state level. Of course, you will not get uniformity -- but what is so sacred about uniformity. Indeed, our strength has always been diversity and it is diversity, not conformity, we should seek.

"It is true that states assuming some of these programs will have to raise taxes, but this will be more than offset by the reduction at the federal level because I assure you these programs can be administered at lower cost by the states.

"I know there are states that receive more from the federal government in aid than they send to it in the form of taxes. But they will have more to spend on themselves if the federal government is forced to reduce its own expenditures. Government should be forced to balance its budget; and forced to return back to the states much of the tax base it

has preempted. Sometimes when you hear this talk, that some states couldn't get along without help from their sister states, remember New York is one of those sister states. I wonder if anyone is suggesting that New York is in a position now to help any other state in the Union.

"I am confident that the American people are ready to demand that the federal government gets its weight off their backs and its fingers out of their pockets and purses.

"Unless we pick leaders who are willing to go over the head of the system and take the people's case to the voters, to the citizens of the 50 states, we are doomed to a never-ending, never-successful struggle.

"Sometimes when you are up to your elbows counting alligators, it is hard to remember your original objective was to drain the swamp.

"Ladies and gentlemen, I think we can take on the system. I think the people want us to, and expect us to. I think that until we do -- and when I say 'we', I mean we Republicans -- I think that until we do we are not only failing our trust as Republican leaders, but we are also failing our trust as concerned Americans. For, until we do, we will never rally to our side those disaffected non-voters who have quit voting, not out of apathy, but because they no longer believe they can influence government to make it responsive to their needs.

"Nor will we attract those Democrats who have had it up to their necks with big spending social programs that interfere with their lives; big inflation that robs them of both jobs and money; and big cuts in national defense that leaves the nagging worry that America may not be able to defend herself in time of need.

"Our task is no longer one of selling our philosophy, our Republicanism, to a citizenry enthused about government, confident of government's ability to be the horn of plenty granting instant utopia.

"A few years ago, more than three-fourths of all Americans did hold such a belief. No longer! Today, more than two-thirds of our people -- Republicans, Independents and Democrats alike -- are convinced they are not getting their money's worth from government.

"Even our opponents are aware of this, as their campaign rhetoric shows. In the leadership gathering in Louisville -- officially named the National Democratic Issues Conference -- they milled in confusion as they faced the revelation that big government doesn't seem to work anymore. If there was consensus at all, it was that the only solution for the problem of big government is bigger government.

"The hall rang with such phrases as 'welfare mess', 'food stamp rip-off' and the 'busing failure'.. But still they cheered and applauded the familiar old tunes they've lived with for 40 years -- the recommendation for public ownership of corporations. Another stressed that 'we can't have a master plan for society run by Washington elitists',--and then proposed a National Institute for Planning to be established by the federal government.

"One of their bright new breed of young Governors, who has beguiled the press by walking to work and declaring that the federal system as it is set up is not working, told the disciples, 'We have seen enough of failing great social programs and the bankruptcy of New York City to conclude that something is radically wrong and that more of the same won't do'. Having delivered himself of lines which any Republican could embrace, he then proposed a national health insurance plan, nationalizing transportation, a federal energy program and a federal guarantee of a job for everyone.

"They suffer from a kind of political schizophrenia. They know the problem, but can only solve it with more of the same doctrinaire liberalism that caused it in the first place.

"In 1972, we had the votes of millions of patriotic Americans, mainly because for the first time they understood what the Democratic leadership had done to that party and to this nation. This time, we can give them a more positive reason for voting. We can prove if we are willing to take the high road that there is a difference between the parties and that we will not dilute that difference for political expediency, we will not compromise our principles. All we need to do to turn this country around and point it in the direction in which we believe it should be going is to offer it a banner around which to rally -- the banner of Responsible Republicanism."

#

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information:
(Traveling with the Governor)
Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary
(In Los Angeles)
Peter Hannaford, Research Director
(213) 477-8231

FOR RELEASE:
9:00 p.m. CST
Saturday, December 13, 1975

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California,
to the Southern Republican Conference Banquet,
Albert Thomas Convention Center, Houston, Texas,
Saturday, December 13, 1975.

"It's a pleasure to be here this evening. We go back a lot of years
and a lot of campaigns. I've spoken in most of your states and know that

Crossfiled Under:

Republicans 1-3
Defense 3-4
Panama 4
U.S. Foreign Policy 4-5
Balanced Budget 6, 11
Capitalism 6-8
International Trade 8
Deterrence 8-9
Federal Spending 9-10 11