

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: January 1976-February 1976
(Copies of Statements) (1 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/>

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information: Lyn Nofziger,
Press Secretary (Traveling with
the Governor)

early 1976

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California

"It was a hot summer day in Philadelphia nearly 200 years ago, but the delegates to the Continental Congress were coolly determined as they signed the document that declared us free and independent as a nation.

"What it said, it said well, and clearly: 'that all men are created equal'; that among their inalienable rights are 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men; deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.' That idea -- consent of the governed -- was daring and new at the time. It is still the newest idea in the whole history of man's relation to man.

"What better time than now -- our 200th anniversary -- to take stock; to put the nation's recent history in perspective; to measure it against the principles stated in the Declaration of Independence?

"It is true that our elected officials govern with our consent which is given at the polls. If we don't like their actions and fail to replace them, then we have only ourselves to blame. But what of that vast bureaucracy centered in Washington that is insulated from us; and feels little need to be responsive to us? It piles regulation upon regulation on our daily lives, erodes our liberties and adds to the cost of most of what we buy.

"A Republican Congressman has revealed some startling figures -- Washington generates enough paperwork each year to fill 50 major league baseball stadiums. Ten years ago, the federal government had 3,800 different forms. Today it has 6,000 generated by 3,500 bureaus, agencies

more--more

and services that maintain 8,000 separate records systems. Fifteen major federal agencies, for example, circulate 145 energy-related questionnaires to the states and private businesses calling for 11 million answers.

"What can be done about a bureaucracy that has grown so large it is now a powerful lobbying force in Washington, concerned to a great extent with keeping and expanding its power?

"Well, recently I was on a panel with a well-known United States Senator -- a Democrat -- who admitted that Congress should be overseeing the effects of those bureaucratic regulations that stem from its legislation, but that Congress just doesn't get around to doing it!

"For decades we have been told that Washington is the place to go to solve problems. The sad truth is, though, that in case after case the so-called solution from Washington winds up making the problem more complex as it adds to the size of the bureaucracy and the budget.

"Thomas Jefferson said, at his first inauguration, 'A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government.'

"He believed the people were the best agents of their own destinies and that the task of government was not to direct them, but to create an environment of ordered freedom in which they could pursue their destinies, each in his own way. He also realized that the tendency of government is always to become both player and umpire. 'What has destroyed liberty and the rights of men in every government that has ever existed under the sun?', he asked, and answered, 'The generalizing and concentrating of all cares and powers into one body.'

"More and more, the 'buddy system', that intricate, interlocked fraternity in Washington, has co-opted the will of one group after another

with the lure that the federal government will somehow solve each group's problems. Today, we see Big Government intertwined with business, labor and with state and city governments. We see mayors of financially-beleaguered cities going to Washington to beg for money. What an irony this is, for it is Washington that bears a large share of the blame for the inability of cities and states to raise the money they need to solve their own problems. When Washington scoops up money from all over the country, it doesn't give it back without keeping a healthy chunk to run its bureaucracy. When it does send back the residue, it is neatly tied with strings -- mandated rules and regulations which the bureaucrats have decided are best for you and me, but which often overlook the differing needs of differing areas.

"Today, governments take more than 44% of the people's income in the United States. It is the biggest item in the family budget -- greater than food, shelter and clothing combined. Most of that is the federal government's share. No nation has long survived a tax burden so great. But in Washington, all our appeals for financial sanity, for an end to the inflation that is caused by huge deficits, seem to fall on deaf ears.

"The federal government's refusal to run its affairs as you must yours -- that is, in the black -- causes unending inflation. And, that's the cruelest tax of all. Take a cost-of-living wage increase, for example. When you get one, it may send you right into a higher tax bracket, virtually robbing you of the increase you were counting on. Only Washington makes a profit on inflation.

"With inflation, each dollar you earn buys less. The government's practices deprive business and industry of the capital needed to fuel our economy and produce jobs. They rob your savings of value and make a mockery of the stable income the government promised our retired citizens.

"As you know, I am a Republican. Now, I am also a candidate for the Presidency. In talking to Republican groups in recent months, I have spoken of a banner of bold, bright colors around which Republicans could rally, but around which sensible Americans of every political heritage -- Democrats and Independents -- could rally, too.

"I call these people -- all of them -- the producers in American society. They are the ones who get up early, send their kids to school, do a day's work, pay their bills and taxes, support their churches and charities and ask little more from government than to be safe in their homes and neighborhoods. There are those who refer to these Americans as the 'common man'. They are, instead, very uncommon men and women -- millions of unsung heroes who are this nation's strength.

"I have spoken about colors in a banner, but that is really a figure of speech standing for beliefs that bind us together, whatever our personal background and history; beliefs we will not compromise.

"The banner I have talked about is a banner for those Americans who feel strongest about their independence. Small business men and women, entrepreneurs, farmers, the self-employed, workers who have used their skills to earn their share of the American Dream for themselves and their families. People who care when Big Government intrudes into their lives, disrupts their businesses, busses their children and squanders their hard-earned wages on experiments in social engineering.

"Another of the bold colors in that unifying banner must stand for strong national defense and a foreign policy based, first, on what is good for the United States. Peace and freedom is not an empty phrase. Peace without freedom is meaningless; and freedom without peace means only that some foreign colonial power or aggressor has mistaken our lack of military preparedness for weakness or an unwillingness to defend the things we stand for.

"The surest guarantee of peace is to be second to none in military strength. To be second is the same as being last. No nation in history that ever placed its faith in treaties and let its hardware go has lived to write many pages of that history. A great and free society must also be a strong one. Appeasement leads only to war. George Washington may have said it best when he said, 'There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation.'

"When a policy such as detente results in truly lowered tensions between nations it is worthwhile, but we cannot afford detente that is only an illusion. Quid pro quo, that Latin term meaning 'something for something', must be the only basis for detente.

~~"For 25 years, the Roman Senator Cato concluded every speech to the Roman Senate with the line, 'Carthage must be destroyed'. Finally, he had his way. Rome set out to make war on Carthage. The people of Carthage were well off, given to art, culture and sports. Their standard of living was the highest in the ancient world and they desperately wanted to keep peace. Envoys were sent to negotiate with the Romans. Finally, Rome relented, but only on the condition that Carthage send as hostages the sons of its 300 leading families. This was done. But, then, Rome demanded all of Carthage's warships and weapons. They were delivered. Then came a final demand: the people of Carthage would leave their city because Rome intended to destroy it. Too late, the people of Carthage recognized the enormity of this deception. They turned on their leaders and destroyed them. Then they set out to build ships, spears and catapults, but it was too little too late. They were slaughtered, almost to the last man, woman and child, the city was leveled and the earth plowed and sown with salt so it could never be planted again.~~

"As a nation, we must commit ourselves to spend whatever is necessary to remain strong; to consider our interests first in international dealings. This does not mean dealing at the expense of others or without generosity to those who need a helping hand, but it does mean always knowing that we must not cast aside our nation's interest just for the sake of making a deal. *To see Second in military relations is to see last.*

"~~There are forces in the world determined to see the United States in decline. And, there are those here in the United States who think we should feel guilty for having been inventive, productive and powerful.~~

"One of the real ironies in this country is the fact, that, although we often have to deal overseas with totalitarian governments whose ideas of governing are light years from ours, those on the left are always politely referred to as 'the government of such-and-such country'. Those on the right, however, are invariably referred to as corrupt or oppressive, even fascist dictatorships.

"The Guilt Lobby is a big success. We have two recent examples.

"Fidel Castro, the Marxist dictator of Cuba, has made it plain for quite a long time that he's hostile to us, even contemptuous. But our State Department has been warming up to him for some time as a prelude to restoring trade and diplomatic recognition. Now, you might think that a pre-condition for such an event would be for Castro to curb his hostility and revolutionary zeal. That doesn't seem like too much to ask. But, instead, we have Castro talking up a revolution in Puerto Rico and sending Cuban troops to fight in Angola.

"High officials in our government had strong words about that. Yet, on the same December day the newspapers reported a tough Cuban message in which the Secretary of State had declared Cuba's involvement in Angola had

put the issue of trade with Cuba on ice, they also carried a short item that our Commerce Department had just ordered a further relaxation of restrictions on trade with Cuba.

"Where is U.S. strategy when it comes to Cuba? I suggest if one of our goals is to have Castro stop exporting his revolution, we should let him know we aren't going to talk business until he does.

"There are a few other points we can discuss, such as curbing Soviet base and landing rights on Cuba; reaffirming U.S. rights to our Guantanamo base; restitution for U.S. and Cuban property seized by the Castro regime; free movement between the two nations by the citizens of each; and renewed civil rights for their own people.

"The second example of the Guilt Lobby's success is the extent to which it has induced so many Americans to wear sack cloth and ashes as they do penance for our truly great achievement in building the Panama Canal.

"For more than 60 years, we have managed the Canal with fairness to all who wished to use it peacefully. We have done so at no profit to the U.S. investing, all told, \$7 billion -- most of which was spent in Panama, giving that country one of the highest standards of living in Latin America.

"But, for 15 years we have been propagandized by our own State Department that our presence in Panama is a kind of colonialism in the form of a long-term lease of Panamanian territory. In 1974, our Secretary of State signed a memorandum which, in fact, called into question our territorial right to the Canal Zone.

"It is time we were reminded that the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, involving the U.S., Great Britain and Panama, gave the United States exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity over the Canal Zone. Not only did we pay the government of Panama, we purchased in fee simple from each

8--8--8
individual owner all the privately-held land in the Canal Zone. All branches of the Panamanian government -- executive, legislative and judicial -- took action to recognize the Zone as being U.S. territory. In 1907, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled it was official U.S. territory and that decision was upheld as recently as 1972. If the Zone is not actually a part of the U.S., then neither is Alaska or all the land acquired by us in the Louisiana and Gadsden Purchases.

"What in the world are we doing -- negotiating a give-away of the Canal to a Marxist, military dictator who seized power eight years ago by forcefully ousting the duly-elected President? There have been no elections in eight years. There are no civil liberties for the people. There is censorship and oppression.

"The Canal is essential to Western Hemisphere defense and the world is safer with the U.S. running the Canal than it would be if we turn it over to General Torrijos. He should be told the Canal Zone is ours and we intend to keep it. And, there is really no need to delay this decision until after the election.

"We cannot abdicate our free world leadership even though it was not sought by us. We cannot do it in the Western Hemisphere. We cannot do it in the Middle East, where we have an interest in protecting a fragile peace. We cannot do it in Europe, where we are, and must remain, committed to a strong NATO alliance. And, we cannot do it in the Pacific, where we have strong ties of long duration and emerging friendships.

"A sound national defense and a sound economy are both necessary. We can't, as a matter of fact, have one without the other. There should be a color on our banner standing boldly for fiscal integrity, for an end to the cycles of inflation, recession, unemployment. When it comes to arguments over whether we should have a \$60 billion Republican deficit or an \$80 billion Democratic deficit, I find there's no room for me on either side.

more--more

"Our goal must be a balanced budget. Oh, but we're told that three-quarters of the budget is 'uncontrollable' -- fixed by statutes passed by Congress. As if they were stars in the sky. Well, statutes passed by Congress can be repealed by Congress; and since the leadership in Congress shows no inclination to do this, then it's time to elect a Congress that will.

"If Washington won't put its house in order instead of cheapening our dollars by running the printing press overtime, how in the name of heaven can we expect 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-quarters of our people live in cities. Are the mayors suggesting they should be supported by the other one-quarter who don't?

"While the argument goes on, Washington spends a billion dollars a day and goes one-and-a-half billion deeper into debt each week. Growing like a fungus, it assumes, apparently, that if it gets big enough it can somehow manage the entire nation's business. It spends \$700,000 each minute that I'm talking to you. There is no connection between their spending and my speaking. I'll stop talking if they'll stop spending.

"We need a color in our banner that stands for the free market system. Under that system, our country has prospered like no other in the world. It has unleashed more human ingenuity than any other system in mankind's history. Yet, for more than four decades, social engineers have tinkered with the system's machinery, claiming to be able to eliminate a squeak here, an imperfection there. Still others would forsake the tinkering and simply scrap the machinery, replacing it with the idiocy of Karl Marx. Why do we even listen to them? Are they too obsessed with their economic tinkertoys to compare our way with the examples we have of socialist failure?

"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, railroads and airlines -- lose roughly one billion dollars a year.

"Inflation in England is 25%-plus a year, and the rate of productivity in their government-run industries is the lowest of all the Western European nations. And, yet, voices are raised in Washington telling us we should follow the path of government intervention.

"There is a more dramatic example for comparison. I've told of it 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 vs. socialism. We have our country to look at and we have a concrete example of socialism in the form of another great nation. It has a land mass larger than our own; it's rich in natural resources; it has 250 million capable people. For nearly 60 years, it has 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!

"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.

"Unfortunately, even in this country, we have too much centralization. Washington has control of some functions which, if they are to be performed

by government at all, should be administered at the state and local levels. Among these are welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, education, community and regional development. They are all functions Washington has shown it does not perform very efficiently or responsively.

"These programs -- and I'm sure there are others -- can be better and more economically administered at the state level; or, in some cases, at the local 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.

"Any transition from federal to state control should be phased and orderly, but 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 with compassion.

"In this whole process, the federal government should be forced to balance its budget; and forced to return back to the states much of the tax base it has preempted. In fact, done with care, the whole program could result in a net saving for the taxpayer, in addition to providing more efficient and responsive programs.

"I believe the American people have had enough of politics as usual. They want government off their backs and out of their pockets.

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

"I think we can drain the swamp. We can take on the Washington system. We can change from remote control to personal control of our lives, if we'll make the effort.

"A few years ago, more than three-quarters of all Americans believed that they could trust the government in Washington to do what was right. Today, little more than one-third of all Americans feel that way.

"Even some Democratic politicians who used to be thought of as Big Government advocates and free-spenders are aware of this problem. In their recent leadership conference in Louisville, some expressed dismay that Big Government doesn't seem to work anymore.

"The hall rang with such phrases as 'welfare mess', 'food stamp ripoff' and the 'busing failure'. But there was a kind of philosophical schizophrenia. One speaker was cheered and applauded when he said, 'we can't have a master plan for society run by Washington elitists', and he was cheered and applauded when he then proposed a National Institute for Planning to be established and run by -- you've guessed it -- those same Washington elitists.

"One of the bright new breed of Governors, who has beguiled the press by taking the streetcar to work and declaring that the federal system as it is set up is not working, told the audience, '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 those lines, which any fiscal conservative could embrace, he then proposed a national health insurance plan, nationalized transportation system, a federal energy program and a federal guarantee of a job for everyone!

"You and I know that a healthy, strong society cannot function this way. It cannot run indefinitely under the massive burden of centralized control that has been growing in Washington. Nor, can it function on a diet of libertarian rhetoric coupled with yet more and bigger Washington programs.

"Government is like the character in Tolstoy's fable who says, 'I sit on a man's back, choking him and making him carry me, and yet assure myself and others that I'm very sorry for him and wish to lighten his load by all means -- except by getting off his back.'

"If we'll look instead to ways and means to make the genius of the free market system work even better, we can redeem the American Dream. A little over 100 years ago, the Homestead Act became law. Under it, tens of thousands of Americans were able to own their own land for the first time. It triggered much of the growth and prosperity we have today. Now, we're on the verge of something similar, though you might call it an Industrial Homestead Act. It hasn't been enacted as such yet, but the first steps have been taken by Congress. As a result, we are seeing a dramatic growth in the rise of something called Employee Stock Ownership Programs. Many companies are finding it beneficial to themselves and their employees to make capitalists out of the workers. To give them a share of the action, so to speak. At the same time, it is helping provide capital for more growth. There are several ideas under discussion for accelerating this new trend, but one thing seems certain: we could hardly find a better way to beat communism than by making successful capital owners of millions of American workers!

"Let me conclude by mentioning that banner again. Aren't all the colors on that banner designed to assure us that, as the Declaration of Independence said, 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness', will be ours forever? We can recapture that spirit of independence, that willingness to try the untried, to dream the new dream, knowing that we can succeed, for our very quest will cleanse and rebuild a system grown weary and so in need of change. We can do it -- together.

"Thank you."

#

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above text. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information: Lyn Nofziger,
Press Secretary (Traveling with
the Governor)

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California

"It was a hot summer day in Philadelphia nearly 200 years ago, but the delegates to the Continental Congress were coolly determined as they signed the document that declared us free and independent as a nation.

"What it said, it said well, and clearly: 'that all men are created

Crossfiled Under:

Court Reg. and Bur. 1-3

U.S. Defense Policy 6-8

Balanced Budget

Capitalism 9-10

Federal Spending 10-11

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information: Lyn Nofziger,
Press Secretary (Traveling with
the Governor)

early 1976

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California

"July 4th marks the 200th anniversary of that hot summer day in Philadelphia when the delegates to the Continental Congress signed the document that declared us free and independent as a nation.

"In what is one of the noblest testimonies to human freedom ever devised, they declared 'that all men are created equal'; that among their inalienable rights are 'life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. That, to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men; deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.'

"That was a daring new idea -- consent of the governed. Today, some would have us believe it is an outmoded idea.

"May I suggest our 200th anniversary is an appropriate time to take stock; to put the recent history of our nation in perspective, measuring it against the principles spelled out in the Declaration of Independence.

"True, our elected officials govern with our consent, given at the polls. If we don't like their actions and fail to replace them, we have only ourselves to blame. But what of that vast bureaucracy working ceaselessly, piling regulation upon regulation on our daily lives, eroding our liberties and adding to the cost of the goods and services we buy?

"A Republican Congressman has revealed some startling figures -- Washington generates enough paperwork each year to fill 50 major league baseball stadiums. Ten years ago, the federal government had 3,800 different forms. Today it has 6,000 generated by 3,500 bureaus, agencies and services that maintain 8,000 separate records systems. Fifteen major federal agencies, for example, circulate 145 energy-related questionnaires

more--more

to the states and private businesses calling for 11 million answers.

"Not too long ago, I was in a panel discussion with a well-known United States Senator -- a Democrat -- who admitted in the course of the discussion that Congress, after adopting programs, turned them over to the bureaucracy for management and made no effort to oversee them or to check on whether the thousands of regulations spawned by the bureaucrats were in keeping with the original purpose of the program. He admitted Congress should do this, but didn't indicate they would.

"For too many years we have been told that Washington was the only place to solve problems. The sad truth is, that in far too many cases, the so-called solutions have simply compounded the problems, enlarged the bureaucracy and increased the national debt.

"Thomas Jefferson said, 'A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned -- this is the sum of good government.'

"Jefferson believed that the people were the best agents of their own destinies, and that the task of government was not to direct the people, but to create an environment of ordered freedom in which the people could pursue those destinies in their own way. He also knew that the tendency of governments is always to become both player and umpire. 'What has destroyed liberty and the rights of men in every government that has ever existed under the sun?', he asked, and answered, 'The generalizing and concentrating of all cares and powers into one body.'

"More and more, the 'buddy system', that intricate, interlocking fraternity in Washington, has co-opted the will of first one group, then another, until today Big Government is intertwined with business, industry,

labor and with state and city governments. We have the spectacle of mayors of financially-beleaguered cities going to Washington to beg for money. That is like asking the Captain of the Titanic for a lift.

"Washington is largely responsible for the cities' plight. First it preempted the biggest share of the tax dollar, then it lured the cities into partnership programs to solve all the problems of humankind. Federal funds to the cities have multiplied to 20 times what they were 20 years ago and now amount to more than a fourth of the cities' total revenue. The result has been an increase in the number of public employees at state and local levels -- more than three times greater than the increase in private industry jobs.

"And, all of that federal money had to come from the people at the local level in the first place. Then it is returned, minus a carrying charge for administrative overhead, but plus a lot of rules as to exactly how it must be spent.

"Today, governments -- federal, state and local -- take more than 44% of our people's income, with the federal government taking the biggest share of that. No nation in history has survived such a tax burden for very long. But even this isn't enough. Each week the federal government goes another one-and-a-half billion dollars into debt. Appeals for financial sanity fall on deaf ears.

"The federal government's refusal to operate its affairs as you and I must -- making outgo match income -- causes unending inflation, the cruelest tax of all. A cost-of-living increase may very well move you into a higher tax bracket and you end up worse off than you were, while government makes a profit on inflation. To fund its deficits, government borrows in the long-term money market, robbing business and industry of access to the capital needed to fuel our economy and produce jobs. It robs your savings of value and makes a mockery of the stable, fixed income

it promised our retired citizens. The President and the Congress must understand the basic lesson of economic survival -- we must learn to live within our income.

"Some of you here tonight paid into the Social Security program month after month, year after year, in the belief that you would have a monthly benefit check so long as you lived after your retirement. Now we are told there is a great imbalance in Social Security and that it has been as badly handled as government has handled all its other finances.

"It is in need of an overhaul, but one thing must be made unmistakably certain -- any reform must have as first priority the guarantee that all those counting on Social Security for their livelihood will continue to receive their monthly check and that their benefits won't decline in purchasing power, but will keep pace with inflation.

"Reform there must be. There are inequities begging to be corrected. Take federal employees, for instance. As a group, they decided long ago to stay out of the system. They opted, instead, for their own pension program. Yet, some of them retire on these pensions at normal retirement age, take a job in private business for a relatively short time, then draw full Social Security benefits along with their federal pensions.

"Yet, if you work for 35 or 40 years in private business and retire at age 65, you can't even draw your full Social Security benefits unless you earn no more than \$2,760 a year. That isn't fair.

"Women are treated unfairly by the present system. A woman must be married to her husband for 20 years before she gains any rights to his Social Security benefits. If she is a homemaker for 18 years, bears and raises children, but for some reason she and her husband are divorced after, say, 18 years, she doesn't get a nickel of his benefits when he retires. This inequity should be corrected.

"A great many working women pay into the system but get nothing back. If a woman works, then retires, she gets nothing extra if her half of her husband's benefits are more than her own would have been individually. So, she pays into the program but gets nothing back.

"Or, take the case of two men reaching age 65. One of them is the president of a company. He has made good money and invested it. He retires with enough to live on from his investments. He is also entitled to his Social Security benefits. But what about the other man, a plumber, same age, but he wants to work for two or three more years. If he does, and earns his normal income, he won't get his Social Security benefits. If he takes the benefits, he can only earn that small amount the law allows. There is something wrong with a system that won't allow people who want to work, and can, do it after age 65 without forsaking their benefits.

"The system is also unfair to younger workers. No worker under age 40 stands to get back in benefits as much as he has put into the system.

"First, in any reform, as I've said, we must recognize the right of our retired citizens to their regular Social Security benefits, as well as the rights of today's workers who have been paying into the system. We must work to correct the inequities I have described. Any other reform proposals should be studied with an open mind, but with great care. Down the road, it is possible the government might decide to make some options available to new workers entering the system. If it does, it must make certain that doing so does not jeopardize today's retired people or workers in any way.

"But there is one reform that stands out above all others. That is for the federal government to set a schedule for balancing its budget and stick to that schedule -- so that those who depend on Social Security will know that the dollars they get next month will buy as much as they do today

and as they did in months past. Right now, Washington gets richer and we get poorer because of inflation. That must change.

"The politicians in Washington seem to be slow in catching on to something that those in the states can feel every day. That is the reawakening of the American spirit of independence and self-reliance. Daniel Webster once said, 'There is nothing so powerful as truth...' -- and the American people are on to the truth that there is no free lunch.

"They don't want any more New Deal or Great Society nostrums. They want government to pay its bills and not spend more than it takes in. And, they want a bigger share in deciding which programs and which ideas work and which don't. Look at the growing ranks of formerly free-spending Democrats who have suddenly become fiscal conservatives, at least in their campaign speeches.

"In these last several months, I've been in more than 30 states and everywhere I heard this reawakening and saw it in the faces of thousands of Americans. They want government off their backs and out of their pockets.

"Yes, and they want government closer at hand, not in the hands of a self-annointed elite in the nation's capitol.

"Right here in New Hampshire, your own government agencies have patrolled the waters of Lake Winnepesaukee safely and well for many years. But Washington wants to send in the Coast Guard to take over the job. Now, the Coast Guard is a fine organization, one we can all be proud of, but why does it have to do a job that is already being done well?

"This reawakened American spirit which is growing across the land recognizes that we, as people, aren't happy if we are not moving forward. A nation that is growing and thriving is one which will solve its problems as they come up.

more--more

"Last fall, I proposed that we take a good, hard look at programs run from Washington which add up to about one-quarter of the federal budget. I suggested we consider them prime candidates for an orderly, phased transfer to the states; that, indeed, they were not a proper function of the federal government.

"The people at state and local levels would and should decide whether they wanted to continue the programs, and, if so, how best to handle them.

"At the time, I predicted there would be howls from those who had an interest in Big Government. And, howls there were from every carpeted anteroom and chauffeured limousine. Those who believe only in big government and some of the pundits who comment on the Washington scene protested that: you can't let the people decide what they want; besides, Congress won't stand for it; and if they did, where would the money come from?

"I'll admit it may be a novel idea for Washington to hear that the people know best, when for so many years Washington has been telling the people that it knows what is best for them. But the greatness of America is in the greatness of her people.

"Some jobs only the federal government can do. National defense is one of them. And we'd better stop the erosion of our strength internationally lest we lose both the real and psychological initiative to those whose appetite for world domination is so clearly visible.

"But domestic programs should be managed at the level of government that can do the job most efficiently. The closer a program is to the people who pay for it, the more they will take an active interest in it. If Joe Doaks is using his welfare money to go down to the pool hall and drink beer and gamble, and the people on his block who are paying the bill also have a say in running welfare, Joe is apt to undergo a sudden change in his life-style.

"Federal authority has tried and failed to be the most efficient and economic in several areas. For example: welfare, food stamps, education, housing, Medicaid, community & regional development and revenue sharing.

"It has taken Washington more than 40 years to acquire its present power. Obviously, reversing the course of more than four decades can't be accomplished overnight. But we can begin. Indeed, we must begin the decentralization of federal power if this free way of ours is to be preserved. Some changes can be made administratively in a short time; others might take months or even a few years.

"But if the people want to regain control over their lives -- regain the right to determine their own destiny and keep a greater share of the fruit of their toil -- and I'm convinced they do -- they can make Congress aware of how they feel. Based on our own experience in California, I know that government by the people will work when the people work at it -- Congress will respond to a demand by the people.

"In California, we instituted a comprehensive program of welfare reform which had three objectives: Increase the grants to the truly needy; remove from the welfare rolls the undeserving greedy; and lighten the taxpayers' burden by bringing costs under control. Our reforms achieved all three of these objectives and a number of other states were soon instituting similar reforms. All of what we did was opposed by a hostile legislature until they finally caught on to the fact that the people wanted to change a system that obviously was not working.

"Will this work at the national level? It will if the people want it to. Government by the people isn't a new idea. It is 200 years old, and in these two centuries, it has become the golden hope of all mankind -- the idea that each one of us is born with the right to become whatever God intended us to be and that government exists only for our convenience. It's

been doing its best to become an inconvenience ever since -- the master, not the servant -- ordering more deficit spending, more rules and regulations, more bureaucrats and always less liberty.

"I have come here to ask your support for our party's nomination for the Presidency. I make no promise of having instant solutions to all the problems besetting us. But I know those problems can be solved -- solved if government will trust in the people and have faith in their capacity for greatness. Our need is for government that is confident not of what it can do for the people, but of what the people can do for themselves.

"We can no longer afford politics as usual. The time has come for those we send to Washington to stop thinking only about the next election and to start thinking about the next generation."

#

OFFICE OF RONALD REAGAN
10960 Wilshire Boulevard
Los Angeles, California 90024
For information: Lyn Nofziger,
Press Secretary (Traveling with
the Governor)

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
former Governor of California

"July 4th marks the 200th anniversary of that hot summer day in Philadelphia when the delegates to the Continental Congress signed the document that declared us free and independent as a nation.

"In what is one of the noblest testimonies to human freedom ever

Crossfiled Under:

~~Social Security Act~~

Urban Policy 3
Social Security 4-5
Balanced Budget 5-6
Federal Spending 7-8

✓

Citizens for Reagan For President

Sen. Paul Laxalt

Chairman

John P. Sears

Exec. Vice Ch.

George Cook

H. R. Gross

Louie B. Nunn

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring

Henry Buchanan

Treasurer

CONTACT: Lyn Nofziger

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts from Speech by Ronald Reagan
before Dade County Citizens for Reagan
Miami Springs, Florida, January 10, 1976

MIAMI, Fla.--"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.

"Unfortunately, even in this country, we have too much centralization. Washington has control of some functions which, if they are to be performed by government at all, should be administered at the state and local levels. Among these are welfare, Medicaid, food stamps, education, community and regional development. They are all functions Washington has shown it does not perform very efficiently or responsively.

"These programs -- and I'm sure there are others -- can be better and more economically administered at the state level, or, in some cases, at the local 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.

(MORE)

"Any transition from federal to state control should be phased and orderly, but 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 with compassion.

"In this whole process the federal government should be forced to balance its budget and forced to return back to the states much of the tax base it has preempted. In fact, done with care, the whole program could result in a net saving for the taxpayer, in addition to providing more efficient and responsive programs.

"I believe the American people have had enough of politics as usual. They want government off their backs and out of their pockets.

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

"I think we can drain the swamp. We can take on the Washington system. We can change from remote control to personal control of our lives, if we'll make the effort.

"A few years ago, more than three-quarters of all Americans believed that they could trust the government in Washington to do what was right. Today, little more than one-third of all Americans feel that way."

"As a nation we must commit ourselves to spend whatever is necessary to remain strong, to consider our interests first in international dealings. This does not mean dealing at the expense of others or without generosity to those who need a helping hand, but it does mean always knowing that we must not cast aside our nation's interest just for the sake of making a deal.

"There are forces in the world determined to see the United States in decline. And, there are those here in the United States who think we should feel guilty for having been inventive, productive and powerful.

(MORE)

"The Guilt Lobby is a big success. We have two recent examples.

"Fidel Castro, the Marxist dictator of Cuba, has made it plain for quite a long time that he's hostile to us, even contemptuous. But our State Department has been warming up to him for some time as a prelude to restoring trade and diplomatic recognition. Now, you might think that a precondition for such an event would be for Castro to curb his hostility and revolutionary zeal. That doesn't seem like too much to ask. But, instead, we have Castro talking up a revolution in Puerto Rico and sending Cuban troops to fight in Angola.

"High officials in our government had strong words about that. Yet, on the same December day the newspapers reported a tough message by the Secretary of State to the effect that Cuba's involvement in Angola would put the issue of Cuban trade on ice, they also carried a short item that our Commerce Department had just ordered a further relaxation of restrictions on trade with Cuba!

"Where is U.S. strategy when it comes to Cuba? I suggest if one of our goals is to have Castro stop exporting his revolution, we should let him know we aren't going to talk business until he does.

"Then, if he does, there are a few other points we could discuss, such as curbing Soviet base and landing rights in Cuba; reaffirming U.S. rights to our Guantanamo base; restitution for U.S. and Cuban property seized by the Castro regime; free movement between the two nations by the citizens of each; and renewed civil rights for their own people.

"The second example of the Guilt Lobby's success is the extent to which it has induced so many Americans to wear sack cloth and ashes and do penance for our truly great achievement in building the Panama Canal.

(MORE)

"For more than 60 years, we have managed the Canal with fairness to all who wished to use it peacefully. We have done so at no profit to the U.S., investing, all told, \$7 billion -- most of which was spent in Panama, giving that country one of the highest standards of living in Latin America.

"But, for 15 years we have been propagandized by our own State Department that our presence in Panama is a kind of colonialism in the form of a long-term lease of Panamanian territory. In 1974, our Secretary of State signed a memorandum which, in fact, called into question our territorial right to the Canal Zone.

"It is time we were reminded that the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, involving the U.S., Great Britain and Panama, gave the United States exclusive sovereignty in perpetuity over the Canal Zone. Not only did we pay the government of Panama, we purchased in fee simple from each individual owner all the privately-held land in the Canal Zone. All branches of the Panamanian government -- executive, legislative and judicial -- took action to recognize the Zone as being U.S. territory. In 1907, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled it was official U.S. territory and a 1972 federal court decision reinforced this ruling. If the Zone is not actually a part of the U.S., then neither is Alaska or all the land acquired by us in the Louisiana and Gadsden Purchases.

"What in the world are we doing -- negotiating a giveaway of the Canal to a Marxist, military dictator who seized power eight years ago by means of a coup, ousting the duly-elected government? There have been no elections since. There are no civil liberties for the people. The press is censored; the National Assembly disbanded.

"The Canal is essential to Western Hemisphere defense and the world is safer with the U.S. running the Canal than it would be if we turn it over to General Torrijos.

###

Citizens for Reagan For President

Sen. Paul Laxalt

Chairman

John P. Sears

Exec. Vice Ch.

George Cook

H. R. Gross

Louie B. Nunn

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring

Henry Buchanan

Treasurer

CONTACT: Lyn Nofziger

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts from Speech by Ronald Reagan
before Dade County Citizens for Reagan
Miami Springs, Florida, January 10, 1976

MIAMI, Fla.--"We come to another color for our banner -- this

Crossfiled Under:

Federal Spending 1-2
U.S. Foreign Policy 2-K

ANGOLA

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY RR -- 1/17/76 --DES MOINES

I think the problem with Angola is all of us are confused about the Soviet Union's aggressive action in there. It worries us. We think if they're that intent on taking over, it must have something to do with us. But, in Washington, we find a great debate between the Administration and Congress. I think the real problem is you and I, the citizens, are left without any information. I think the first thing is for the federal government to tell us what is the strategic importance of Angola; is it of any interest to our national security? If it isn't, then we don't do anything. If it is, then we ought to know how it is and what action we can take. But, in the meantime, again, in the spirit of Detente, while they're telling us that, I think our government should make Russia understand that we don't think what they're doing in Angola is a part of Detente. They get out; we get out, and let the Angolans have the place to themselves.

RR:RR

DRAFT -- RR -- 1/22/76

INSERT -- Stump Speech

I have proposed that half a dozen functions now being performed by the Federal Government should be transferred back to state and local governments for administration and control. I suggested they were not properly the province of the national government and could be more efficiently and economically handled at levels of government closer to the people.

In making this proposal I made it very clear that such a transfer should be systematic, and phased in over a period of time, possibly, in some cases, even years. I also made it plain that with the transfer of authority there should also be a transfer of resources -- meaning the federal taxes presently used to fund these services.

The half dozen programs were education, housing, community development, man-power training, revenue sharing and welfare.

I predicted at the time that we could expect to hear screams of anguish from the carpeted anti-rooms in Washington. Bureaucracy is adept at protecting its nest. It also has a built-in instinct for preservation and reproduction of its own kind. Dr. Parkinson, in his book, wrote that government employs a "rat catcher" and one day finds he has become a "rodent control officer". He has no intention of getting rid of the rats -- they have become his reason for being.

My prediction, of course, has come true. A well orchestrated chorus of doom-criers, their voices amplified in this policial season, have predicted every disaster but a plague of locusts. Increased local taxes, the needy thrown out in the snow to die, and fiscal disaster and depression are just some of what they say we can expect if we reduce the size and power of the Washington bureaucracy.

more--more--more

I've heard it all before. A few years ago in California, we were faced with the kind of "welfare mess" we are still faced with in Washington. For four years, we tried to halt the runaway increase in caseload and cost but nothing seemed to work. We were frustrated by federal regulations, court orders obtained by "welfare rights groups" using government paid lawyers from O.E.O. and a liberally oriented Democratic majority in the legislature.

Finally, we appointed a task force -- some members of our administration and a number of public spirited citizens who were willing to give of their time and talent. They studied the Congressional acts, the regulations (which they found in many instances were contrary to Congressional intent) and our own state regulations. Prior to that we had been dependent on the welfare professionals for information and all they had told us were the things we couldn't do. What we could do, according to them, was accept things as they were.

At the end of seven months, our task force handed us the most comprehensive proposal for welfare reform ever attempted in this country. Some of the provisions were administrative and could be implemented immediately. But much of the reform depended on legislation and some on waivers from H.E.W. in Washington. By this time our caseload was increasing by 40,000 people a month.

The legislature, of course, was totally against any of the measures we proposed although (and this has a familiar ring) they too said there should be welfare reform. It was just our welfare reform that wouldn't work. Their chorus of doom proclaimed that we would simply shift the burden of welfare to county general relief, which would increase property taxes at the local level. The needy would be turned out in the street and we'd wind up with a state deficit of \$750 million. Sound familiar?

more--more--more

Unable to even get the legislature to listen to our proposal, we took our case to the people. We told them of recipients who were earning more than the median income, yet were legally drawing welfare, medicaid and food stamps. One county had 194 full-time county employees drawing welfare, some of them welfare case workers acting as case workers for each other. Hundreds of checks were being sent to families who had gone abroad to live -- one family was receiving its check in Russia. Intrigued by our story, the news media sent reporters out to see if they could get on welfare. They found they could, sometimes more than once under different names.

The people heard the facts and were outraged. They made their feelings known to the legislature and, after having been delayed almost half a year, we got our reforms.

The 40,000 a month increase in caseload became an 8000 a month decrease. No one died in the streets. County general relief went down in caseload, not up. Forty-three of our 58 counties were able to reduce their property tax rates two years in a row and the second year, two other counties joined them. Oh yes!, that \$750 million deficit turned out to be an \$850 million surplus which we returned to the people in the form of a one-time tax rebate. One Senator who had opposed us said he considered giving that money back to the people an unnecessary expenditure of public funds.

Now, I feel like I'm seeing and hearing a re-run on the late, late show. Washington is filled with talk about the welfare mess and everyone says something should be done about it. The only proposal the bureaucracy could come up with was the "Family Assistance Plan" which died aborning (thank Heaven) because it would have added 12 million to the welfare rolls at a cost of tens of billions of dollars a year.

more--more--more

A liberal Senator, now a presidential candidate, recently charged that welfare by any standard of measurement is a dismal and utter failure. He describes it as "a ship at sea without rudder or compass" (and I'll swear I had that line in one of my speeches). "It has no basic goal except to perpetuate itself, creating new generations of welfare recipients and new generations of welfare bureaucrats." He termed it the "root cause of inflation" and so it is. He, too, demanded reform but offered no plan.

The truth is no one in Washington knows how many people in this country are on welfare. They only know how many checks they're sending out. In Chicago, a woman used 80 names, 30 addresses, and 15 telephone numbers in collecting food stamps, social security, welfare and veterans' benefits from four deceased but non-existent husbands. Her tax-free cash income alone was \$150,000 a year.

In California, we reduced the rolls by almost 400,000 in three years, saved the taxpayers \$2 billion and raised the grants to the deserving needy an average of 43% by making able-bodied welfare recipients work at useful community projects in return for their grant, we funneled 57,000 of them through those projects into private enterprise jobs in just the last six months of 1973 and the first six months of 1974, while the recession was deepening and unemployment was increasing.

In St. Johns Township, Indiana, they began an experiment with their Temporary Relief Program; something similar to our county general relief. They made recipients work for their grants. Cost of the program had been averaging \$5000 a month. In September, the first month of the experiment, the cost dropped to \$1200; in October, it was \$900; November, \$800 and in December, \$300.

One last footnote on welfare. A judge in Cambridge, Massachusetts

more--more--more

found a woman guilty of welfare fraud. He ordered her to repay \$1,511.64 to the welfare department at \$15 a month but he ordered the department to increase her grant \$15 a month so she could pay off the debt.

For the sake of the people we are trying to help and for the taxpayers, welfare should be administered at the state and local level without the benevolent hand of Washington laying a finger on it.

Food stamps are as out of control as welfare. A few years ago, a journalist in an Eastern paper wrote of a welfare recipient who worked part time on a farm. One day, he stole a ham from the farmer's smoke house and sold it to a grocer for \$27.00.

With \$20 of the \$27 he bought \$80 worth of food stamps. He used the stamps to buy back the ham for \$29. Then he returned the ham to the smoke house. The journalist concluded his item saying, "the farmer got his ham back, the grocer made a profit and the man on welfare had \$7 cash and \$51 in groceries -- with no one the loser". That's the kind of arithmetic that got New York in trouble.

Food stamps are of course welfare but they are administered by the department of agriculture. Secretary of Agriculture Butz, has tried to have this program transfereed to the welfare agencies. The truth is, if some one had set out to design a welfare program that wouldn't work, he couldn't do better than food stamps. You probably figure that way when you stand in the checkout line with hamburger while the guy ahead is buying T-bone steaks with food stamps. The federal government makes the rules and then orders the states to go out and find people who can be considered eligible to receive stamps. And they've found them. In 1965, there were fewer than a half-million Americans drawing food stamps at a cost of only \$36 million; last year, there were 19 million and the cost was \$5 billion and more than 57 million are declared eligible at least one month out of the year. Advertisements right now

tell you to check because even at incomes of \$16,000 a year, you too may be eligible.

What do you do when you are a Governor and a call comes in from an irate father in another state who declares he's making \$100,000 a year, sending his son to college in your state and demands to know why you are putting his son on welfare. Well, it turned out that his student son was getting food stamps and we had to tell the man that under the rules, if his son asked for food stamps, we had to give them to him. We had a young woman in California receiving stamps as a student -- she was studying to be a witch.

In many counties of one major state where universities and colleges are located, 20% of the food stamp recipients are students. College papers print detailed instructions on how to obtain stamps. Santa Clara County, where Stanford University is located has 15,000 students getting food stamps. Tuition at Stanford is \$4,267.

There is no minimum age limit -- a teen-age high school boy left home, moved in with friends and paid his way with free food stamps.

No limit is placed on the value of a home, auto or personal property. In fact, ownership of an expensive home can actually help qualify you. A Louisiana recipient's home was robbed of \$3700 in jewelry, \$240 in cash, and \$500 worth of food stamps. The executive city editor of a metropolitan paper reported that he was told by the local welfare department he could purchase food stamps even though he informed them he owned a \$40,000 home, a 3 acre lot, 2 late model cars and his salary was \$400 a week.

Taxpayers finance strikes by way of food stamps. The Wharton School of Finance and Commerce estimates that major strikes in 1969-71 cost the public \$240 million in stamps for strikers.

The National Education Association has notified its 1.7 million teacher members that they are undoubtedly eligible and to apply.

Graft is rampant in the administration of the program and food stamps are easily counterfeited. Two men in California were arrested who had 1.3 million dollars worth of counterfeit stamps. A man in Texas is alleged to have accepted \$300 in food stamps for performing car repairs and painting, 300 for a used car and 250 for a mini-bike.

Does anyone doubt that transferring this program to state and local governments would be an improvement? In California, we completed a task force study of this program too late in our administration to do anything about it but a number of our recommendations have been included in a reform bill authored by Senator James Buckley. The bill would reduce costs by \$2 billion while it increased help to the truly needy by 29%.

Washington's record in activities, not its proper province, is discouragingly consistent. Years ago, they set out to build low-cost housing for the poor. So far, they've destroyed 3-1/2 dwellings for every one they've built. Their net loss by 1968 was 314,000 housing units. But of those they have built, almost 1/2 aren't low-cost. They can only be afforded by upper middle class renters.

F.H.A. has lost \$1.4 billion on resale of houses taken in mortgage foreclosures and there have been major scandals in 20 large cities in the last four years. The rate of foreclosure is seven times what it is in the private sector.

When he was Secretary of H.U.D., George Romney proved to a Congressional committee that under the rules they had laid down, the government could not provide housing for less than 20% above the price charged by private builders. At the time, housing for the poor in Washington was being

built at a cost of \$56,000 per unit.

Right now, H.U.D. is out advertising that under present regulations, 1/3 of the families in America are probably eligible for a rent subsidy and everyone should run down to their nearest friendly bureaucrat to check on this. It seems if your income is 80% or less of the median income in your neighborhood, you are eligible. In some areas, that means people with incomes of around \$15,000 can have part of their rent paid by their neighbors.

In recent years, we've all been concerned because little Willy doesn't seem able to read. In California, our state universities have added a freshman course dubbed "bone head" English for students who have entered the University (and they had to be in the top 12% of their class to enter) but who haven't learned enough grammar in high school to take Freshman English.

Over the last 10 year period, the scores on entrance exams for college have been nose diving and last year were the lowest we've ever known. By some quirk or coincidence, the decline in education quality has been in direct proportion to the increase in Federal financial aid. The General Accounting Office in reviewing the results of Title I of the Federal Aid to Education Act of 1965 (the reading program) finds that between the educationally deprived children who were supposed to be helped by the program and the average citizen, the gap has widened in 14 states.

Former Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon when she was chairman of a Congressional subcommittee on education said, "I have come to realize with much pain that many billions of Federal tax dollars have not brought the significant improvement we anticipated. There are even signs we may be losing ground. Programs never seem to phase out, even after the problem has been solved or after the program has shown

very disappointing results".

She went on to describe the committees experience in visiting the department dispensing the educational grants. She said, "A federal agency consists of an upper echelon of polirical appointees and a vast underlay of permanent civil service bureaucrats. The lower level bureaucracy runs the show. This means regulations and guidelines are issued, laws are interpreted, contracts are let and grants are made by 3rd and 4th rank officials who are immune to constituency complaints." By that last sentence, she meant that the bureaucracy doesn't have to be beholden to the people. They can't be voted out of their jobs.

She described what they found as complete chaos. No one knew to whom the grants were given, for what purpose or what were the results. And then added, "We can't tolerate more centralization and federal control".

Some years ago when federal aid to education was first proposed, a group of distinguished college and university presidents went to Washington. They expressed a fear that federal funds would be followed by federal rules thus endangering academic freedom. As an alternative they suggested a plan whereby the taxpaying citizen would be allowed to subtract a prescribed portion of his income tax and send it to the educational institute of his choice. The government would set the amount of tax which could thus be contributed. This would, in fact, be federal aid but it would be given directly by the people, not in the form of federal grants. Also, a competitive feature would be introduced; educational institutes would have to do well to attract contributors and there is nothing wrong with that.

One of the University Presidents who attended those meetings told me how for days they argued with Francis Keppel, Director of Education. He

insisted there was no threat to academic freedom, that Washington had no intention of interfering with educational policy -- there would be no strings attached to the grants of money. The Presidents kept asking, then, why wouldn't their proposal work? Finally, he blurted out, "because under such a system, the government wouldn't be able to achieve its social objectives".

And social objectives there are. The Carnegie Foundation surveying 132 schools, describes conditions as "confused and chaotic -- full of contradictory guidelines, enforced by agencies that are often feuding with each other". The foundation says the very survival of some of the schools is threatened because of the excessive cost of required paper work.

Dartmouth, an independent college of prestige and rich tradition was hiring a new dean. They knew who they wanted to hire but couldn't until they had advertised first in a number of national publications. Last summer, the University of Washington was required by H.E.W. to present statistical information on its 15,000 faculty and staff in a new format that cost \$50,000. One middle size independent college had government paper work costs go from \$2000 to \$166,000. The American Council on Education has found the cost of complying with Federal programs increased in 10 years to as much as 20 times what it was. Some schools which have never taken a penny of federal funds are now being told they come under HEW regulations because a few of their students are on federal scholarships or loans. Brigham Young University in Salt Lake City has been told it can no longer enforce its own student dress and appearance code. HEW in Washington had decided that there shouldn't be such codes.

Public grammar schools are being forced to fill out forms if pupils are punished, stating the reason for and kinds of punishment administered.

Washington's handling of job training is a twin to the confusion and chaos Congresswoman Green found in federal aid to education. Right there in the Capitol City, \$71,000 was spent on a job training program which resulted in only one person finding employment.

From the beginning, Washington adopted a policy of paying people, (even those on welfare) to take job training. The result was predictable. Many took job training only for the pay they received for doing so, moving from one program to another upon completion of each course. One such program in a low income area in Los Angeles a few years ago paid the enrollees to learn dishwashing. The training slots were filled but those taking the training good naturedly joked that dishwashing was the one job they could always get without training.

In 1968, C.O.R.E., the Commission on Racial Equality said, "Hand-outs are demeaning. They do violence to a man, strip him of his dignity and breed in him a hatred of the total system. Poor men want the same as the rest of us. Poor men want to be independent. Poor men want jobs, ownership, control over their own destiny. Welfare is no answer but there is an answer. We seek to harness the creative energy of private enterprise to achieve a solution to America's crisis. We look to American independence of spirit to recognize opportunity and to take advantage of it. We look to the vitality of American initiative to transform the underdeveloped parts of this nation. It has happened in the past -- it can happen again."

No one can quarrel with that statement but in the years since it was spoken what have we had under the majority leadership in both houses of the Congress? Certainly not a revival of our independent spirit nor development of the creative spirit of free enterprise.

We have had instead a massive build up in the staff and budget of

Congress itself. It has increased in everything but its output of legislation. There has even been a 60% increase in the number of words spoken on the floor of the house. If we could harness that fuel source, we wouldn't have to turn the thermostats down. The staff of Congress had increased by 256% and the budget by 681% in just a couple of decades. One of the items in their budget is \$40,000 to fold copies of Senators speeches.

I mentioned energy -- we've heard promises that our goal was to become independent of outside imports -- Washington somehow refuses to learn that the best thing it can do is to do nothing. In 1958, there were 58,000 new oil wells being drilled, then Congress got into the act with price controls and regulations. By 1973, we were only drilling 27,000. Frightened by the embargo and the consequent shortage of oil, they freed new oil discoveries from price controls. In just two years, we were up to almost 39,000 new wells. But they couldn't leave well enough alone. Now we have a new energy bill and already the drilling rigs are closing down by the hundreds. In a few years, we'll be dependent on imports for 50% of our oil. What if we have an embargo then?

Congress has met the problem of recession by treating the symptoms, passing emergency job creation programs. The jobs are all in the field of government and they must be new jobs. So when New York City with its troubles laid off 260 policemen and 150 firemen, they hired (with federal funds) 400 new employees in the department of mental hygiene.

The director of the Hill-Burton project -- the program in which the government subsidizes hospital construction turned back almost \$300 million he didn't need because there is now an excess of hospital beds in the country. The House Appropriations Subcommittee refused to let him save the money -- it had to be spent. When Casper Weinberger was

Secretary of HEW, he wanted to turn back \$17 million in student aid funds for which there were no applicants. Congress ordered him to find and persuade students to take the money.

But Washington does try to protect us. The Federal Trade Commission rules it is misleading to the consumer to call a fake fur -- a fake fur. A company is not allowed to say its product is better than another -- but it can say it's the best.

Think of all the tragedy we've been spared by the Consumer Product Safety Commissions timely warning to mothers that sharpened pencils and shiny scissors can bring howls of pain from children if they aren't used with care.

A Rutgers Professor has written, "that the billions of dollars that are being spent on the urban poor by all levels of government go mainly to support a growing welfare bureaucracy of teachers aides, youth workers, clerks, supervisors, key punchers and peoples' lawyers. The bureaucracy is sustained by the plight of the poor, the threat of the poor, the misery of the poor, but it yields little in the way of loaves and fishes to the poor. When the old programs fail they are re-baptized and re-funded."

DRAFT -- RR -- 1/22/76

INSERT -- Stump Speech

I have proposed that half a dozen functions now being performed by the Federal Government should be transferred back to state and local governments for administration and control. I suggested they were not properly the province of the national government and could be more efficiently and economically handled at levels of government closer to the people.

In making this proposal I made it very clear that such a transfer

Crossfiled Under:

Federal Spending 1-2
Welfare 3-5, 13
Ford Stamps 5-6 7
Housing Programs 7-8
Education - Federal Aid 8-10
Federal Jobs Programs - 11/12
Energy - Supplies 12
Consumerism - 13

For information:
~~Lyn~~ Nofziger, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Brevard County Republican Dinner,
Melbourne Auditorium
Melbourne, Florida
January 30, 1976

"There cannot be a peaceful world or a guarantee of our continued existence as a free people unless we start now to build whatever is necessary to ensure that we will never be second to anyone in the ability to defend ourselves.

"This means, for example, we cannot afford the vague definitions used in the SALT I agreement, for vague definitions only lead to liberal interpretations by the other side. In SALT I we also agreed to reduce an important defensive weapons system -- the ABM -- in which we held a wide technological lead. It is vital to our nation that there be no repeat of this. With our cruise missile, we also hold a sizeable technological lead. Today, it is our best chance for maintaining an adequate military defense. It must not be compromised for some cosmetic concession by the Soviets, and it most certainly is worth a great deal more to us than the Soviet Union's Backfire bomber.

"In our own hemisphere it is time we recognized our own interests. Fidel Castro, the Marxist dictator of Cuba, has made it plain for years that he's hostile to us, even contemptuous of us. Yet, our State Department has been warming up to him for some time, as a prelude to restoring trade and diplomatic recognition. Now, you might think that a precondition for such an event would be for Castro to show us he has curbed his hostility. That doesn't seem to be too much to ask. Instead, we have Castro sending thousands of troops to fight in Angola while he's promoting a revolution in Puerto Rico!

more--more--more

"Just what is U.S. strategy with regard to Cuba? It isn't at all clear, but if one of our goals is to have Castro stop exporting his revolution, I suggest we let him know we aren't going to talk business till he does.

"We face a similar situation with Panama. The military strongman there, Omar Torrijos, overthrew the elected government in 1968. He demands that we turn over the Panama Canal to him. He backs this up with a well-orchestrated propaganda program, aided and abetted by the press of the Soviet Union. Dark hints of sabotage and riots are made if we don't do the bidding of this dictator who hasn't permitted an election since he took power; who censors the press; and who doesn't permit civil liberties in Panama.

"Does our State Department kowtow to him? For more than 60 years we have managed the Canal with fairness to all who wished to use it peacefully. We have done so at no profit to the U.S., investing, all told, \$7 billion. In the process, we've helped Panama achieve one of the highest standards of living in Latin America. Yet, for several years we have been propagandized not only by the left-leaning Panamanian military junta, but also by our State Department to the effect that our presence in the Canal Zone is a kind of colonialism in the form of a long-term lease. In 1974, the Secretary of State even signed a memorandum which called into question our territorial sovereignty over the Canal Zone, despite both U.S. and Panamanian court actions over the years which reaffirmed that sovereignty.

"They are rewriting history. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, involving the U.S., Great Britain and Panama, gave us sovereignty in perpetuity over the Canal Zone. If the Zone is not actually sovereign U.S. territory, then neither is Alaska or all the land acquired by us in the Louisiana and Gadsden Purchases. It is time we recognized that it is vital to our defense and commerce and we should maintain control over it.

Citizens for Reagan For President

Sen. Paul Laxalt
Chairman

John P. Sears
Exec. Vice Ch.

George Cook

H. R. Gross

Louie B. Nunn

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring

Henry Buchanan
Treasurer

CONTACT: Lyn Nofziger
Jan McCoy
202/452-7606

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts from Gov. Reagan's Remarks
Fort Lauderdale, Florida
Tuesday, February 3, 1976

FT. LAUDERDALE, Fla.--There cannot be a peaceful world or a guarantee of our continued existence as a free people unless we start now to build whatever is necessary to ensure that we will never be second to anyone in the ability to defend ourselves.

This means, for example, we cannot afford the vague definitions used in the SALT I agreement, for vague definitions only lead to liberal interpretations by the other side. In SALT I we also agreed to reduce an important defensive weapons system -- the ABM -- in which we held a wide technological lead. It is vital to our nation that there be no repeat of this. With our cruise missile, we also hold a sizeable technological lead. Today, it is our best chance for maintaining an adequate military defense. It must not be compromised for some cosmetic concession by the Soviets, and it most certainly is worth a great deal more to us than the Soviet Union's backfire bomber.

(MORE)

Just as detente must be a two-way street if it is to work, so, too, must our participation in the U.N. and other international organizations be a two-way street.

In recent months, our Ambassador to the U.N., Mr. Moynihan, has said clearly and forcefully things that needed to be said for a long time. He made it refreshingly clear that the United States would be nobody's punching bag in that international forum. I was sorry to read this morning that Pat Moynihan found it necessary to resign from his post at the U.N. We need the Pat Moynihans of this world to remind us that our nation's future need not be one of retreat and pessimism, but rather one of making a dynamic contribution to the world's betterment without sacrificing our national interests. I am sorry that the Administration was unable to keep him. His voice will be hard to replace.

In our own hemisphere it is time we recognized our own interests. Fidel Castro, the Marxist dictator of Cuba, has made it plain for years that he's hostile to us, even contemptuous of us. Yet, our State Department has been warming up to him for some time, as a prelude to restoring trade and diplomatic recognition. Now, you might think that a precondition for such an event would be for Castro to show us he has curbed his hostility. That doesn't seem to be too much to ask. Instead, we have Castro sending thousands of troops to fight in Angola while he's promoting a revolution in Puerto Rico!

Just what is the U.S. strategy with regard to Cuba? It isn't at all clear, but if one of our goals is to have Castro stop exporting his revolution, I suggest we let him know we aren't going to talk business till he does.

(MORE)

We face a similar situation with Panama. The military strongman there, Omar Torrijos, overthrew the elected government in 1968. He demands that we turn over the Panama Canal to him. He backs this up with a well-orchestrated propaganda program, aided and abetted by the press of the Soviet Union. Dark hints of sabotage and riots are made if we don't do the bidding of this dictator who hasn't permitted an election since he took power; who censors the press; and who doesn't permit civil liberties in Panama.

Does our State Department kowtow to him? For more than 60 years we have managed the Canal with fairness to all who wished to use it peacefully. We have done so at no profit to the U.S., investing, all told, \$7 billion. In the process, we've helped Panama achieve one of the highest standards of living in Latin America. Yet, for several years we have been propagandized not only by the left-leaning Panamanian military junta, but also by our State Department to the effect that our presence in the Canal Zone is a kind of colonialism in the form of a long-term lease. In 1974, the Secretary of State even signed a memorandum which called into question our territorial sovereignty over the Canal Zone, despite both U.S. and Panamanian court actions over the years which reaffirmed that sovereignty.

They are rewriting history. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903, involving the U.S., Great Britain and Panama, gave us sovereignty in perpetuity over the Canal Zone. If the Zone is not actually Sovereign U.S. territory, then neither is Alaska or all the land acquired by us in the Louisiana and Gadsden Purchases. It is time we recognized that it is vital to our defense and commerce, and we should maintain control over it.

###

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above text. He will, however, stand by the above quotes.)

For information:
Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary
(Traveling with Governor Reagan)

RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 10, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks
by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
at the Phillips Exeter Academy,
Exeter, New Hampshire
February 10, 1976

"It is an honor to be here today and I want to thank all the students of Phillips Exeter Academy for inviting me.

"In the last few decades a fourth branch of government has developed to rival the Executive, Legislative and Judicial. It's the bureaucracy -- a permanent structure which cannot be removed by our votes. It invades nearly every facet of our lives. It covers the nation with a multitude of regulations and robs us of our liberty. And, if we don't interrupt its present course, one day we're going to find ourselves living in a society where everything that isn't compulsory will be prohibited.

"There are some 3500 federal departments, agencies and bureaus that require Americans in various lines of work in this country to fill out more than 10,000 separate forms.

"There are 8,000 separate federal record-keeping systems keeping tabs on us. Yet, despite all of this, Social Security could still send a letter to a fellow in New Jersey, telling him he was dead, and thus terminating his payments. When he showed up very much alive, they still couldn't figure out a way to reinstate his payments. But they did tide him over for awhile: they gave him \$700 for his funeral!

"Now, to pay for all this, governments -- federal, state and local -- are taking 44 cents out of every dollar earned in the United States in the form of taxes and deficits.

"Taxes today take more of the people's earnings than food, shelter and clothing for the family altogether. Still the government in

Washington goes one-and-one-half billion dollars a week deeper into debt. This causes an unending inflation which is just another form of tax -- a cruel tax -- falling on those least able to pay.

"And, despite all this taxation, we have programs being run by the Washington establishment which are neither responsive to people's needs, nor efficient.

"I have proposed that several functions now being performed by Washington should be transferred back to the states and communities where they can be made more responsive and efficient because they'll be closer to the people. Such a transfer process should be systematic and phased in over a period of time, and should include transfer of the federal tax resources to finance the programs. The categories I have named as the most likely "candidates" for transfer are: education, housing, food stamps, welfare, Medicaid (not Medicare), community and regional development and revenue sharing.

"These programs are basically local in nature. Bringing them home where they can take on a more human scale would give us more responsive government -- something that anyone who has ever tried to complain or appeal to the bureaucracy in Washington knows we badly need.

"Take one category: education. Over the last 10-year period, the scores in college entrance exams have been going down. Last year they were at their lowest. Oddly, or perhaps not, federal funding and control have been increasing in almost direct proportion to this decline.

"Former Congresswoman Edith Green, whose liberal credentials are unquestioned, chaired a Congressional committee on education. She said, 'I have come to realize, with much pain, that many billions of dollars of federal tax have not brought significant improvement as anticipated. Programs never seem to phase out, even after the problem has been solved.'

"She's right about that. A federal program, once instituted, becomes the nearest thing to eternal life that you and I will ever see on this earth.

"The Congresswoman went on to describe her committee's experience in visiting the department that dispensed the educational grants. She said--no one over there knew to whom the grants were given; for what purpose; or what the results were. Then, she added, 'We cannot tolerate more centralization and federal control.'

"The Carnegie Foundation, surveying 132 schools, has found the situation 'confused and chaotic, full of contradictory guidelines, enforced by agencies that are often feuding with each other.' They said that the very survival of some schools is threatened by the excessive paperwork.

"One independent college of medium size saw its paperwork cost go from \$2,000 to \$166,000 in one year.

"Today, even institutions that have never taken a penny of federal funds are being told that if one student on campus is there under the G.I. Bill or a federal scholarship or loan, the entire institution becomes subject to federal regulations.

"Isn't it time we said to Washington, give it back! Give us control of these programs and give us back the resources to pay for them. And, I mean the tax resources -- not a return to us of our own money in the form of grants accompanied by rules and restrictions on how it must be spent.

"Instead of federal giantism, shouldn't we be talking about education on the human scale? Talking about individual students, individual teachers, individual schools and colleges -- not abstract statistics?

"I've talked so far about programs that I am convinced can be better handled away from Washington. We must be concerned, of course, about others that must remain in federal hands. Our foreign policy and national security are prime examples.

"We are told that Detente is our best hope for a lasting peace. Hope it may offer, but only so long as we have no illusions about it. When we sit down at the bargaining table, we must always remember that the Soviet Union's representatives across the table will give up as little as they have to, and take as much as they can get. They have a history of being tough negotiators, and we should be, too. Detente, if it is a one-way street, will fail. As a two-way street it may succeed.

"When the stakes are war and peace, we can bargain successfully only if we are strong militarily and only if we are willing to defend ourselves if necessary. We must also have a sense of unity and a national purpose in our foreign policy.

"In a free society, these things can be accomplished if the government will confide in the people. They must know why a particular policy is in our best interests as a nation. They must know what dangers are involved if the policy isn't adopted. Given the facts, they will make the right decisions and their elected representatives will know of it soon enough.

"During World War II and for some years afterward, disagreements we Americans had among ourselves stopped at the water's edge. One thing we agreed on was that there would be 'no more secret covenants, secretly arrived at'. No repeats of Yalta and Potsdam, the international conferences where the fate of Eastern Europe was sealed, and the freedom of millions was given away by men who had no right to do so.

5--5--5
"For many years we remained the strongest nation on earth. Through the 1950's and on into the early 60's our national security was coupled with a sense of national unity and purpose.

"But that changed. The Soviet Union has now forged ahead in producing nuclear and conventional weapons. Meanwhile, our navy has shrunk dramatically and, for the first time since two years before Pearl Harbor, we have well under 500 combat-ready ships. The disparity is even greater than the number suggests, when you stop to think that the mission of our navy is to defend entire oceans, while the mission of theirs is only to interdict shipping lanes.

"In Western Europe we are committed to helping our allies on the ground, yet even enhanced by our allies' resources, we are outnumbered in tanks by the Soviet Union three-to-one.

"Let us look at the state of foreign affairs in recent years. One wonders if we even have a foreign policy, for it is impossible to detect a coherent global view.

"In the attempt to bring peace to Vietnam we signed the Paris Agreement. The Soviet Union was a co-guarantor. The final chapters in the history of that conflict raise doubts as to the reliability of their word in such agreements.

"In the Mediterranean, we were compliant when the Greek junta prepared for upsetting the status quo in Cyprus. Subsequently, we winked at undue use of Turkish military force. The United States is now distrusted by both sides and the southern flank of NATO is weakened as a consequence.

"In the Middle East, the United States first spurred on the Kurds to rise against the government of Iraq, to discourage it from foreign adventures. The Kurds are a proud people, some two million strong, a

more--more--more

separate ethnic group living mostly in Iraq. When the Iraqi government moved strongly against the Kurds we abandoned them in their hour of need. We cannot afford to deal with others on a stop-and-go basis, for it raises questions among our allies throughout the world as to the value of America's word.

"In Lebanon, Moslem and Christian have been tearing apart a nation that had previously been one of the few sources of stability in the Mideast. A peacemaking effort by neutral nations might have spared much of the bloodshed, but it did not occur. Now, the Palestine Liberation Army, acting as a proxy for Syria, seems to be the principle gainer in the conflict. The United States' policy toward the issue, if indeed we had one, was never made clear, and no leadership from us was forthcoming.

"In the matter of Angola, our government provided covert aid on a small scale to two of the three factions there. Once the Cubans arrived by the thousands to fight, the civil war escalated dramatically. Even after the Portuguese renounced their sovereignty in November, our government pretended that a small-scale operation would be enough to curb 10,000 Cuban troops.

"The importance of Angola to our national security was never fully explained to the American people. Instead, the matter was allowed to generate into a war between the Administration and Congress. At virtually the eleventh-and-a-half hour, Congress was asked for more aid to supply the Angola factions fighting the Soviet-backed group. Under the circumstances, it was unrealistic to expect Congress to agree. Yet, ever since their predictable turn-down, the Secretary of State has denounced everyone in sight who failed to agree with his request.

"Opening the Chinese door offered an excellent opportunity for us to blunt the expansionism of the Soviet Union. But, we have since lost the momentum we gained by acting as if we expected the Soviets to inherit the earth.

"If you were a Russian official and you heard the American Secretary of State deliver stern warnings to you for trying to dominate the situation in Angola, but all the time you knew he was packing his bags to come to Moscow to negotiate a new arms limitation agreement, would you really take his words seriously?

"And, if you were a Chinese official watching these contradictory moves, wouldn't you wonder just how much confidence you could have in America's words?

"Two thousand years ago, in the Athenian market place, Demosthenes said, 'What sane man would let another man's words, rather than his deeds, tell him who is at peace and who is at war with him?'

"The truth is we should be far more aware of our bargaining strength than we seem to be. The Soviet Union seems most anxious to enter into a SALT II agreement. They have reason to be worried about a defense weapons system in which we hold a huge technological lead. A bright spot for us in what has become a growing weapons imbalance is something called the cruise missile. Its significance should not be underestimated, for it could reverse our 25-year dependence on nuclear weapons for security.

"Basically a flying bomb, it can be fired from a submarine's firing tube, from the deck of a ship or launched from an airplane. It has a very accurate guidance system which scans the terrain over which it flies at low elevation -- low enough to avoid radar and enemy antiaircraft systems. It has a range of up to 2,000 miles, yet is neither large nor

very heavy. Because of its pinpoint accuracy, it need not carry nuclear warheads in order to be effective, though it could do so.

"A U.S. intelligence analyst is quoted as saying, 'For the Soviets, this weapon poses a frightening problem. They've just managed, with enormous effort and sacrifice, to achieve something like nuclear strategic parity with the U.S. -- and here we come up with a new weapon that could force them into a major new effort to keep up.'

"I have said before that we can afford to be second to no one in military strength, not because we seek war, but because we want to insure peace. With the stakes as high as they are, to be second is to be last, and that invites war.

"The balance of forces has been shifting gradually toward the Soviet Union since 1970. It has continued through the years of so-called Detente.

"A strong military defense capability must be kept up-to-date at all times to discourage potential aggressors from starting wars. Defense experts, of course, must regularly calculate the possible destruction if a war were ever to start.

"Paul Nitze, former Secretary of the Navy and Deputy Secretary of Defense and for several years on our Strategic Arms Limitation Delegation, made a sobering assessment of the situation in a recent article in Foreign Affairs.

"He said that by 1977 -- next year -- 'after a Soviet-initiated counterforce strike against the United States to which the United States responded with a counterforce strike, the Soviet Union would have remaining forces sufficient to destroy Chinese and European NATO nuclear capability, attack U.S. population and conventional military targets, and still have a remaining force throw-weight in excess of that of the

2-9-9
United States. And, after 1977, the Soviet advantage after the assumed attack mounts rapidly.'

"In SALT I, we compromised our clear technological lead in the anti-ballistic missile system, the ABM, for the sake of a deal. Now, the cruise missile gives us a chance to insure that we shall be second to none in military security. We must not sacrifice this advanced technology for some cosmetic concession by the Soviets in Angola or elsewhere.

"The best way to have an equitable SALT II agreement is to negotiate from a firmly established position. We should not be so eager for an agreement that we make unnecessary concessions, for to grant such concessions is to whet the Soviet's appetite for more.

"And, any agreement we do set out to make must not be secret under any circumstances. There is nothing so complex about these matters that would require secrecy and withholding the facts from the American public.

"Let us not be satisfied with a foreign policy whose principal accomplishment seems to be our acquisition of the right to sell Pepsi-Cola in Siberia. It is time that we, the people of the United States, demanded a policy that puts our nation's interests as the first priority. Humanitarian impulses and benevolence are commendable and they have a place, but our own strength and survival must come first.

"In a constitutional republic, which our nation is, the people must take part in policy decisions. When it comes to SALT II, the Administration should make public the tentative terms of any agreement before it goes to the Senate for debate as a treaty.

"Our foreign policy in recent years seems to be a matter of placating potential adversaries. Does our government fear that the American people lack willpower? If it does, that may explain its reluctance to assert our interests in international relations.

"How else can we explain the government's bowing to the propaganda campaign of the military dictator of Panama and signing a memorandum with his representative signifying our intention to give up control and ownership of the Panama Canal and the Canal Zone?

"How else can we explain the slow and subtle, but nevertheless steady warming up toward Cuba which our State Department has been engaging in till very recently? Since Castro's heavy involvement in Angola began the State Department appears to have cooled the process of renewing trade and diplomatic relations, but are we to believe this is more than temporary when recent history -- just last year -- saw it going forward despite Castro's highly public efforts to promote a revolution in Puerto Rico?

"Last fall, our government signed the Helsinki document. The conference at which it was signed was conducted with great fanfare to demonstrate brotherhood among many nations. But, our signing seemed primarily to be a concession to the Soviet Union, made in the hope of earning goodwill in the forthcoming SALT negotiations.

"It was a propaganda 'plus' for the Soviet Union. In effect, we agreed to legitimize the boundaries of Eastern Union, totally acquiescing to the loss of freedom of millions of Eastern Europeans.

"After Helsinki, the Soviet Union quickly made it clear that the so-called 'wars of liberation' of which they are so fond, would not be affected by the document. In other words, there was a double standard. Everyone else was to respect the status quo in Eastern Europe; the Soviet Union was free to go on colonial adventures wherever it pleased.

more--more--more

11-11-11

"When it comes to future agreements -- such as arms limitations -- the people of this nation should be told just what is at stake. Let us not have any sudden surprises unveiled before us without having the time to weigh all of the consequences. We can afford no take-it-or-leave-it propositions.

"George Washington may have made the best summation of the need for caution in foreign agreements when he said, 'There can be no greater error than to expect or calculate upon real favors from nation to nation.'

"Most Americans came from somewhere else, or their parents or grandparents did. Secret agreements that could affect the lives of many; decisions made by a small elite group are among the things many Americans wanted to leave behind when they left the old countries. Such things have no place here.

"It is a basic premise of our democratic heritage in America -- and one to be reinforced in our Bicentennial year -- that the individual citizen can be trusted to make an intelligent decision if he is armed with the facts. A rational foreign policy can be built on a foundation of principles spelled out clearly and presented to the people. It is incumbent upon the leaders of any constitutional republic to do just that. And, in America, it is the people who are the nation's greatest strength.

"Thank you."

#