

# 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:** March 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/>

LIST OF BAD REAGAN QUOTES *Date, Location, Speech or Interview?*  
*Other misquotes?*

A. Used in Carter/Mondale/Kennedy Convention Speeches

2. 1. "Fascism was really the basis of the New Deal." (MONDALE)

7. 2. "a faceless mass waiting for handouts." (MONDALE says Reagan said this about the weak and disadvantaged.)

→ 3. "demeaning and insulting" (MONDALE says Reagan used these words re programs to help blacks and Hispanics)

7. 4. "the minimum wage has caused more misery and unemployment than anything since the great depression." (MONDALE)

7. 5. "Unemployment insurance is a prepaid vacation plan for freeloaders." (KENNEDY: no friend of labor)

7. 6. "I have included in my morning and evening prayers every day the prayer that the Federal Government not bail out New York." (KENNEDY: no friend of the cities)

1964, 716, 1976 7. Social Security "should be made voluntary". (KENNEDY: no friend of senior citizens)

Radio 8. "Eighty percent of our air pollution comes from plants and trees." (KENNEDY: no friend of the environment)

March 4, 1976

EMBARGOED UNTIL 4:00 P.M. EST

Statement by Ronald Reagan,  
in Orlando, Florida, March 4, 1976.

Ladies and gentlemen, it is not easy for me to say the things I must say to you today, but I have decided that matters of national security and defense are beyond politics and that the American people deserve my assessment of them.

I am deeply concerned about our defense posture. Despite the assurances of Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Ford, the United States is no longer the first military power on earth.

The Soviet Army is now twice the size of ours. Russia's annual investment in weapons, strategic and conventional, now runs some 50% ahead of ours.

Our Navy is outnumbered in surface ships and submarines 2-to-1. We are outgunned 3-to-1 in artillery pieces; 4-to-1 in tanks. Soviet strategic missiles are larger, more numerous and more powerful than those of the United States.

Under Messrs. Kissinger and Ford this nation has become Number Two in military power in a world where it is dangerous -- if not fatal -- to be second best. Along with the 93rd and 94th Congress, the Ford-Kissinger leadership must be held accountable to history for allowing this to happen.

Has the Soviet Union become more tractable, more accommodating, more cautious with its growing military superiority? No, the opposite is true.

In 1973, the Soviet Union secretly poured into the Middle East the weapons used to launch a surprise attack on Israel. Dr. Kissinger said we must not allow this to interfere with detente.

That year the Soviets also urged the Arab states to strangle the Western industrial democracies with the oil boycott. Again, Dr. Kissinger said we must not allow this to interfere with detente.

In 1974, the Soviets doublecrossed Kissinger, tore up the Paris accords for which he won his Nobel Peace Prize, and poured into Hanoi the armor used

, more--more

to overrun South Vietnam and inflict upon the United States the worst humiliation in its history. Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger said in chorus: we must not let this interfere with detente.

Last year and this, the Soviet Union -- using Castro's mercenaries -- intervened decisively in the Angola civil war and routed the pro-Western forces. Yet, Messrs. Ford and Kissinger continue to tell us that we must not let this interfere with detente.

Well, the time has come for Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger to tell us, the American people what we are getting out of detente.

We have given the Soviets our trade and our technology. At Kissinger's insistence, Mr. Ford snubbed Alexander Solzhenitsyn, one of the great moral heroes of our time. At Brezhnev's insistence, Mr. Ford flew halfway around the world to sign an agreement at Helsinki which placed the American Seal of approval on the Soviet Empire in Eastern Europe.

What has the United States gotten in return, other than Soviet belligerence in the Middle East, Soviet duplicity in Southeast Asia, and Soviet imperialism in South Central Africa?

Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger ask us to trust their leadership. I confess I find that more and more difficult to do. Despite Henry Kissinger's sophistication and wit, his recent stewardship of U.S. foreign policy has coincided precisely with the loss of U.S. military supremacy.

Despite Mr. Ford's evident decency, honor and patriotism, he has shown neither the vision nor the leadership necessary to halt and reverse the diplomatic and military decline of the United States.

That is the truth, and even those of us who like Gerald Ford as a person know it is the truth.

I believe in the peace of which Mr. Ford Speaks -- as much as any man. But, in places such as Angola, Cambodia and Vietnam, the peace they have

3  
come to know is the peace of the grave.

I fear for my country when I see White House indifference to the decline of our military position; when election year rhetoric is used as a substitute for strength. I worry when I see Henry Kissinger rushing to Moscow to bargain away our technological breakthrough in the cruise missile, a weapon system which might help restore strategic equality.

In my view, the policy of detente as pursued by the Administration is, one of making "preemptive concessions" to the Soviets. Perhaps there is some great strategy in this policy, but I confess I cannot see it.

All I can see is what other nations the world over see: collapse of the American will and the retreat of American power. There is little doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union will not stop taking advantage of detente until it sees that the American people have elected a new President and appointed a new Secretary of State.

What do I offer the American people in place of the delusions of detente. I offer them what I believe to be the truth, that all our smiles, concessions and boasts of detente have not brought genuine peace any closer. The truth is that this nation must trust less in the preemptive concessions we are granting the Soviet Union and more in the reestablishment of American military superiority.

Let us remember one thing: if Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger are incorrect in their belief that Soviet ambitions have moderated so much that we no longer need to maintain military superiority, there will be no future opportunity to rectify their error.

These matters are so crucial that what the people of this state -- and of all the states -- decide about them will affect the course of history.

# # #

For information:

Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Friday, March 5, 1976

Excerpts of remarks by the Honorable  
Ronald Reagan, at Florida appearances,  
Friday, March 5, 1976.

I applaud Mr. Ford's rhetoric about Fidel Castro being an "international outlaw" and I am glad that he agrees with those of us who thought so all along. Still, I am more impressed with the reality of 12,000 Cuban soldiers fighting the Soviet Union's battles in South Central Africa.

I hope that Mr. Ford's new position will cause a change in our government's stance about Castro. More than a year ago, the State Department began warming up to the dictator. Concessions to Castro were to be the order of the day, or so it seemed. In March, Dr. Kissinger said, "We should not be antagonistic toward Castro".

In July, the State Department instructed the U.S. delegate to the Organization of American States to vote in favor of lifting the embargo on trade with Cuba. The attitude of the U.S. virtually assured passage of the resolution.

In August, the Administration lifted the U.S. prohibition on trade with Cuba by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms.

To implement this policy of concessions toward Cuba, Mr. Ford picked a man quite sympathetic to the idea, George McGovern's former Latin American affairs adviser, William P. Rogers. Mr. Ford named Mr. Rogers Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

In September, Rogers went before the House Committee on Inter-American Affairs to recommend relaxation of a policy toward Cuba which had been forged during three Administrations. According to Rogers, there would be no particular merit in continued hostile attitude toward Castro. This relaxation would serve as the first step toward rapprochement.

more--more--more

How could a high official appointed by President Ford go before Congress with such a recommendation when anyone the least bit familiar with the thrust of the Tri-Continental Congress of 1966 could have predicted that a Soviet-inspired Cuba would one day send troops to such places as Angola?

And, how could the Administration make such a recommendation in late September when earlier in the same month Castro had hosted an international conference in Havana to promote revolution in Puerto Rico?

Why did Mr. Ford wait until last week to become indignant over Castro's involvement in Puerto Rico and Angola? For years, Castro and the Soviet Union have supported a so-called Free Puerto Rico mission in Havana, and its minions have commuted back and forth to Puerto Rico with the ease of New York subway riders. There is no "independence" movement. It is subversion, pure and simple, and it is an outgrowth of the Tri-Continental Congress of 1966.

When I refer to Cuba, I refer to more than a place on the map. It is what Cuba represents that counts, and that is the enlargement of Soviet power in the Caribbean, and the use of that power against people and governments.

If Castro, doing the Soviet Union's bidding, has the ability to airlift troops to Angola, what might he do if the Panama Canal were no longer firmly in U.S. hands?

Now that he has begun to recognize Castro for what he is, I hope that Mr. Ford will change U.S. policy to blunt Soviet-Cuban power. For example, he could call on the OAS to hold a special meeting to reimpose the trade embargo; he could reimpose the Cuban trade prohibition on subsidiaries of U.S. firms. He could reimpose the 25-mile travel limit on Cuban U.N. diplomats which he lifted last year; and, he could replace Mr. Rogers with someone who shares his own new view that Castro is an "international outlaw".

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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Friday, March 5, 1976

Excerpts of remarks by the Honorable  
Ronald Reagan, at Florida appearances,  
Friday, March 5, 1976.

In his State of the Union message a little over a month ago, Mr. Ford devoted only a few lines to our national defense and foreign policy. He told us everything was coming up roses. He said that "the state of our foreign policy is sound and strong and that "...our military power is without equal."

Soon after, Dr. Kissinger said that "there is no alternative to detente." Yet, just last week, Mr. Ford suddenly announced that he would no longer call the centerpiece of his foreign policy "detente". Why not? Had it become an embarrassment? It seems to be a case of change-the-name-but-keep-the-game -- a game we are losing. His new phrase is "peace through strength". If that is the case perhaps Americans should begin worrying seriously about peace.

While Mr. Ford was talking as if American weakness could be swept away by eliminating a word from his vocabulary, Mr. Rumsfeld, his Secretary of Defense, was speaking to a group in Pensacola cataloguing America's shrinking military power.

Is that "peace through strength"?

Just last month, the Library of Congress released an 86-page study compiled by its senior national defense specialist John Collins. The report said that the Soviet Union has more missiles, more submarines and more men under arms than we do. And, it said that the superior quality of some of our equipment has "never compensated completely" for the Russian advantage.

Is that "peace through strength"?

General Alexander Haig, the Commander of NATO, said recently

that the "...explosion of Soviet military capabilities...far exceeds the requirements of a purely defense posture. We are getting to the fine edge of disaster?"

Is that "peace through strength"?

Paul Nitze, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, writing in the Soviet Union's strategic power will be such that it can initiate a counterforce strike against us, absorb our return strike, have enough strength to destroy Chinese and NATO nuclear capability, attack our population and conventional military targets and still have more throw-weight left than we will. "After 1977," he said, "the Soviet advantage after the assumed attack mounts rapidly."

Is that "peace through strength"?

James Schlesinger, the former Secretary of Defense, said in FORTUNE Magazine that "A specter is haunting Europe...the specter of Soviet hegemony...at no point since the 1930's has the Western world faced so formidable a threat to its survival."

And Mr. Ford talks of "peace through strength."

The government's top experts on arms control are not burdened with such rhetoric.

Dr. Fred Ikle, director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, said in an interview in The National Observer this week, "There's a troublesome imbalance that has been developing in conventional arms. Over the past decade we consoled ourselves by saying we had a strategic superiority. Now that we have strategic equivalence or parity, we have to pay greater attention to the imbalance against us in conventional arms."

And, Dr. Malcolm Currie, Chief of Research and Engineering at the Department of Defense, told an aerospace group just a few days ago that "The momentum is now on the side of the Soviet Union and it is staggering. He went on to say, "...it is time to lay the facts and our concerns

on the table and...the public will respond as it always has in past moments of national danger."

I agree with Dr. Currie, but I am concerned that Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger seem to be indifferent to or unaware of these problems.

Indeed, if the reports of Dr. Kissinger's recent trip to Moscow are true, the Administration's policy continues to be no more than business-as-usual. Recently, Dr. Kissinger said, "Our native inclination for straight-forwardness has brought increasing impatience with diplomacy whose attribute is ambiguity and compromise."

My answer to that is, yes, we Americans are straight-forward people and it is precisely Dr. Kissinger's kind of ambiguity that we don't need or want. I for one don't think the American people want ambiguous negotiations with the Soviet Union or anyone else, and I think they deserve better from their president than ambiguous terms such as "peace through strength" when the facts tell them it isn't true.

The fact is, we need less campaign rhetoric and more leadership and decisions that are in the interests of America rather than merely political.

# # #

(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.)

March 6, 1976

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at Florida Appearances,  
Saturday, March 6, 1976.

I worry when I see cracks in our relationship with mainland China. The Nixon reception in Peking the other day highlighted them. Responsibility for them must be laid at the doorstep of the Ford Administration.

The Washington-Peking link was based on mutual interest and mutual concern. The common concern was the Soviet Union's growing military might and its drive for global supremacy. This threatens both America and China. The common interest lay in both of us standing firm against Soviet expansionism, subversion and aggression the world over.

Under Ford and Kissinger, the United States has failed miserably to uphold its end of the bargain as the senior partner and super-power in the relationship with China.

In place of the determined and confident America the Chinese bargained with four years ago, they see in Washington today a timid, vacillating and divided leadership, attempting to sweet-talk the Russians out of their belligerent behavior. Under the circumstances, it is not surprising that the Chinese -- in their frustration -- would send a jet for Richard Nixon, well aware of Mr. Nixon's problems in his own country, but hoping that he could explain to them why America seems unwilling to play her part as a super-power.

How can the Chinese government have any confidence in an America which rushes to Moscow with new trade and technological concession the year that the Soviets double-crossed and humiliated this nation in Southeast Asia?

How can the Chinese regime place confidence in a government whose answer to Soviet imperialism in Angola is to talk of new strategic concessions at SALT II?

Mr. Ford pleads that he cannot maintain a strong American posture overseas because Congress has "lost its guts". But, in another breath, Mr. Ford tells us that those in Congress are his friends and associates of long-standing -- men with whom he can deal

2  
when no one else can. Why should we believe that the Congress will respond to his call in the next four years when it has refused to do so thus far?

Mr. Ford has decided that the time has come to ditch the word "detente", as if it had become an embarrassment to him. What he fails to understand is that it is not his choice of words which frightens our allies. It is the Ford-Kissinger policy of trying to buy off the Russians with "preemptive concessions" and with trade and technology that does not work. What difference whether he calls it "detente" or some other convenient phrase? It is Mr. Ford's policy, not his vocabulary, which has the world alarmed.

The question raised by Mr. Nixon's visit to China is not whether Mr. Nixon should have gone or not, but whether Mr. Ford is viewed by the Chinese as a man capable of dealing effectively with the Soviet Union.

Perhaps there is some great strategy behind the Ford-Kissinger policy, but I confess I cannot see 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.)

TELEVISION ADDRESS BY  
THE HONORABLE RONALD REAGAN  
IN MIAMI, FLORIDA

MARCH 6, 1976

(REBROADCAST -- CALIFORNIA, MAY 19, 1976)

On November 20, I announced my decision to seek the Republican nomination for the presidency. An important consideration in my decision to run was how my candidacy might affect our party's hope for victory in November. I pledged that I would do nothing to reduce our chances. This does not mean, however, that there can't be an earnest discussion of the issues. Indeed, there should be such a discussion if the primary is to serve a useful purpose.

The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said, "It is possible to be loyal to your government and still disagree with the policies of those in power." Well, I do disagree with a number of the government's policies and you are entitled to know which ones and why, so that you can fairly judge the differences between the two of us who are candidates.

Two hundred years is a dot of time measured against the span of recorded history; but in that dot of time, we have achieved a higher standard of living, a greater range of opportunities for a greater number of people than has any other people who ever lived. Yet, we celebrate our bicentennial beset by troubles that have us in a time of discontent. Inflation cheapens every dollar we earn and robs our savings of value. We are concerned about jobs and unemployment. Almost half of our earnings are taken in taxes and even that isn't enough. We go one and a half billion dollars deeper into debt each week. Last week the national debt was \$95 billion greater than it had been just one year before. The current fiscal year's deficit is the largest in the nation's history. Next year

more--more--more

we face more of the same.

This deficit spending by the government in Washington is the sole cause of inflation. Inflation, in turn, is the cause of our current recession and unemployment. Not only does Washington invade the private capital market, driving up interest rates, it reduces the value of our dollar by increasing the money supply with printing-press money. Our savings, insurance and pension funds are eroded. Social Security benefits have increased 350% in the last four decades but they buy 80 fewer loaves of bread than they did 40 years ago. Bureaucracy grows in size and power, but industry can't find the money it needs to expand and provide the jobs our people must have.

Congress has no incentive to control inflation. It passed an act to automatically increase its own income to keep pace with the cost of living. The other day, the White House proclaimed the integrity of social security must be preserved. What is really needed is to restore the integrity of social security. The system must be strengthened and improved so that those who have reached their non-earning years will be guaranteed first that they can always count on receiving their checks; and, second, that those payments will keep pace with inflation. While we are at it, we should correct some inequities in the system. Women, especially working wives, are discriminated against. And, those men and women who want to continue working should be allowed to do so without losing their benefits.

The Washington establishment is united in its talk about trimming big government down to size and bringing inflation under control. But the talk is not matched by acts. In the recently submitted federal budget, there is an optimistic paragraph about increased revenues which will help reduce the deficit. That isn't good news for the citizen.

On Page 29 of the budget, you will find this statement: (QUOTE) -- "Receipts are projected to increase . . . as rising real incomes and inflation move people into higher tax brackets" -- (UNQUOTE). In other words, when you get a cost-of-living pay raise, that just makes you keep even and doesn't increase your purchasing power by one penny; that increase in the number of dollars you earn moves you into a higher surtax bracket and your income tax goes up. Last year, Washington's profit on these cost-of-living pay raises amounted to \$7 billion. That was \$7 billion less we all had to spend; but \$7 billion more for government. And they tell us they expect to do even better in the year ahead.

A question has been raised in this campaign as to whether there are basic differences between the two Republican candidates. There are fundamental differences between us and you have a right to know what they are before you go to the polls. One very basic difference has to do with our respective governmental experiences. Before his appointment to the Vice Presidency by Richard Nixon, Mr. Ford spent 25 years in the Congress, where his principal interest necessarily had to be the welfare of his congressional district. There is no question but that he represented his district ably and well. My experience, on the other hand, was of shorter duration and in a different capacity. I was Governor for eight years of the most populous state in the nation -- California -- with more than 22 million people. If California were a nation, it would be the 7th ranking economic power in the world.

I believe this is one of the differences you will want to consider. One of us has been a member of the Washington establishment throughout a long career. The other has not. One apparently has faith in the ability of that establishment to find solutions for the grave problems confronting us as a people and a nation. This has been evident in his appointment of former Congressmen and officeholders to high positions.

I believe, on the other hand, that those who have been part of the problems are not necessarily the best able to resolve them.

A few days ago, Mr. Ford expressed his belief that we must have a "continuity" of government in Washington. My belief is to the contrary: that we should not continue the present course of government; that we have reached a period in our nation's life where changes must be made and that those changes can better be made by those who have not had a career in Washington, who are not bound by long time relationships and personal ties. In other words, one of our differences could be in our approach to government, particularly in this time of crisis.

In 1966, I was elected by a million-vote margin in a state where Independents outnumbered Republicans and Democrats outnumber us 3-to-2. California was virtually insolvent, on the verge of bankruptcy, spending a million to a million and a half dollars a day more than it was taking in. Reserves had been spent while bookkeeping tricks hid such deficit spending. We were told by the Attorney General that those reserves had to be restored before the end of the fiscal year -- less than six months away. California was in pretty much the situation New York City is in. The only difference between Washington and New York is that Washington has a printing press.

Those who preceded us had been swelling the payroll by adding between 5,000 and 7,000 new employees each year. The teachers' retirement fund hung over every property owner in the state as a \$4 billion unfunded liability. Our great water moving project was unfinished and underfunded by a half billion dollars. The entire year's budget for medicaid had already been spent with half the fiscal year to go. I didn't know whether I'd been elected Governor or appointed receiver.

We had no choice but to increase taxes. This came hard for me because I believed California's taxes were already too high. I told

our people that I considered the increase temporary and that, as soon as we could, we'd return the money to them. Then we set out to change the course of government. It was not a time to preserve "continuity in government".

I didn't think of myself as part of government. I was a citizen temporarily serving or representing my fellow citizens and my loyalty was to them. The problems to be solved were their problems and I turned to them for the answers -- not to the bureaucracy which had created the situation to begin with. I turned to the people for help in recruiting those best qualified for cabinet positions and other important posts. I laid down two additional criteria: seek those who did not want a career in government; seek those who would be the first to tell me if their job was unnecessary.

There was a reason for seeking people who did not want a government career. The structure of government is such that it provides a built-in incentive for empire-building. Dr. Parkinson, in his famous book on bureaucracy, summed it up when he said: "Government hires a rat catcher and before you know it he's become a rodent control officer".

For more than 20 years, government has been growing in size two and a half times as fast as the increase in population. Today there is one public employee for every four and a half Americans who are working, earning and being taxed in the private sector. Even while we were setting up our administrative team, we sought more help from the people. We called upon what had to be the top level of leadership in California to go into 64 different areas of state government to see how modern business practices could be put to work to make government more efficient and responsive to the people. We implemented more than 1600 of their recommendations. It was government by the people actually being practiced.

Over the eight years, with our growth in population, many departments absorbed as much as 66% workload increase without increasing the number of employees. In fact, we ended the eight years with virtually the same number of employees we started with. The underfunded water project was completed with \$165 million left over. The teachers' retirement fund is on a sound actuarial basis, no longer a liability. California's bonds for the first time in 40 years have a triple "A" rating -- the highest credit rating you can get. We turned over to the incoming administration a balanced budget plus a \$500 million surplus. And kept our promise to the taxpayers by returning to them in tax cuts and rebates \$5,761 billion.

With the wealth of skill and talent to be found among our citizens, I believe what was done in California can be done at the national level. I am not confident that it can be accomplished if we depend on those who have been involved in the runaway growth of government. Former U.S. Senator George Smathers of Florida, who spent more than 20 years as a member of the Washington establishment, recently told a group in Florida what he has learned now that he has been working in the private sector for six years. He described Congress as "composed of a bunch of professional politicians who really don't understand the free enterprise system" and admitted this had been true of himself as well as the three presidents with whom he'd known a close, personal relationship. Where once he had thought of government as all powerful, he is now appalled by the large number of federal agencies which have been created to tell the people what they can and can't do.

There are thousands and thousands of good Americans employed in government who would like nothing better than to help eliminate waste and improve efficiency. We found this out in California when they began

helping our task forces. They said: "No one had ever seemed interested before in making things better." Only a great people can create a great society and we are a great people. There is no limit to what the American people can accomplish, but we must be given a chance -- told what needs to be done and then turned loose to do it without bureaucratic harrassment and nit-picking. We opened up the West without an area redevelopment plan and built great cities from coast to coast without urban renewal. Wherever Washington has tried to do things the people should be doing, it has failed.

Welfare is a classic example. Even the establishment in Washington calls it an utter and dismal failure. No one in Washington knows how many people are on welfare. They only know how many checks they are sending out. When they did try to come up with a reform plan, it turned out to be one that would have added 12 million people to the rolls and countless billions of dollars to the cost.

In California, we gave this problem to a citizens task force at a time when our rolls were going up by 40,000 people a month. In three years, we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people, saved the taxpayers \$2 billion and increased the grants to the truly deserving by an average of 43%.

Every year we're told by Washington that something must be done about the blizzard of paperwork required by government. Twenty-five years ago, the Hoover Comission discovered that Washington filed a million reports a year just to report there was nothing to report. So last year, government paperwork increased by 20%. And so it has been with regulations -- until there is a regulation -- usually two or more contradictory ones covering every facet of our lives.

But there is one problem confronting our nation which makes all the

others academic unless it is resolved. If our defense posture is such that a potential adversary can become permanently more powerful, then our survival as a free people will be threatened. I believe our nation is in great danger and that danger grows greater with each passing day. In words that remind us of his grandfather, a young member of Britain's House of Commons, Winston Spencer Churchill, in describing the world scene, recently said: "The sinister forces of totalitarianism are again on the march while the democracies are wandering without aim."

"Wandering without aim", I believe, describes U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Ford, who a few months ago said no one can forsake detente and get elected, now tells us he will abandon the word but retain the policy. But it is the policy that has made the word unpopular.

No words from Washington can hide the fact that we no longer deal from strength. That is what former Secretary of Defense Schlesinger was trying to tell the American people and I believe that's why he is no longer our Secretary of Defense. His words were too true. Now, the new Secretary of Defense, former congressman Rumsfeld tells us our strength is (QUOTE) -- "roughly equivalent" -- (UNQUOTE) to that of the Soviet Union.

What does "roughly equivalent" mean? It is not a term you use if you are trying to say we are second to none in our defense capability. It is only suitable if you mean to say we are second, period.

At the bottom of the depression, during a dark hour in our history, Franklin Roosevelt declared that "the time has come to speak the truth frankly and boldly". I am deeply concerned about the drift of our country. I sense in the statements of Henry Kissinger and the decisions of Gerald Ford no comprehension of the grave situation in which the United States finds itself. The time has come to tell the American people the plain, blunt, hard truth.

Despite the assurances of Dr. Kissinger and Mr. Ford, the United States is no longer the first military power on earth. The Soviet army is now twice the size of ours. Russia's annual investment in weapons, strategic and conventional, now runs some 50% ahead of ours. Our navy is outnumbered in surface ships and submarines two-to-one. We are outgunned three-to-one in artillery pieces: four-to-one in tanks. Soviet strategic missiles are larger, more numerous and more powerful than those of the United States. This nation has become number two in military power in a world where it is dangerous -- if not fatal -- to be second best. Along with the 93rd and 94th Congress, the Ford-Kissinger leadership must be held accountable to history for allowing this to happen.

Has the Soviet Union become more tractable, more accomodating, more cautious with its growing military superiority? The opposite is true. In 1973, the Soveit Union secretly poured into the Middle East the weapons used to launch a surprise attack on Israel. Dr. Kissinger said we must not allow this to interfere with detente. That year, the Soviets also urged the Arab states to strangle the western industrial democracies with the oil boycott. Again, Dr. Kissinger said we must not allow this to interfere with detente.

In 1974, the Soveits doublecrossed Kissinger, tore up the Paris accords for which he won his Nobel Peace Prize, and poured into Hanoi the armor used to overrun South Vietnam and inflict upon the United States the worst humiliation in its history. Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger said in chorus: we must not let this interfere with detente.

Last year and this, the Soviet Union -- using Castro's mercenaries -- intervened decisively in the Angola civil war and routed the pro-western forces. Yet, Ford and Kissinger continue to tell us that we must not let this interfere with detente. Well, the time has come for Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger to tell us, the American people, what we are

more--more--more

getting out of detente.

We have given the Soviets our trade and our technology. At Kissinger's insistence, Mr. Ford snubbed Alexander Solzhenitsyn, one of the great moral heroes of our time. At Brezhnev's insistence, Mr. Ford flew halfway around the world to sign an agreement at Helsinki which placed the American seal of approval on the Soviet empire in Eastern Europe. What has the United States gotten in return, other than Soviet belligerence in the Middle East, Soviet duplicity in Southeast Asia, and Soviet imperialism in South Central Africa?

Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger ask us to trust their leadership. I find that more and more difficult to do. Henry Kissinger's recent stewardship of U.S. foreign policy has coincided precisely with the loss of U.S. military supremacy. Despite Mr. Ford's evident decency, honor and patriotism, he has shown neither the vision nor the leadership necessary to halt and reverse the diplomatic and military decline of the United States. That is the truth, and even those of us who like Gerald Ford as a person know it is the truth.

I applaud Mr. Ford's rhetoric about Fidel Castro being an "international outlaw" and am glad that he agrees with those of us who thought so all along. Let us hope there will now be a change in our government's policy toward Castro. For more than a year now, the State department has been warming up to the dictator. Only last March, Dr. Kissinger said, "we should not be antagonistic toward Castro." In July, the State Department instructed our delegate to the organization of American states to vote in favor of lifting the embargo on trade with Cuba. In August, the administration lifted our prohibition on trade with Cuba by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms. Mr. Ford named William P. Rogers, George McGovern's former Latin American Affairs Adviser, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American

affairs. In September, he went before the House Committee on Inter-American Affairs to recommend relaxation of a policy toward Cuba which had been forged during three administrations while Castro was hosting an international conference in Havana promoting revolution in our commonwealth of Puerto Rico.

What is our foreign policy? If now we are to recognize Castro for the dictator he is; if we are going to protect Latin America from export of his kind of revolution, then let action match our words. We could call on the O.A.S. to reimpose the embargo. We could prohibit trade by U.S. firms subsidiaries: reimpose the 25-mile travel ban on Cuba U.N. delegates and see if Mr. Rogers shows the view that Castro is an "international outlaw", and that he maintains and expands a soviet foothold in the Caribbean. And, while we are establishing just what our foreign policy is, what of the quiet, almost secret negotiations we're engaged in to give away the Panama Canal. Everyone seems to know the negotiations are going on except the rightful owners of the Canal Zone -- the American people.

In 1974, Dr. Kissinger signed a memorandum with his Panamanian counterpart, foreign minister Juan Tack -- which called into question that matter of whether the American people did in truth own the Canal. Well, we do. Just for the record, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the U.S. In 1904, this was upheld by all three branches of the government of Panama and affirmed in 1907 by our own surpeme court.

And yet, a February 18 article in Times of the Americas quotes Foreign Minister Tack as saying, "the United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty." Tack gives

the President of the United States as authority for his claim that sovereignty over the Canal will be transfereed on December 31, 1995.

If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a state department preoccupied with secrecy. The Panama Canal Zone is sovereign U.S. territory just as much as Alaska is, as well as the states carved from the Louisiana Purchase. We bought it, we paid for it and General Torrijos should be told we're going to keep it.

I believe in the peace of which Mr. Ford speaks -- as much as any man. But, in places such as Angola, Cambodia and Vietnam, the peace they have come to know is the peace of the grave.

I fear for my country when I see White House indifference to the decline in our military position: when election year rhetoric is used as a substitute for strength. I worry when I see Henry Kissinger rushing to Moscow to bargain away our technological breakthrough in the cruise missile, a weapon system which might help restore strategic equality. In my view, the policy of detente as pursued by the administration is one of making "preemptive concessions" to the Soviets. I cannot see it. All I can see is what other nations the world over see: collapse of the American will and the retreat of American power.

There is little doubt in my mind that the Soviet Union will not stop taking advantage of detente until it sees that the American people have elected a new president and appointed a new Secretary of State.

What do I offer the American people in place of the delusions of detente? I offer them what I believe to be the truth. The truth is that this nation must trust less in the preemptive concessions we are granting the Soviet Union and more in the reestablishment of American military superiority. Let us remember one thing: If Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger are wrong in their belief that Soviet ambitions have moderated so much

that we no longer need to maintain military superiority, there will be no future opportunity to rectify their error. These matters are so crucial that what the people of all the states decide about them will affect the course of history.

What kind of an answer is it to say we're going to continue a foreign policy we know is bankrupt, but we just won't call it "detente"? We'll change the name, but keep the game -- a game we're losing. We need decisions that are practical, not political.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have no magic solutions to the problems besetting us; no plan that will provide an instant cure for our ills. But I believe in this system handed to us by the founding fathers. I know there is disillusionment and cynicism on the part of some about what seems to be the failure of the system to meet our needs. Yet, the system has never failed us. Now and then we have failed the system by forgetting that government of and for the people is also supposed to be by the people. Either we run politics or politicians run us. The choice is ours to make.

I believe we want our country to be so strong that no would-be adversary would dare challenge us; that we are willing to bear any burden, pay any price, because we know nothing could cost as much as the loss of freedom. I believe also that you want the truth about our domestic problems and that you can't be frightened by hard and unpleasant facts.

Why should we be frightened? No people who ever lived have fought harder for freedom, done more to advance the dignity of man. A few months ago in New Hampshire, I was doing a question-and-answer session when a little girl who couldn't have been more than six or seven stood up and said, "Why do you want to be president?" I tried to tell her that I wanted to reduce the power of the federal bureaucracy; to return authority

and autonomy to state and local governments; to make governments once again the servant of the people, not the master, and to give government back to the people.

I realized, of course, that my answer, while true, was hardly suitable for a six-year-old. It wasn't until later, flying through the night that I told Nancy I knew what my answer should have been.

I want very much to go to Washington to see if we can't have an America again in which that little girl will know and grow up knowing the same freedom our generation knew when we were growing up.

Soon you will be faced with a choice. I hope you will ask yourself some questions. Are the prices you pay for things going down? Do postage stamps cost less? Is government more efficient? Are you proud of your position in the world?

I was asked by a newsman if I thought I could do better than Mr. Ford has done. I didn't answer the question at the time -- I'll answer it now. If I didn't think I could do the job better, I would not be here asking for your support and your votes.

# # # #

TELEVISION ADDRESS BY  
THE HONORABLE RONALD REAGAN  
IN MIAMI, FLORIDA

MARCH 6, 1976

(REBROADCAST -- CALIFORNIA, MAY 19, 1976)

On November 20, I announced my decision to seek the Republican nomination for the presidency. An important consideration in my decision to run was how my candidacy might affect our party's hope for victory in November. I pledged that I would do nothing to reduce our chances. This however that there can't be an earnest discussion of the

Crossfiled Under:

*Federal Spending 1-3*  
*U.S. Foreign Policy 8, 12-13*  
*Balance of Power 8-9*  
*Soviet Union - Imperialism 9-10*  
*Cuba 10-11*  
*Panama 11-12*

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

3/6/76

"Ladies and gentlemen, on November 20th, I announced my decision to seek the Republican nomination for president. Believing as I do that our party offers the best hope of restoring fiscal sanity to government, an important consideration in my deciding to run was how my candidacy

Crossfiled Under:

Federal Spending 2  
Social Security 2  
U.S. Foreign Policy 9-10  
Panama 10-11

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

35-6

"Ladies and gentlemen, on November 20th, I announced my decision to seek the Republican nomination for president. Believing as I do that our party offers the best hope of restoring fiscal sanity to government, an important consideration in my deciding to run was how my candidacy might affect our chance for victory in November. I pledged that I would do nothing divisive in this primary contest -- nothing that would reduce our hope of winning. This does not mean, however, that there can't be a discussion of the issues and certainly I have a right to correct mis-statements of fact when such mis-statements are made as they have been in this campaign so far.

"For example, that I should not be our party's nominee because I represent only a narrow segment of the party and wouldn't be able to win the Independent and Democratic votes any Republican must have to win in November. No explanation is given for the fact that I had more than 49 and a half percent of the Republican vote in New Hampshire and more than 1500 Democrats wrote my name in on the Democratic ballot. But, more to the point, in California there are more Independents than Republicans. Democrats outnumber Republicans three to two. I was elected Governor of California by a million votes and won re-election four years later.

"The first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln said, 'It is possible to be loyal to your government and still disagree with the policies of those in power'. I do disagree with a number of administrative policies. Our country cannot continue down the road we've been traveling

more--more--more

these many years. We are told that things are looking up but just a few days ago I was called from Washington and told that on that day, this Nation was \$95 billion deeper in debt than it was just one year ago. We add \$1 and a half billion to that debt every week so already that figure of \$95 billion has been surpassed and we have been assured next year will be virtually the same. This deficit spending by government is the sole cause of inflation. Inflation in turn is the cause of our recurrent recessions and unemployment. Not only does the government invade the private capital market, driving up interest rates, it reduces the value of our dollars by increasing the money supply with printing press money. Our savings, insurance and pension funds are eroded. Benefit payments in Social Security have increased 350% since 1936 but they buy 80 fewer loaves of bread than those smaller payments did in 1936. Possibly Mr. Ford was misinformed by his campaign aides when he criticized me for pointing out some of these unpleasant facts. He said he wanted to protect the integrity of Social Security. Well, I want to restore that integrity and assure our citizens who are dependent on Social Security they won't find themselves continuing to fall behind as inflation reduces their purchasing power. For 15 years, I've been talking about problems with Social Security while Washington has done nothing. It is time to assure those who've reached their non-earning years that Social Security will keep its word. I was also accused of demagoguery for pointing out that Congress had insured itself against inflation (the very inflation for which it must accept some responsibility). The pay of Congress will automatically rise to meet the increased cost of living. What incentive is there for Congress to curb its profligate spending and bring inflation under control?

"There is more. In the budget just submitted, there is an optimistic

more--more--more

prediction of increased tax revenues which it is pointed out should help reduce the deficit next year. But that optimistic forecast is based on a continuation of inflation. You see government makes a profit on inflation and this is true at every level of government. Your local property tax rates don't have to go up. They just reassess the value of your property upward and tell you that you owe more because you own more.

"At the Federal level, the graduated income tax is the villain. That cost of living pay increase you received didn't raise your purchasing power, it just kept pace with higher prices. That is, it did until you paid your income tax. Then you found that because the number of dollars you were paid had gone up, you had moved into a new surtax bracket and owed the Internal Revenue Service more money. Last year their profit on these cost of living pay raises amounted to \$7 billion. That is \$7 billion less than the American people had in purchasing power. Now the budget in one little paragraph tells us they happily look forward to doing even better next year.

"Another charge made in this campaign is that there are no basic differences between the two Republican candidates so why not leave well enough alone. That too is a mis-statement of fact. There are fundamental differences between us and you have a right to know what they are before you go to the polls.

"One very basic difference has to do with our respective governmental experiences. Before his appointment to the Vice Presidency and subsequent accession to the Presidency a year and a half ago, Mr. Ford spent 25 years in the Congress where his principal interest had to be the welfare of his congressional district. There is no question that he represented his district ably and well.

"My experience, on the other hand, was of shorter duration and in a

different capacity. I was a Governor for 8 years and think I'm entitled to point out that the state I governed is the largest in the nation with more than 22 million people. If California were a nation, it would be the 7th ranking economic power in the world.

"I bring up this matter of our backgrounds because I believe it is one of the differences which should be considered. One has been a member of the Washington establishment. One has not. One apparently has faith in the ability of that establishment to find solutions for the grave problems confronting us as a people and a nation. This has been evident in his appointment of former Congressman and office holders to high positions. I believe, on the other hand, that those who have been part of the problems are not necessarily the best able to resolve them. A few days ago, Mr. Ford expressed his believe that we must have a continuity of government in Washington. My belief is to the contrary; that we should not continue the present course of government; that we have reached a period in our nation's life where changes must be made and that those changes can better be made by those who have not had a career in Washington; who are not bound by long time relationships and personal ties. In other words, one of our differences could be in our approach to government; particularly in this time of crisis.

"In 1967 when I became Governor, Califonria was virtually insolvent, on the verge of bankruptcy, spending a million to a million and a half dollars a day more than it was taking in. Reserves had been spent while bookkeeping tricks hid such deficit spending because of our Constitutional prohibition against going into debt. We were told by the Attorney General those reserves had to be restored before the end of the fiscal year which was less than six months away.

"California was in pretty much the situation New York City is in and

more--more--more

may I point out that the only difference today between New York and Washington is that Washington has a printing press. Those who preceded us had been swelling the payroll by adding between five and seven thousand new employees each year. The teachers retirement fund hung over every property owner in the state as a \$4 billion unfunded liability. Our great water moving project was not yet finished but underfunded by a half a billion dollars. And the entire year's budget for medicaid had been spent before I took the oath of office with half the fiscal year to go. It was hard to figure whether I'd been elected Governor or appointed receiver.

"Of course, we had no choice but to increase taxes. This came hard because I believed taxes in California were already too high. I told our people that I considered the increase temporary and that, as soon as we could, we'd return the money to them. Then we set out to change the course of government. I did not think it was a time to preserve the continuity of government. As a matter of fact, I didn't think of myself as a part of government in the sense of loyalty to the institution itself. I was a citizen temporarily serving or representing my fellow citizens and my loyalty was to them.

"The problems to be solved were their problems and I turned to them for the answers -- not to those who had created the situation to begin with. Anyone who looks at the troubles we face today must see that government as such is not the solution -- government is the problem.

"I turned to the people for help in recruiting those needed for cabinet positions and other important posts. Those I turned to were selected because they knew who in California were the best qualified. They served not so much as a screening committee but as recruiters. I had laid down two criteria in addition to qualification for the job; seek those who did not want a career in government; seek those who would

be the first to tell me if their job was unnecessary. We put a team together made up of a happy mix of prematurely retired and bright young executive types. Some of the latter could only take a limited time away from their chosen careers. When they had to return to private life, we replaced them with others willing to make a sacrifice for the public good.

"There was a reason for seeking people who did not want a government career. The structure of government is such that it provides a built-in incentive for empire building. Those in supervisory or managerial positions are paid proportionately to the number of employees they supervise. Dr. Parkinson, in his famous book on bureaucracy summed it up when he said, 'Government hires a rat catcher and before you know it he's become a rodent control officer'.

"For more than 20 years, government has been growing in size two and a half times as fast as the increase in population. Today there is one public employee for every 4 and a half Americans who are working, earning and being taxed in the private sector.

"Even while we were setting up this administrative team, we sought more help from the people. We called upon what had to be the top level of leadership in California -- the most qualified experts in their particular specialities. Hundreds responded enthusiastically. They gave an average of 117 days each at no cost to the taxpayer going into 64 different areas of state government to see how modern business practices could be put to work to make government more efficient and responsive to the people.

"More than 1600 of their recommendations ranging from fleet buying practices in transportation to space allocation in buildings and kitchen management of our hospitals and prisons were put into operation. It was government by the people actually being practiced. Over the eight years, with our growth in population, many departments absorbed as much as a 66%

workload increase without increasing the number of employees. In fact, we ended the eight years with virtually the same number of employees we started with.

"The underfunded water project was completed with \$165 million left over. The teachers' retirement fund is on a sound actuarial basis no longer a liability. California's bonds for the first time in 40 years have a tripple A rating -- the highest credit rating you can get. We turned over to the incoming administration a balanced budget plus a \$500 million surplus. And kept our promise to the taxpayers by returning to them in tax cuts and rebates \$5.761 billion.

"With the wealth of managerial skill and talent to be found among our citizens, I believe what was done in California can be done at the national level. I do not have confidence that it can be accomplished if we depend on those who created the problem to begin with.

"Former U.S. Senator George Smathers of Florida spent more than 20 years as a member of the Washington establishment. For the last six years he has been working and earning in the private sector. He recently told a group in Florida what he has learned in these six years. He described Congress as 'composed of a bunch of professional politicians who really don't understand the free enterprise system' and admitted this had been true of himself as well as the three presidents with whom he'd known a close, personal relationship. Where once he had thought of government as all powerful, he is now apalled by the large number of federal agencies which have been created to tell the people what they can and can't do.

"There are thousands and thousands of good Americans employed in government who would like nothing better than to help eliminate waste and improve efficiency. We found this out in California when they began

helping our task forces. They said, 'no one had ever seemed interested before in making things better'.

"Only a great people can create a great society and we are a great people. There is no limit to what the American people can accomplish but we must be given a chance -- told what needs to be done and then turned loose to do it without bureaucratic harassment and nit picking. We opened up the west without an area redevelopment plan and built great cities from coast to coast without urban renewal. Wherever Washington has tried to do things the people should be doing, it has failed.

"Welfare is a classic example. Even the establishment in Washington calls it an utter and dismal failure. No one in Washington knows how many people are on welfare. They only know how many checks they are sending out. When they did try to come up with a reform plan it turned out to be one that would have added 12 million people to the rolls and countless billions of dollars to the cost.

"In California we gave this problem to a citizens task force at a time when our rolls were going up by 40,000 people a month. In three years, we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people, saved the taxpayers two billion dollars and increased the grants to the truly deserving by an average of 43%.

"How many years have we been told by Washington that something must be done about the blizzard of paper work required by government? Twenty-five years ago, the Hoover commission discovered that Washington filed a million reports a year just to report there was nothing to report. Last year government paper work increased by 20%. And so it has been with regulations -- until there is a regulation -- usually two or more contradictory ones covering every facet of our lives. Ask your druggist, your local businessman, the farmer and your local government.

more--more--more

"But there is one problem confronting our nation which makes all the others academic unless it is resolved satisfactorily. It has to do with our place in the world scene, call it international relations, U.S. foreign policy or what you will.

"I believe our nation is in great danger and that danger grows greater with each passing day. In words that remind us of his grandfather, a young member of Britain's House of Commons, Winston Spencer Churchill described the world scene as 'a disaster synonymous with appeasement'. He said, 'the sinister forces of totalitarianism are again on the march while the democracies are wandering without aim. Men acting from a variety of motives are helping actively the Soviet Union in its imperialistic desires.'

"'Wandering without aim' I believe describes U.S. foreign policy. Mr. Ford who a few weeks ago said no one can foresake detente and get elected now tells us he will abandon the word but retain the policy. But it is the policy that has made the word unpopular. No words from Washington can hide the fact that we no longer deal from strength. That is what former Secretary of Defense Schlesinger was trying to tell the American people and I believe that's why he is no longer our Secretary of Defense. His words were too true. Now the new Secretary of Defense, former Congressman Rumsfeld tells us our strength is (QUOTE) 'roughly equivalent' (UNQUOTE) to that of the Soviet Union. What does 'roughly equivalent' mean? It is not a term you use if you are trying to say we are 2nd to none in our defense capability. It is only suitable if you mean to say we are second, period.

"The Library of Congress has released an 86 page study compiled by the Senior national defense specialist there. In it we learn we are behind in missiles, submarines, men under arms (they have increased by one million men, we have cut back by 1.3 million) and the superior power

of some of our equipment has never compensated completely for this Russian advantage. Furthermore, the report makes it plain that Russia continues to forge ahead. Only now do we learn that our figures on Soviet military spending have only been half right -- they are spending two times as much as we had thought.

"From a military intelligence source, we learn that while we have talked detente Russia has been dispersing its factories into great scattered underground facilities and has a plan for emergency dispersal of its population.

"What is our foreign policy? One week we are relaxing trade bans and befriending Castro, the next we are sworn enemies of the bearded tyrant. I hope the last decision is final, certainly I never understood the first. Nor do I understand the quiet almost secret negotiations we're engaged in to give away the Panama Canal. Everyone seems to know the negotiations are going on except the rightful owners of the Canal Zone -- the American people.

"In 1974, Dr. Kissinger signed a memorandum with his Panamanian counterpart Foreign Minister Juan Tack -- which called into question that matter of whether the American people did in truth own the canal. Just for the record, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 did give sovereignty over the canal zone to the U.S. In 1904, this was upheld by all three branches of the government of Panama and affirmed in 1907 by our own Supreme Court.

"Now we submit to blackmail in a sense and enter into negotiations with a Marxist, military dictator who overthrew the duly elected government of Panama in 1968. There have been no elections or civil liberties in Panama since '68 and the press is censored.

"Our government has maintained a mouse-like silence as criticism of a giveaway has increased. But in the long run there are no secrets.

Virtually unnoticed by the United States press is a February 18 article in Times of the Americas, reporting that Foreign Minister Tack has said, 'The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal and the 1,400 square kilometers that surround it because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty.' Tack then said that the President, in a message that has not yet been made public, has proposed a compromise formula in which Panama's sovereignty over the Canal and the Zone is accepted; that sovereignty over the Canal will be transferred on December 31, 1995.

"If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. They deserve a full explanation. The Panama Canal Zone is sovereign U.S. territory just as much as Alaska is as well as the states carved from the Louisiana purchase. We bought it, we paid for it and General Torrijos should be told we're going to keep it.

"And may I add that with full appreciation of services rendered to our country by the Secretary of State and certainly with no personal animus -- if I am elected President I will name a new Secretary of State. It is time for the U.S. to stop worrying about whether the rest of the world loves us and start making the rest of the world respect us.

# # # # #

What kind of answer is it to say we're going to continue a foreign policy we know is bankrupt but we just won't call it "detente"? We'll change the name but keep the game -- a game we're losing. We need decisions that are practical, not political.

Ladies and gentlemen, I have no magic solutions to the problems besetting us; no plan that will provide an instant cure for our ills. But I believe in this system handed to us by the Founding Fathers. I know there is disillusionment and cynicism on the part of some about what seems to be the failure of the system to meet our needs. Yet, the system has never failed us. Now and then we have failed the system by forgetting that government of and for the people is also supposed to be by the people. Either we run politics or politicians run us. The choice is ours to make.

I believe you want our country to be so strong that no would-be aggressor would dare challenge us; that you are willing to bear any burden, pay any price because you know nothing could cost as much as the loss of freedom. I believe also that you want the truth about our domestic problems and that you can't be frightened by hard and unpleasant facts. Why should we be frightened? No people who have ever lived have fought harder for freedom, done more to advance the dignity of man or accomplish more than we have.

A few weeks ago in New Hampshire I was doing a question and answer session when a little girl who couldn't have been more than six or seven stood up and said, "Why do you want to be President?" No one had ever asked that particular question before. I tried to tell her that I wanted to reduce the power of the federal bureaucracy; to return authority and autonomy to state and local governments; to make government once again the servant of the people not the master and to give government back to the people. I realized of course that my answer

.more--more--more

while true, was hardly suitable for a six year old.

It wasn't until later, flying through the night that I told Nancy I knew what my answer should have been. I want very much to go to Washington to see if we can't have an America again in which that little girl will know and grow up knowing the same freedom our generation knew when we were growing up.

# # # # #

and autonomy to state and local governments; to make governments once again the servant of the people, not the master, and to give government back to the people.

I realized, of course, that my answer, while true, was hardly suitable for a six-year-old. It wasn't until later, flying through the night that I told Nancy I knew what my answer should have been.

I want very much to go to Washington to see if we can't have an America again in which that little girl will know and grow up knowing the same freedom our generation knew when we were growing up.

Soon you will be faced with a choice. I hope you will ask yourself some questions. Are the prices you pay for things going down? Do postage, stamps cost less? Is government more efficient? Are you proud of your position in the world?

I was asked by a newsman if I thought I could do better than Mr. Ford has done. I didn't answer the question at the time -- I'll answer it now. If I didn't think I could do the job better, I would not be here asking for your support and your votes.

# # # #

For information:

Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

March 7, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at Florida Appearances,  
Sunday, March 7, 1976.

I applaud Mr. Ford's rhetoric about Fidel Castro being an "international outlaw" and I am glad that he agrees with those of us who thought so all along. Still, I am more impressed with the reality of 12,000 Cuban soldiers fighting the Soviet Union's battles in South Central Africa. Where will they be used next?

Let us hope there will now be a change in our government's policy toward Castro. More than a year ago, the State Department began warming up to the dictator. Only last March, Dr. Kissinger said, "We should not be antagonistic toward Castro".

In July, the State Department instructed our delegate to the Organization of American States to vote in favor of lifting the embargo on trade with Cuba. The attitude of the U.S. virtually assured passage of the resolution.

In August, the Administration lifted our prohibition on trade with Cuba by foreign subsidiaries of U.S. firms.

Mr. Ford named George McGovern's former Latin American affairs adviser, William P. Rogers, Assistant Secretary of State for Inter-American Affairs.

In September, Rogers went before the House Committee on Inter-American Affairs to recommend relaxation of a policy toward Cuba which had been forged during three Administrations.

How could the Administration make such a recommendation in late September when that very month Castro hosted an international conference in Havana to promote revolution in Puerto Rico?

Why did Castro become an "international outlaw" just a few days before the Florida primary? After all, for years, Castro and the Soviet Union have supported a so-called Free Puerto Rico mission in Havana. Its agents

have virtually commuted back and forth to Puerto Rico. It is no "independence" movement. It is subversion, pure and simple -- an outgrowth of the Communist-sponsored Tri-Continental Congress of 1966.

Castro's Cuba represents the enlargement of Soviet power in the Caribbean. If Castro, doing the Soviet Union's bidding, has the ability to airlift troops to Angola, what might he do if the Panama Canal were no longer firmly in U.S. hands?

What is our foreign policy? If Mr. Ford is going to see Castro for what he is, let action match his words. For example, he could call on the OAS to hold a special meeting to reimpose the trade embargo; he could reimpose the trade prohibition on subsidiaries of U.S. firms. He could reimpose the 25-mile travel limit on Cuban U.N. diplomats which he lifted last year; and, he could make sure that Mr. Rogers shares the view that Castro is an "international outlaw".

And, while we are establishing just what our foreign policy is, what of the quiet, almost secret negotiations the Administration has been engaged in to give away the Panama Canal? Everyone seems to know about them except the rightful owners of the Canal Zone, the American people.

In 1974, Dr. Kissinger signed a memorandum with Panama's Foreign Minister, Juan Tack, which questioned whether the United States does own the Canal. Well, we do. Just for the record, the Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to us. In 1904, this was upheld by all three branches of the government of Panama and affirmed in 1907 by our own Supreme Court.

Yet, a February 18 article in Times of the Americas quotes Juan Tack as saying that, "The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal Zone because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty." Tack cited the President of the United States as the authority for his claim that sovereignty will be

transferred on December 31, 1995. A panamanian newspaper early last month reported that William P. Rogers, on a visit to that country, said virtually the same thing.

If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. Where does Mr. Ford stand on this issue? In 1967, he said, "With Cuba under control of the Soviet Union via Castro and increased Communist subversion in Latin America, a Communist threat to the Canal is a real danger." The situation is unchanged. What is his position now?

Just last week, Robert L. Funseth, a State Department official, said at a press conference that "As far as the Administration is concerned, all instructions to the (treaty) negotiating team...are by the President who has maintained strict control over the whole process."

If this is so, let Mr. Ford tell the American people what has changed the fact that the Panama Canal is as much sovereign U.S. territory as Alaska and the state of the Louisiana Purchase.

# # #

For information:

Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of remarks by  
the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at Florida Press Conferences  
Monday, March 8, 1976

These four days here in Florida have been great. I've visited many parts of the state and everywhere I have found enthusiasm and the feeling that we're building a real head of steam. I want to thank the thousands of people who have come out to meet me and all those who are helping in my campaign to offer an alternative to the Washington "buddy system".

Everywhere I've gone I have found that a great many people share my concern that our nation has slipped to Number Two in military defense strength in a world where it is dangerous -- if not fatal -- to be second best.

Mr. Ford said the other day that he is "guiding a steady, balanced course" for the nation. I have looked over the record and I cannot see it. I see not a steady, balanced course, but a series of inconsistencies that do not add up to a coherent foreign policy.

A little over a month ago in the State of the Union address he said that "...our military power is without equal." A week or so later, the Secretary of Defense said we were only "roughly equivalent" to the Soviet Union. Who should we believe?

Henry Kissinger said recently "there is no alternative to detente". A few days ago Mr. Ford made the word inoperative, hoping the people will forget that it is under his and Dr. Kissinger's policies that we have fallen behind the Soviet Union's momentum and under them that the Russians have proved more adept at the bargaining table.

All last year, the Ford-Kissinger policy toward Cuba was to

More--more--more

warm up to Castro. Castro kept right on promoting revolution in Puerto Rico and shipped his troops to Angola on Soviet aircraft, but the warm-up process continued. Now, just before the Florida primary, Mr. Ford has suddenly discovered that Castro is an "international outlaw". Is this a steady, balanced course? Will U.S. action now match Mr. Ford's words?

The Ford-Kissinger policy continues to be one of negotiating away our sovereignty over the Panama Canal. But, as criticism has increased, they have become quiet as mice about it. Is it a "steady, balanced course" to give away the Panama Canal, to give away this link in our national security to a leftist dictator closely aligned with that "international outlaw" Castro?

Mr. Ford's Administration urged America's grain farmers to plant from fence row to fence row and sell all they could on the open market. They did, but suddenly last September the Administration switched the signals and -- at George Meany's insistence -- put an embargo on further grain sales to the Soviet Union. It cost the farmers some \$2.2 billion. Is this what Mr. Ford meant by a "steady, balanced course"?

# # #

\*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)

FOR RELEASE March 08, A.M.

Excerpts of remarks by  
the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at Danville, Illinois,  
Monday, March 8, 1976

The other day, Mr. Ford described his approach to government as "guiding a steady, balanced course." I have looked over the record of the year-and-a-half of his Administration and behind those words and I am not reassured. I see not a steady, balanced course, but a series of actions which seem expedient, at best.

In October, 1974, he launched -- with fanfare -- a "war" on inflation and called for a general tax increase. Three months later, he switched to fighting recession and asked Congress to cut taxes. ~~Is that a steady, balanced course?~~

In March last year -- in no uncertain terms -- he drew the line at \$60 billion federal deficit. In October, he put forth a tax cut plan which suggested he'd accept a deficit of \$70 billion. And, the final deficit is expected to run close to \$80 billion. Is that a steady, balanced course when the inflation that deficit causes hurts every American?

In July, he called for business tax cuts to stimulate the economy to help create jobs and encourage capital formation. In October, he shelved the idea in favor of a plan to tie a \$28 billion general tax cut to equal cuts in federal spending.

For months he opposed extending the 1975 income tax bill. He even vetoed a bill to extend it for six months. The next day he agreed to sign an identical bill, even though he said he would never support a bill that didn't include equal spending cuts. Is that a steady, balanced course?

more--more--more

For months he insisted that the federal government not lend money to bail out New York City. Suddenly, in late November, he did an about-face and agreed to a \$2.3 billion federal loan program. Is that a steady, balanced course?

He promised his Secretary of Labor, John Dunlop, and George Meany that he would sign the common situs picketing bill. When opposition to the bill mounted, he switched signals and vetoed it. Now I opposed the bill from the beginning, so I'm not critical of a veto, but the circumstances raise some real doubts about a "steady, balanced course". In fact, Mr. Dunlop, with the rug pulled out from under him, resigned.

In October, when he abruptly fired James Schlesinger and William Colby and shuffled around other top officials, Mr. Ford offered the ambassadorship of NATO to Mr. Colby, without telling the man already on the job. Naturally enough, the Ambassador, on hearing that his job was being offered to someone else, resigned.

Mr. Ford's Administration urged America's grain farmers to plant from fence row to fence row and sell all they could on the open market. They did, but suddenly in September the Administration switched the signals and -- at George Meany's insistence -- put an embargo on further grain sales to the Soviet Union. It cost the farmers some \$2.2 billion. Ask an Illinois farmer if he thinks this is a "steady, balanced course".

# # #

- For information:  
Lynn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Gov. Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of remarks by  
the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at Illinois appearances  
Tuesday, March 9, 1976

An important question Republicans will be asking themselves before they go to the polls in the primary will be, who can win in November against the Democrats?

If he is to carry the Republican Party to victory and help elect more Republicans to Congress, you would want him to be able to go into the campaign without having to defend the largest budget deficit in our history.

Without having to defend a record national debt -- one that increased by \$95 billion in just the last year alone.

Without having to defend the decline of U.S. military strength to second place.

Without having to defend the one-way street of detente.

Without having to defend the Helsinki document and the giveaway of the Panama Canal.

Without having to defend the firing of a James Schlesinger and the inability to keep at his U.N. post a Daniel Patrick Moynihan.

You want him to be free from having to defend the Washington buddy system, at a time when the American people want very much to reverse the flow of power and tax dollars back to their communities where problems can be solved best.

You would want him to have a record of success in cutting government down to size, in balancing budgets and in reforming overgrown programs such as welfare.

Most of all, you would want him to go into that battle against the Democrats not having to defend a part of the past which Republicans want to leave to history.

He will need to attract many Democrats and Independents to win.

I was elected and re-elected Governor of our most populous state by large margins, even though in California there are more Independents than Republicans and we are outnumbered more than 3-to-2 by the Democrats. Just two weeks ago in New Hampshire, I received more than twice as many write-in votes as Mr. Ford on the Democratic ballot without campaigning for them.

The voters know that I owe nothing to the Washington Establishment. I have never been a part of that buddy system. I can and will win in November.

# # #

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 Gov. Reagan)

March 10, 1976

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of remarks by the  
Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at Illinois appearances,  
Wednesday, March 10, 1976

Just yesterday, the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, appeared before the Senate Budget committee. In answer to a direct question by Senator James McClure of Idaho, he refused to say that this nation is Number One in military strength.

I'll tell you why. The evidence is clear and it is mounting every day that this nation has become Number Two in military power in a world where it is dangerous -- if not fatal -- to be second best.

All Mr. Rumsfeld would admit to was "rough equivalency" with the Soviet Union in military strength. That is not reassuring.

# # # # #

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

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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY  
March 11, 1976

Excerpts from remarks made by  
the Honorable Ronald Reagan  
at appearances on Thursday,  
March 11, 1976

It took 166 years for our republic to put itself in debt by \$95 billion. That occurred in 1943, during the middle of World War II. By contrast, the Ford Administration has added \$95 billion in just the last 12 months. In fact, in the 19 months since Mr. Ford became President, one fourth of the total debt has been added.

In these 19 months, each family's share of the nation's debt has increased by \$2,100. His proposed budget for the next fiscal year even if nothing is added -- and that's unlikely -- would add at least another \$1,000 of indebtedness for every family. Someone is going to have to pay this debt -- we, or our children. But, regardless, the debt that is mounting so rapidly today will cause much worse inflation tomorrow. In the last few days, Mr. Ford has spoken glowingly of the upsurge in the economy; of being on the road to a solid prosperity. You cannot have a real prosperity based on going \$95 billion a year deeper into debt.

# # # # #

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

For information:

Lyn Nefziger, Press Secretary  
(Traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

March 11, 1976

Statement by Ronald Reagan,  
in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, March 11, 1976.

Just one month ago I spoke in New Hampshire about my concern over a foreign policy that seemed contradictory and my concern that the balance of forces has been shifting toward the Soviet Union throughout the years of detente.

In the weeks since, the evidence from defense experts has mounted rapidly that we are no longer Number One in military strength, but Number Two.

This is so despite the assurances of Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger. The Soviet Union's investment in strategic and conventional weapons is now some 50 percent ahead of ours. Their army is twice the size of ours. Their Navy outnumbers us 2-to-1. They are ahead 3-to-1 in artillery pieces and 4-to-1 in tanks. Their strategic missiles are larger, more numerous and more powerful than ours.

Recently, Dr. Malcolm Currie, Chief of Research and Engineering at the Department of Defense, said, in an address to an aerospace group, "The momentum is now on the side of the Soviet Union and it is staggering."

Dr. Fred Ikle, director of the United States Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, spoke in an interview the other day of the need to pay greater attention to the imbalance against us in conventional arms.

Paul Nitze, former Deputy Secretary of Defense, wrote in Foreign Affairs that the Soviet Union could launch a strategic nuclear attack on us, withstand a counterattack, knock out our allies and most of our targets and still have power left over. He said that "After 1977, the Soviet advantage...mounts rapidly."

A new Library of Congress study, compiled by its senior defense specialist, says that "the superior quality of our equipment has never compensated completely", for the Russian advantage.

While the balance has been shifting, the Ford-Kissinger policy of detente seems to be one of preemptive concessions, giving something first and hoping to get something in return later on. The Russians don't bargain this way, as we have seen.

They must wonder about our negotiating strength. After all, Dr. Kissinger rushed to Moscow, on the heels of the decisive intervention of the Soviet Union's Cuban mercenaries in Angola, to use as a bargaining chip the cruise missile, a new weapon system which would help us restore strategic equality and reduce our heavy dependence on nuclear weapons.

We have given the Soviets our trade and our technology. At Dr. Kissinger's insistence, Mr. Ford snubbed Alexander Solzhenitsyn. At Brezhnev's insistence, Mr. Ford flew to Helsinki to sign an agreement which placed the American seal of approval on the Red Army's World War II conquests in Eastern Europe.

It is time Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger told the American people just what are we getting out of detente, other than Soviet belligerence in the Middle East, Soviet duplicity in Southeast Asia and Soviet imperialism in Southcentral Africa?

All Mr. Ford has told us recently is that he won't use the word "detente" any longer. Yet, Dr. Kissinger insists "there is no alternative to detente".

In his State of the Union address, Mr. Ford said that "...our military power is without equal."

Yet, only two days ago, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld, when asked a direct question in a Senate committee hearing, refused to say that we are Number One in military strength. He would admit only to something called "rough equivalency" of power. Could that be a fancy way of saying "Number Two"?

Reassuring statements about detente--or whatever it is to be called now--accompanied by preemptive concessions to the Soviet Union seem to sum up Mr. Ford's and Dr. Kissinger's policy. The American people are now finding that these are no substitute for reestablishing American military superiority.

# # #

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)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts from remarks by the  
Hon. Ronald Reagan at a meeting  
with representatives of Middle  
Western ethnic press, Cicero,  
Illinois, Friday, March 12, 1976

I am opposed to the Helsinki document.

Last summer, at the insistence of the USSR's Communist Party Secretary Leonid Brezhnev, and at the urging of Secretary of State Henry Kissinger, Gerald Ford flew halfway around the world to sign it.

In effect, it put the American seal of approval on the Red Army's World War II conquests in Eastern Europe and on Soviet imperialism there.

The supposed benefit for us was some hoped-for Soviet concession in international dealings. So far, it hasn't come about. Brezhnev, apparently wanted the agreement signed in order to bolster his strength at the 25th Communist Party Congress, just completed in Moscow. He's still in power, so we can conclude that the Helsinki document served his purpose.

As for serving ours, there is no evidence of it. Mr. Ford, in a recent letter to Americans of Estonian ancestry, said that the document was not a treaty or a legally binding document. If so, then why be a party to something that was basically a Soviet propaganda ploy? I don't think Mr. Ford should have gone to Helsinki. I don't think any American President should ever be a party to giving away freedom, a precious commodity that is not ours to give.

# # #

NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be changes in, or additions to, the above text.

For information:

Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Gov. Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

March 12, 1976

Excerpts of remarks by  
the Honorable Ronald Reagan  
at Illinois appearances,  
Friday, March 12, 1976

Dr. Kissinger says that we must not criticize the Ford-Kissinger foreign policy. To do so would be "dangerous", he says. That's funny. I thought that in this country no public official was above and beyond public questioning.

Still, if the Ford-Kissinger foreign policy were a success, criticism wouldn't be necessary. As it is though, if that policy is so dependent on hope instead of strength that it cannot survive the slightest criticism, then perhaps it is time to start afresh.

I think the first step is to replace Dr. Kissinger with a new Secretary of State.

Next, we might invite Alexander Solzhenitsyn to the White House to dinner.

Then, we might get the State Department to acknowledge Mr. Ford's recent discovery that Castro is an "international outlaw", by changing its policy. It hasn't yet. Only last Sunday, by secret arrangement between the U.S. and Cuban governments, Cuba's prima ballerina danced in Los Angeles.

Instead of warming up to the Cuban dictator, as it did last year and is still doing, the Ford Administration should ask for a meeting of the Organization of American States to reimpose the trade embargo, lifted last summer, at our government's urging. Mr. Ford could also

reimpose the ban on sales to Cuba by subsidiaries of U.S. firms; and he could reimpose the 25-mile travel limit on U.N. Cuban diplomats which he lifted last year.

Then, since neither Mr. Ford nor Dr. Kissinger can tell us why they want to give away the Panama Canal, they might tell the leftist Panamanian dictator, General Torrijos, that since we bought it, we paid for it, we built it and it is ours, we intend to keep it.

And, before we enter into negotiations with other nations, we should make sure we know what we want to get out of the negotiations, that the other side also knows what our objectives are, and that we make no unnecessary concessions.

Let us add something about openness, too. In this republic, the people must take part in the policy-making process. When it comes to SALT II, or other agreements, the Administration should make public the tentative terms before the matters go to the Senate, so that there can be full and open public debate of their merits.

# # # # #

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