

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: April 1976-June 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/>

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

April 5, 1976

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
News Conference, Dallas, Texas,
Monday, April 5, 1976

Apparently, my television speech last week touched some sensitive nerves in Washington. First, Dr. Kissinger had the State Department issue a 10-page memorandum attempting to rebut what I had said about U.S. foreign policy.

Among other things, I had said that his top aide, Helmut Sonnenfeldt, had expressed to a group of U.S. ambassadors meeting in London last December, the belief that, in effect, the captive nations of Eastern Europe should resign themselves to their fate as part of a Soviet empire. He had used the word "organic" to describe this. I also attributed to him the idea that "their desire to break out of the Soviet straitjacket" threatens us with World War III.

Dr. Kissinger's memo hotly replies that "It is wholly inaccurate and a gross distortion of facts to ascribe such views to Mr. Sonnenfeldt or to this Administration. Neither he nor anyone else in the Administration has ever expressed any such belief."

Maybe not, but I have been shown excerpts from the cablegram reporting Mr. Sonnenfeldt's remarks, and he expressed just such beliefs as I described. For example, he said:

"The Soviets have been inept. They have not been able to bring the attractions that past imperial powers brought to their conquests. They have not brought the ideological, legal, cultural, architectural, organization and other values and skills that characterized the British, French and German adventures." About the relationship between

more--more

the Soviet Union and the captive nations, he says, "This inorganic, unnatural relationship is a far greater danger to world peace than the conflict between east and west." He adds, "...it must be our policy to strive for an evolution that makes the relationship between the eastern Europeans and the Soviet Union an organic one." And, "We seek to influence the emergence of the Soviet imperial power by making the base more natural and organic so that it will not remain founded in sheer power alone." As for our encouraging any independent thoughts by the captive nations, he says, "Any excess of zeal on our part is bound to produce results that could reverse the desired process for a period of time, even though the process would remain inevitable within the next 100 years."

In other words, slaves should accept their fate.

One very serious question before the voters is, what are we going to do about our declining military status with regard to the Soviet Union? And now, another is, can we believe any longer what we are told by the State Department? Unless they can demonstrate that Mr. Sonnenfeldt never said these things, I can only conclude that the rebuttal to my remarks by the State Department was an exercise in creative writing.

Mr. Ford jumped to his own defense, too. He said we are "unsurpassed" militarily. What he didn't say was that his Secretary of Defense, Mr. Rumsfeld has refused in the last month to tell either a Senate Committee or a national television panel that we are Number One. He would admit only to a "rough equivalency." When you are Number One, or "unsurpassed" you don't use words like "rough equivalency".

My criticism of our defense posture is not based on a crystal ball. I have cited Defense Department statistics; statements by the current

more--more

Ronald Reagan 3-3-3

Secretary of Defense and his immediate predecessor; our arms control chief; the Pentagon's research chief; former SALT negotiators and our NATO chief -- among others.

Mr. Ford's protestations that he has "an impeccable record of standing for a strong defense deparemtn and a fully capable, fully trained, fully equipped and ready military force" miss the point.

No one is questioning his patriotism; only the record. Since the mid-1960's we have, as a nation, frittered away a clear military superiority over the Soviet Union. The trend has continued under Mr. Ford's and Dr. Kissinger's leadership and I have yet to see it change. The American people must be told the facts so that they will demand a change. That is what I am working to do.

####

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

April 6, 1976

RELEASE ON RECEIPT

Excerpts from Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
at Texas events, Tuesday, April 6, 1976

If we were Number One in military strength in the world, we would know that Mr. Ford's branding Castro an "international outlaw" and Dr. Kissinger's dire warnings to the Cubans to forego further African adventures would be more than just words. In fact, we would probably have seen them backed by actions by now; actions such as a cooperative quarantine of Cuba by all the states of the Americas and other allies as well.

And, if we were Number One we wouldn't have to be concerned that Cuba has become, in effect, an advance operational military base for the Soviet Union just 90 miles from our shore.

The reports cannot be ignored. We hear that Soviet cargo planes leave Cuba almost daily, bound for Angola with Soviet-equipped and trained Cuban troop replacements. Reports that there are several thousand -- perhaps 5,000 or more -- Soviet advisers and technicians in Cuba. Reports that the Cuban Army, under Soviet training, has become a tactical offensive force, mobile and ready to use anywhere. Reports that Soviet warships and submarines make regular calls at Cuban ports, and Soviet medium-range bombers and long-range reconnaissance planes operate from Cuban airfields.

Perhaps Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger can prove to us that these reports are all unfounded. That we have nothing to be concerned about. But, until they do, I shall continue to be deeply concerned that this Soviet military buildup just off our shores is one more piece of evidence that we have become Number Two in a world where it is dangerous--if not fatal--to be second best.

#####

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

April 9, 1976

RELEASE ON RECEIPT

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Wyoming campaign appearances, Friday,
April 9, 1976

Remember the old schoolyard rhyme game with a flower blossom, "She loves me; she loves me not" Well, Dr. Kissinger may be counting flower petals right now. That's how rapidly the Administration's feelings about him seem to change.

Last weekend there was a flurry of hints from people close to Mr. Ford that Dr. Kissinger's days as Secretary of State were numbered.

Rogers Morton, Mr. Ford's campaign manager, went to California to try to get the endorsement of the state's largest Republican volunteer group for his boss. He didn't succeed, but he did tell a meeting of its leaders, "I'm sure Mr. Kissinger is getting toward the end of a long political career. It would be bad politics to throw him out bodily. But I would anticipate--and I'm sure I'm right on this--that he would not go on beyond this year."

Meanwhile, in Norman, Oklahoma, Undersecretary of Commerce James Baker was telling a group that, "He (Kissinger) has been around a long time and I think the President believes it is probably time for a change."

And, up in Wisconsin, former Secretary of Defense Mel Laird was saying much the same thing.

But they quickly retreated, with apologies and "clarifying" rhetoric during the week when Mr. Ford described him as "one of the greatest Secretaries of State in the history of the United States." In fact, Mr. Ford told a group of Michigan businessmen

more--more--more

Reagan 2-2-2

on Wednesday, "I thought the results in Wisconsin certainly fully justified my faith in Henry Kissinger."

That's funny. Not long before, Mr. Ford's Wisconsin campaign managers had been confidently predicting he would win two-thirds of the vote, leaving the other third to me. But it didn't turn out that way. On the heels of the North Carolina race, the outcome was very much closer, 55-to-45. I suspect there isn't much comfort in that for Dr. Kissinger for it shows that more and more Americans are concluding every day that the Ford-Kissinger policies are not working.

###

for information:
Jim Lake, press secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

April 10, 1976

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
news conference, Olympic Hotel, Seattle,
Washington, Saturday, April 10, 1976

Earlier this year, Dr. Kissinger said "there is no alternative to detente." Yet, it has been during the years of "detente" -- a word Mr. Ford no longer uses -- that the balance of power has been shifting in favor of the Soviet Union.

The Soviets' annual investment in strategic and conventional weapons runs some 50 per cent ahead of ours. It is buying them superiority. Their navy outnumbers us 2-to-1 in surface ships and submarines. They are ahead 3-to-1 in artillery; 4-to-1 in tanks. Their strategic missiles are larger, more numerous and more powerful than ours. And the size of their army is more than double ours.

Worse yet, we now know that our army is badly under-equipped. Secretary of the Army Martin R. Hoffman, who replaced Bo Callaway when he resigned to run Mr. Ford's campaign, told the Senate Armed Forces committee recently, "If we were to go to war tomorrow, the Army could equip only 51 percent of its 16 divisions." He added that it has only 39 percent of the tanks it needs for effective combat; 51 percent of the armored personnel carriers; 71 percent of the attack helicopters and 78 percent of the artillery. "This is a critical situation," he said.

Army Chief of Staff, General Fred C. Weyand, underscored the danger. He said, to the House Armed Services committee, "In the event of a conflict, our Army deployments would be too little and too late."

Is this the "peace through strength" of which Mr. Ford speaks?

for information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

for release

7:40 PM, April 10, 1976
PST

Excerpts from remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Rally, Sick Stadium, Seattle, Washington,
Saturday, April 10, 1976

Now, the press reports of a British Defense Ministry memo prepared for Parliament. It says that the Soviet Union and its Eastern European satellites this year will put into service a wide range of new weapons in a buildup of armaments.

There will be 200 new-generation intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBMs); 1,000 combat aircraft; 700 helicopters; 3,000 tanks; 4,000 armored personnel carriers; up to 10 nuclear submarines carrying missiles with a 4,000-mile range; and several major surface ships, including a 40,000-ton aircraft carrier.

The report also talks of 30 to 40 aircraft factories turning out about 1,000 combat aircraft a year and almost as many helicopters. And, new, bigger nuclear missiles are also being produced at a rate of several hundred a year.

Soviet tank production averages 3,000 a year and they are coming out with a new model with improved firepower and mobility.

Former Secretary of Defense James Schlesinger said only a few days that we are unduly dependent on a nuclear deterrent. Such a situation could mean that our only response to Soviet adventuring in conventional arms might have to be the threat by us of a nuclear one.

This is hardly "peace through strength."

###

For information, contact:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts from remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan
at a rally at Robert E. Lee High School,
Midland, Texas, 7:15 p.m. CST
Tuesday, April 13, 1976

Mr. Ford has stated flatly that he doesn't intend to give away the Panama Canal. Now, today, we learn that Mr. Ford has issued written instructions to the State Department to do just that.

Congressman Gene Snyder of Kentucky has released testimony given to the House Panama Canal Subcommittee by Ambassador Ellsworth Bunker, the chief negotiator, on April 8. Although the testimony was originally secret, Congressman Snyder obtained unanimous approval of the subcommittee to release his line of questioning of Bunker. The following excerpt from that record makes it quite clear just what Mr. Ford's intentions are about this sovereign United States territory:

Ambassador Bunker: "Mr. Congressman, we are proceeding to negotiate under guidelines established by the President, both by President Nixon and President Ford."

Mr. Snyder: "I do not think that is responsive to my question. I want to know what directive or directives the State Department has received from President Ford to do this?"

Ambassador Bunker: "We have been directed to proceed with the negotiations on the basis of the guidelines --"

Mr. Snyder: "To give it up? To give up the Canal Zone over a period of time?"

Ambassador Bunker: "To give up the Canal Zone after a period of time, that is correct."

Mr. Snyder: "And the Canal over a longer period of time?"

Ambassador Bunker. "Longer period of time."

Mr. Snyder. "Longer period of time. And what are the directives? Are they written memorandums?"

Ambassador Bunker: "The directives are in written memorandum."

Mr. Snyder. "Signed by the President?"

Ambassador Bunker. "Signed by the President."

Mr. Snyder. "Under what date?"

Ambassador Bunker. "Varying -- various dates."

For information contact:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

Immediate Release

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Texas events, Tuesday, April 13, 1976

While the Administration is talking about cutting military bases right and left, closing post offices and reducing postal services to make ends meet, Congress has increased our subsidy of the United Nations by \$44 million -- 30 percent greater than last year's \$188 million.

While the U.N. General Assembly routinely passes outrageous resolutions aimed at the United States and its allies, U.N. employees enjoy salaries at levels 15 percent above those of U.S. civil service workers in comparable positions. U.S. taxpayers are underwriting these U.N. salaries which makeup nearly three-quarters of the organization's budget.

While the United States pays 25 percent of the annual U.N. budget, the oil-rich nations contribute tiny amounts, ranging from Iraq's puny one-half-of-one percent up to Iran's two percent.

Why isn't the Administration reviewing this situation? Only they can tell us, but so far Mr. Ford is silent on the subject. Senator Dewey Bartlett of Oklahoma has proposed that we cut our contribution to the U.N. to 15 percent over the next five years. Though his proposal hasn't yet been adopted, there is nothing to prevent Mr. Ford from instructing our Ambassador to the U.N., William Scranton, to begin negotiations with the U.N. hierarchy to make some reduction in our contribution.

###

for information contact:
Martin Anderson or Mike Deaver
(traveling with the Governor)

IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan
Texas events, Thursday, April 15, 1976

Last month, Dr. Kissinger sent Hanoi a memorandum telling them that our government is ready to negotiate the matter of diplomatic relations and normalization of trade and travel with the Communist regime in Vietnam.

On the heels of that, a news report from Paris last weekend says that the Vietnamese have set a high price on "normalization" and that the U.S. government is expected to pay it, including:

- Support for Vietnamese membership in the U.N. next fall.
- Admission, in effect, of "war guilt".
- A gift of large amounts of economic aid, to be labeled "war reparations".

According to the report in last Sunday's Baltimore NEWS AMERICAN, the Vietnamese are counting on pressure from Congress to keep nudging the Administration toward this settlement.

Just a year after they tore up the Paris Peace Accords and -- with the aid of the Soviet Union -- overran South Vietnam, the Communists are intent on achieving a major political victory over the United States.

In the absence of any denial of these reports by the White House, we must assume that Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger are prepared to accept this sort of humiliation for America. But questions remain: Why? And, is this "peace through strength"?

####

for information contact:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

Immediate Release

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan
Texas events, ~~Wednesday~~, April 14, 1976

~~Thurs.~~

15

Though he has not spelled out the details, Mr. Ford has apparently endorsed the idea of replacing present welfare programs with a national guaranteed annual income scheme if he is nominated and elected this year.

Having presided over a comprehensive welfare reform program in California which has served as a model for many other states, I am poles apart from Mr. Ford on this issue.

Early this month, in a meeting with the Wisconsin Association of Manufacturers, he was asked what he would do about welfare. He said:

"In 1971 and again in 1972 I voted for a complete junking of the existing welfare program and voted for what I thought was a great improvement, and it obviously was not perfect; it passed the House twice, it was called the Family Assistance Program -- much better than the system we had.

"I think in 1977, we have to come up with a comprehensive reform of existing welfare; something like--although I am not going to embrace it entirely--the Family Assistance Program that was passed by the House in 1971 and 1972."

This Family Assistance Plan--not Program--that Mr. Ford was talking about would have put something like 12 million more people on welfare virtually overnight and would have provided, essentially, a guaranteed annual income. In other words, work or not, you get the money.

Estimates of the cost to the taxpayers varied, ranging up to

more--more

\$16 billion a year.

Having had plenty of experience with welfare reform by that time, I testified against "FAP" in Washington. Our experience had been -- and continued to be throughout my term -- that sensible administrative and legislative caseload reform at the state level is the real answer to the welfare mess.

Tighter eligibility standards, better record keeping, elimination of red tape, identification of fraud and rule-stretching -- all contributed to reducing the welfare rolls and holding the line on costs. By the time I left office, we had reduced the rolls more than 300,000 persons since our reforms were first instituted administratively in January, 1971. It was estimated we saved the taxpayers \$2 billion in additional welfare costs. At the same time, the savings made it possible to increase grants to the truly needy by an average of 43%. So, we had reform, economy and compassion in one state's program. Many others have since adopted these ideas.

The guaranteed annual income in the guise of the Family Assistance Plan has been defeated before. It will be defeated again because it won't work. What is needed instead is a return of control of welfare to the states, along with the federal tax sources involved, so it can be run more efficiently and responsively than Washington runs it with H.E.W.'s endless mass of red tape and obstructionism.

Mr. Ford, who also hinted at his support of a "FAP" - like program at a reporters' breakfast earlier this year, should spend some time examining reforms the states are putting into practice in spite of, not because of Washington's bureaucracy. And, he might talk with the men and women who would have to foot the bill for the guaranteed annual income -- the producing taxpayers -- to find out what they think of the idea.

For information:

Jim lake, Press Secretary

(202) 452-7676

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan
Houston, Texas, Thursday, April 15, 1976

One of the differences between Mr. Ford and myself is our approach to welfare. In California, we were faced with a runaway program that was adding 40,000 people a month to the welfare rolls. We instituted a complete reform of welfare involving tighter eligibility, better record keeping, ^{AND} elimination of fraud and loose interpretation of the rules.

Our program reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people in less than three years; saved the taxpayers \$2 billion and enabled us to increase the grants to the deserving needy an average of 43 percent.

Washington was proposing a welfare reform of its own called the Family Assistance Plan (FAP). It was in fact a proposal for a guaranteed annual income that would have instantly added 12 million people to the welfare rolls at a cost of at least \$16 billion.

Fortunately, this ill-conceived idea was finally halted in the Senate Finance Committee. Evidence presented by California played a part in getting it stopped.

A few weeks ago, campaigning in Wisconsin, Mr. Ford was asked what he would do about welfare. He told of how he had voted twice as a Congressman for a wonderful program called the Family Assistance Plan and said, "I think in 1977 we have to come up with a comprehensive reform of existing welfare". And then went on to say it would be something similar to the "Family Assistance Plan" he had voted for twice as a Congressman in 1971 and 1972.

Mr. Ford would institute a guaranteed annual income costing billions of dollars, administered by those who have made welfare our fastest growing, costliest failure. I believe authority and administration of welfare should be returned to state and local control along with the federal tax sources to fund it, and I cite California as proof of the potential savings to the taxpayers.

###

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Georgia Events, Wednesday, April 21, 1976

In my telecast a few weeks ago, I gave as an example of our vacillating foreign policy, our ■willingness to negotiate the matter of diplomatic relations and normalization of trade and travel with the Communist regime in Vietnam. This, too, was vehemently denied. Now the press reports that we did inform Hanoi of our readiness to negotiate, but that Hanoi is snubbing us. A report from Paris says that the Vietnamese have set a high price on "normalization" and that the U.S. government is expected to pay it, including:

- Support for Vietnamese membership in the U.N. next fall.
- Admission, in effect, of "war guilt".
- A gift of large amounts of economic aid, to be labeled "war reparations".

According to the report, the Vietnamese are counting on pressure from Congress to keep nudging the Administration toward this settlement.

It was Hanoi, not the U.S., that tore up the Paris Peace Accords and -- with the aid of the Soviet Union -- overran South Vietnam. Why should we now go hat-in-hand to give them a major political victory? If there is to be any recognition of Hanoi, let it be discussed only after they have kept their pledge to give a full accounting of our men still listed as Missing in Action.

#

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with the Governor)
or Jan McCoy, Citizens for Reagan
(202) 452-7606

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement by The Hon. Ronald Reagan
Birmingham, Alabama, Friday, April 23, 1976

Wednesday of this week, in a speech in Washington, Mr. Ford, instead of answering the questions about our national defense raised by me and others, launched a rhetorical attack on anyone who raises such questions. He also asserted that the United States is "the single most powerful nation on earth". I wish it were still true, but it isn't. I have arranged with the CBS television network to purchase five minutes of network time next Wednesday evening, April 28, (10:55 p.m. Eastern and Pacific times; 9:55 Central; varied times Mountain), to spell out the dangers of our present national defense situation.

#

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Indiana Events, Tuesday, April 27, 1976

Last week, Mr. Ford replied to my criticism of his plan to give away the Panama Canal by saying that a U.S. refusal to negotiate this "would turn most of Latin America, if not all of Latin America, against the United States".

He didn't present any evidence to support his claim. Perhaps there isn't any. There is some evidence to the contrary, though.

It seems that the response was so disappointing to Panama's recent invitation to all Latin American heads of state to attend a summit conference there in June that the event has been cancelled. It was to have celebrated the 150th anniversary of the first Latin American summit, called by Simon Bolivar.

If Mr. Ford were right about Latin American solidarity, you would think Panama would be more popular with its neighbors when it sends out invitations. It was 20 years ago when nearly every Latin American head of state attended the 130th anniversary celebration in Panama City. The President of the United States attended, too.

Mr. Ford also said the other day that the U.S. would "never" give up operational or defense control of the Canal. Later, Press Secretary Ron Nessen explained that Mr. Ford's remarks lacked "precision and detail". It turned out that "never" had a deadline attached to it, 30 to 50 years in the future.

What Mr. Ford did not explain was how he expects the U.S. to keep operational and defense control of the Canal if it gives up sovereignty over the Canal Zone. Without sovereignty we would be there at the sufferance of the government of Panama's dictator, Omar Torrijos. Nothing would prevent him from suddenly "nationalizing" the Canal and kicking us out altogether. What would Mr. Ford propose to do then? His treaty would be worth little more than the paper it was written on.

TEXT OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN'S NATIONWIDE TELEVISION ADDRESS,
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 28, 1976.

RELEASE: Embargoed. Release upon delivery 10:55 p.m. (EDT),
Wednesday, April 28, 1976.

CONTACT: Jim Lake, Press Secretary (traveling with Governor Reagan)
or Jan McCoy, Citizens for Reagan, 202/452-7606

Good evening. Thank all of you who've written to me since I last
addressed you, March 31st.

Like you, I'm concerned about keeping world peace. I've raised
questions about our national defense. Questions which have been met
with evasions or words that don't match deeds.

I have talked of the negotiations now going on to give up sovereignty
of the Panama Canal. But, Mr. Ford declared he has no intention of
giving away the Canal.

Yet, testifying before a Congressional committee, Ambassador Ellsworth
Bunker revealed that he's been carrying out Mr. Ford's direct orders to
do just that. To give up the Canal Zone and the Canal.

In a world where it's dangerous, if not fatal, to be second best,
we're becoming Number Two in military strength. After I first said this,
Mr. Ford reacted sharply, declaring that we are "the single most powerful
nation on earth".

The basis of our defense system was to insure peace by being so strong
no other nation would dare break the peace by testing us. But, during the
years of Detente, momentum has shifted to the Soviet Union. Detente has
been a one-way street. In fact, Mr. Ford says he won't even use the word
anymore. He'll use "peace through strength".

Yet, his Secretary of Defense refused to say we are still Number One,
even when asked to do so by a Senate Committee. He finally admitted to a
"rough equivalency" to the Soviet Union. Well, that is hardly "peace
through strength".

more--more--more

The fact is, the Soviet Army is twice the size of ours. They have four times as many reserves. Their annual investment in weapons is half again as much as ours. We're outgunned in artillery pieces, in tanks. And, outnumbered in surface ships and submarines. Is that "peace through strength"?

Here you see scale models of the strategic nuclear missiles that are the mainstay of the Soviet force, the dark ones. Our strategic defense rests almost entirely on the one in front of them. Our Minuteman, the white one.

The SALT agreement limits the number of missiles each nation can put into silos for launching. But SALT puts no limit on the number that can be put on wheels. The Soviets have modified this one so it can be put on wheels. Now we don't know how many of these they might have hidden throughout the Russian countryside.

Does SALT really give us "peace through strength"?

What do the experts see if these trends continue?

General Alexander Haig, Mr. Ford's NATO commander, said recently, "We're getting to the fine edge of disaster." Is that "peace through strength"?

Paul Nitze, former SALT negotiator and Deputy Secretary of Defense, says about Soviet strategic nuclear power, "After 1977, the Soviet advantage after an assumed attack mounts rapidly." Is that "peace through strength"?

And the chief of Research and Engineering at the Pentagon, says, "The momentum is now on the side of the Soviet Union and it is staggering." Is that "peace through strength"?

James Schlesinger, former Secretary of Defense, says, "...at no point since the 1930's has the Western world faced so formidable a threat to

its survival". Is that "peace through strength"?

To us, nuclear war is unthinkable. It must never happen. That is not the Russian view. The Soviets have a massive civil defense program designed to let them survive -- and win -- a war they think they will one day have to fight. The late Soviet Defense Minister Grechko said, "Soviet strategic missile forces are intended for the destruction of the enemy's means of nuclear attack . . . and the disorganization of his state." That means us. We can't abdicate our free world leadership without abdicating our ability to keep the peace.

This was the only subject I'd intended talking about tonight, but another has arisen. For several weeks Congress has played politics as usual with the federal matching funds which you've put up for distribution to those of us who are candidates. That money is undistributed because Congress won't act. Now they're considering a bill which would make the money available but would give the hierarchy of organized labor increased power to influence elections while limiting the rights of all others.

I need those matching funds as much as anyone but not at that price. The bill shouldn't be passed. If it is, it should be vetoed.

That means I'll have to depend on your contributions to continue campaigning.

#

(traveling with the Governor)

Statements made by Governor Ronald Reagan
in Alabama and Texas. Thursday, April 29, 1976

Mr. Ford and I disagree on a number of issues, but on none more than the idea of a Guaranteed Annual Income. Mr. Ford favors it. I oppose it.

In Wisconsin early this month, he said, "I think in 1977, we have to come up with a comprehensive reform of existing welfare; something like the Family Assistance Program that was passed by the House in 1970 and 1972."

He did embrace it wholly both times. The Nixon Administration's version of a Guaranteed Annual Income plan was the Family Assistance Plan which Mr. Ford steered through the House both times. Both times it was killed in the Senate.

It would have added an estimated 12 million persons to welfare at the stroke of a pen and at a cost estimated to range up to \$16 billion a year.

In Wisconsin, Mr. Ford called it "a great improvement" over existing welfare programs. Considering his lifelong career in Washington, I'm not surprised he favored this further federalization of welfare, but I wish he had taken a closer look at successful welfare reforms conducted in the states -- often in the face of hostility by the welfare bureaucrats at H.E.W. The record of our California comprehensive reforms is well known. They succeeded and many other states copied them. It is clear from our experience there that more, not less, state control of welfare can bring about welfare programs that are more efficient and responsive than Washington could ever decide. And they won't include any guaranteed annual income.

###

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

EMBARGOED: RELEASE UPON
DELIVERY, 12:55 P.M.CDT
April 30, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks by the Honorable Ronald Reagan
The Alamo, San Antonio, Texas, Friday, April 30, 1976

I must express my concern over what appears to be a massive shift in U.S. policy in Southern Africa as announced by Secretary Kissinger on Tuesday. We seem to be embarking on a policy of dictating to the people of Southern Africa and running the risk of increased violence and bloodshed in an area already beset by tremendous antagonism and difficulties.

It is imperative that we avoid impulsive reactions in a potentially explosive situation. Any transition process in Rhodesia should not overlook the protection of minority rights as well as insure full majority participation.

The peoples of Rhodesia - black and white - have never been our enemies. They fought with us in World War II against Hitler and in the Pacific. If they show a creative attitude that can lead to a peaceful settlement, ourselves and others should avoid rhetoric or actions that could trigger chaos or violence. They have special problems which will require time to solve. But nothing will be solved by poorly thought out policies suddenly announced but which are not understood and do not command support here at home. Granting we seek the correction of injustice that we believe exists in Africa, how then do we explain our ignoring the plight of the enslaved millions in the Soviet Union and other

more--more--more

Communist countries ?

We're not going to cure the ills of the world overnight. The great issue of racial justice is as vital here at home as it is in Africa and it would be well to make sure our own house is in order before we fly off to other lands to attempt to dictate policies to them.

In the meantime, foreign policy will work only when it has the enlightened support of our people. Certainly we are entitled to more facts than we've been given so far about this new adventure in Africa.

Announcing what he called America's "unrelenting opposition" to the government in Rhodesia, and in decreeing that Rhodesia must achieve complete majority rule within two years, it is possible Mr. Kissinger has literally undercut the possibility for a just and orderly settlement. Curiously enough this is the same Mr. Kissinger who argued against unrealistic deadlines in his negotiations with the North Vietnamese.

What is even more incredible is his announcement that our citizens in Rhodesia will not be protected by the United States government and that U.S. citizens residing in Rhodesia will be advised to get out. This has to be a "first" -- the United States government proclaiming officially that its citizens must go unprotected in a foreign land.

In haste to get in line with what is considered to be an

more--more--more

"inevitable outcome" in Southern Africa and as a result of the stinging defeat suffered in Angola it is possible the Ford Administration has opened a Pandora's box of additional problems for U.S. policy in Africa.

There is a great inconsistency in a foreign policy which can embrace the Helsinki pact and say in effect that the peoples of Eastern Europe are now permanently within the domain of the Soviet Union; that the interest of world peace is served by their remaining there while at the same time we try to dictate the course of events in Southern Africa.

Secretary Kissinger's announcement further contained a declaration that directly affects the prosperity and security of the U.S. He said the Administration will ask Congress to repeal the legislation which permits us to buy chrome from Rhodesia.

There is only one other major source of chrome in the world, the Soviet Union. Chrome is absolutely essential to American industry and to the production of military hardware. In 1967 through 1971, we obeyed U.N. sanctions and did buy our chrome from Russia. Russia doubled the price.

Now Secretary Kissinger would make us once more totally dependent upon the Soviet Union at a time when they are intent on out-building us militarily.

###

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

Release: Upon Delivery

RONALD REAGAN STATEMENT OF MAY 1, 1976, INDIANAPOLIS, INDIANA

I am deeply grateful to the voters of Texas for providing me with today's dramatic victory. The 96 delegates which were elected to support me in Kansas City next August are enough, when added to those which I have already received in primaries and convention states so far, to give me as many committed delegates as Mr. Ford as of now. With the vast majority of the delegates to the national convention still to be picked in May and June, I believe I can obtain the support needed to become the Republican Party standard bearer.

During the weeks ahead, Republican primary voters and party leaders in the caucus states must decide which of us offers the best chance of victory in November, particularly if Mr. Carter is the Democratic nominee. The support I have received in the Republican Party, and Mr. Carter's strong showing in the Democratic indicates that the country does want a change in Washington and a re-evaluation of our foreign policy and defense posture.

For information:
Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

STATEMENT BY THE HON. RONALD REAGAN

SOUTH BEND, INDIANA, MONDAY, MAY 3, 1976

The voters are showing, more and more, that they want a change in the way this country approaches its problems. In both parties they are saying that they don't want Washington's old business-as-usual approach any more.

Jimmy Carter will possibly be the Democratic nominee. Like me, he is not a part of the Washington Establishment. The question which will now be uppermost in the minds of Republicans is, who can beat Carter in November?

Mr. Ford, as the nominee, would be forced by Carter to defend the largest budgets and deficits in our history; the decline in U.S. defense strength; an energy policy that makes us more, not less, dependent on foreign oil; and the Washington Establishment's traditional way of doing things through a bureaucracy that is inefficient and unresponsive to the people.

As the Republican nominee I would not have to defend old problems. I would concentrate instead on new solutions and on building that new coalition of Republicans, Democrats and Independents which already has begun the process of reawakening the American spirit. That spirit must be the foundation for solving our problems, for the problems cut through party lines.

* * *

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Statement by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Shreveport, Louisiana, Thursday, May 6, 1976

For a long time, I have been honestly trying to say that our projections of what might happen in this primary campaign were that Mr. Ford and I would probably go to the convention, each with a group of pledged delegates. There would be a group of uncommitted, and there, at the convention, the decision would be made as to who would become the nominee of the party.

I have to tell you now, in view of the last few days, they have so far exceeded our projections; that I would like to see the Louisiana delegation pledged, not uncommitted, because I believe it is possible to go to the convention now with enough delegates to win on the first ballot. And if the Democratic nominee is to be Jimmy Carter, I will tell you now I believe that I offer the best opportunity for victory for what we believe in, in a contest with Jimmy Carter in November.

#

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Idaho Appearances, Tuesday, May 11, 1976

With Jimmy Carter the possible, or even probable, Democratic nominee, Republicans are faced with some important questions.

Which Republican candidate will fare best in the south and southwest in November?

Who can appeal across party lines to Democrats and Independents who think as we do on basic issues?

Will we, as a party, be offering new solutions to old problems, or defending old policies against the attacks of a Democrat who is not part of the Washington Establishment?

The results of the last several primaries -- in both parties -- reveal a great desire on the part of the people for a change -- an end to politics-as-usual and the continuing growth of the Washington bureaucracy.

We, as Republicans, must also look ahead to unifying our party for the General Election. We have had a vigorous primary season; unusual for Republicans, but it has breathed new life into our party. Now we must look ahead to the General Election and pledge that we will go into that campaign united. I know it can be done, just as we did it in California in 1966 when we made a nearly clean sweep of statewide offices and gains in the Legislature as well.

I've been asked who -- if I were the nominee -- would be my choice for Vice President. Well, under the new election laws, I can't mention any names, but I believe that a Vice President should be compatible enough with the President to continue his policies if the duty fell to him, without a radical change in course.

I have proposed in this primary season what I think are mainstream Republican solutions to this nation's problems and I would look to that

more--more--more

mainstream for a running mate whose principles are strong and whose practices are sensible. And there are many men and women in our party who fit that description.

#

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan
Kentucky & Michigan Appearances, Thursday, May 13, 1976

Last summer Alexander Solzhenitsyn was in our nation's capitol for the first time. It seemed only natural that he would be invited to the White House for a meeting with the President, but no invitation was forthcoming.

There's no point in rehashing the reasons given for this snubbing of one of the great moral leaders of our time. They ranged from a White House schedule too heavy to squeeze him in to a later charge of a "staff mix-up".

The truth is, inviting Mr. Solzhenitsyn to meet Mr. Ford didn't fit in with present foreign policy. Dr. Kissinger felt that such an offering of White House hospitality might be displeasing to the Kremlin. He even went so far as to tell the press that Solzhenitsyn views could threaten world peace. Those views, of course, are his eloquent pleas for human freedom and his warnings about putting too much faith in detente. Now, almost a year later, it seems Mr. Solzhenitsyn is still being snubbed.

In March of last year, the United States Senate unanimously voted to make him an honorary citizen of the United States. In due course, the resolution moved to the House of Representatives where it was assigned to the Judiciary Committee and subsequently, to the Sub Committee on Immigration. Routinely, the Commission requested opinions from the Justice Department and the State Department. The Justice Department responded favorably. The State Department did not; it said Solzhenitsyn had done nothing for us to earn this honor.

more--more--more

It seems to me Mr. Solzhenitsyn has warned us and the free world, for that matter, of a very real danger confronting all of us. And, he has become the world's foremost symbol of man's age old struggle against tyranny and oppression.

But then, burying the matter of his honorary citizenship in a Congressional Sub-Committee is probably consistent with a foreign policy that could accept the Helsinki pact which wrote off freedom for millions of people in the captive nations of Eastern Europe.

#

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary

(Traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan
Michigan/Detroit Economic Club Address, Friday, May 14, 1976

A well known newspaper columnist wrote not long ago that "of all the inventions that have liberated the working man from the drudgery of daily existence, none has done more than the automobile."

Yet, today the automobile and the men and women who make it are under constant attack from Washington. Attack from the elitists, some of whom feel guilty because Americans have built such a prosperous nation, and some of whom seem obsessed with the need to substitute government control in place of individual decision making.

The energy bill which Congress passed and Mr. Ford signed is a case in point. Among other things, it mandated gasoline mileage standards which by 1985 will have the effect of forcing Detroit to make some 80 to 90% of its automobiles sub-compacts or smaller. No matter whether anyone wants them or will buy them (and there is little evidence that they will sweep the country in popularity). The bill regulates the market place, dictates to the consumer and, in the process, will make Detroit's unemployment problem worse than it already is. In fact, because it takes less manpower to make these small cars than the present ones favored by the American consumer, the unrealistic fuel-use standards mandated by the energy bill--if they are allowed to remain--would cost at least 200,000 Michigan workers their jobs, according to industry sources. For all of this you can thank Washington--from Capital Hill to the White House.

While we're talking about energy, let's not forget that this bill is already making us more, not less, dependent on foreign oil. One week in March, for the first time, we crossed the halfway mark in dependency on foreign oil. More than half was imported. And, lacking incentives, the U.S. oil explorers are not doing what we must do, which is to get every drop of oil out of our own ground that we

more--more--more

reasonably can get.

At the time of the Arab oil embargo in late 1973, the Federal Energy Administration was created very hastily. It has grown like a weed ever since. It has 112 publicists churning out press releases. Its Administrator, Frank Zarb, was a key proponent for that energy bill I've just talked about.

As Congress has passed energy legislation, it has given it to the FEA to administer. The Wall Street Journal estimates that this bureacuracy is costing the consumer about three to five cents a gallon.

When it comes to conservation, the FEA doesn't apply the term to the dollars it spends. Last June, it retained a fashion consultant to put on an "energy conservation fashion show" at a fashionable New York Hotel. The fashion show cost FEA \$10,000. FEA will go out of business on June 30, unless Congress extends it. Mr. Ford apparently intends to ask Congress to do just that--with a budget three times FEA's present size.

Secretary of the Treasury, William Simon, who was the first federal energy director, thinks FEA is a monster that should be closed down. He has said, "It's an outrage. I'd abolish the agency and close its doors tomorrow."

If government is going to be responsive to the people, one thing it owes us is a regular and careful review of the efficiency and usefulness of the bureaus and agencies it creates. Neither the White House nor the Congress should automatically renew the life of this agency.

Whether this agency stays or goes does not erase the fact that, here in Michigan, your unemployment rate is still at 12.5%. In fact, Michigan led the nation and suffered the worst unemployment in 1975. There has been much talk from Washington about an economic upturn. I have warned for months that fighting recession without fighting inflation would only bring worse inflation down the line. Now, we are beginning to see the first disturbing signs. Nationally, unemployment has stopped dropping. And, the wholesale price index has started upward again. That is not good news anywhere in the nation, but especially not here. We must change our priorities;

we must fight inflation effectively; wrestle the federal budget into balance, and index taxes so the working man doesn't have his cost-of-living wage increase eaten up by income taxes. Then, we'll begin solving these basic problems.

* * * * *

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(Traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Oklahoma Appearances, Saturday, May 15, 1976

Mr. Ford says he is a friend of the farmer.

Last September his Administration showed the farmers just how friendly by suddenly changing the rules in the middle of the game. Having told the grain farmers for months to plant fence-row-to-fence-row and sell on the open market, the Administration clamped an embargo on further grain sales to the Soviet Union. During the weeks of that embargo, American farmers lost sales of approximately \$2 billion--cash sales for--dollars the Russians were obtaining by selling off their gold reserves.

Now, we have a new example of Washington's friendship for the farmer. This March, OSHA--the Occupational Health and Safety Administration--set forth its standards for safety guards on farm field equipment. No one is against safety, of course, but OSHA, which took three years to study the new regulations, has given the farmer and the manufacturers of farm equipment just three months to comply. That means in only ninety days equipment manufacturers must interpret the rules, design the new equipment, build prototypes and test them, tool up for production, get the necessary materials, fabricate, assemble, ship and sell the equipment. And, the farmers must get the equipment installed. All this in just 90 days. It stretches the imagination, to say the least.

Now, we see Dr. Kissinger returning from his African junket having promised the creation of yet another international development organization to make the deserts bloom. We already have three such organizations, and the American taxpayer would probably foot the bill for this
more--more--more

new one as well as for the investment in marginal desert lands in Africa. He didn't mention that, but, he did mention a proposal to create "buffer stocks" of agricultural commodities -- which would put government right back in the business of farm product price-fixing.

I wouldn't be surprised if the average American farmer right now was beginning to think of that old expression, "With friends like this.."

#

Excerpts of Remarks Made by The Honorable Ronald Reagan at
Nevada Events, Wednesday, May 19, 1976

As one neighbor to another, I'm here to ask for your support next week in your primary so we can move even closer to our goal of a first ballot victory.

We've made a lot of progress since last week. Over the weekend we completed a sweep of Oklahoma's delegation. We made a nearly clean sweep in Louisiana; added a dozen more delegates from Missouri and found that in Hawaii, where we hadn't expected any, an Associated Press survey says we could get a majority of the delegation. And, yesterday, we picked ^{around} up 30 delegates in Mr. Ford's home state of Michigan.

In the count of committed delegates we have now passed the 500 mark, almost halfway to our goal. Our delegate projection shows us well ahead of where we thought we'd be right now.

The reports from the caucus states are encouraging, and with your help in next week's Primary, we can add Nevada. In fact, I think we're going to do well in that whole big round of primaries before the climax in California where I'm very optimistic.

#

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Kansas Events, Saturday, May 22, 1976

Not long ago there was much talk of Soviet violations of SALT I -- of the 1972 Strategic Arms Limitation Agreement -- Former Secretary of Defense, Mel Laird, wrote a feature article about it in Readers Digest. Then the State Department in the spirit of detente explained it was just a case of the language in the SALT Agreement being so flexible that the Russians had a different interpretation than we did. It just looked like cheating.

Now, however, reliable Washington sources talk of a definite Soviet violation.

The 1972 agreement requires that when the Russians deploy more than the permitted number of missile-launching submarines they must dismantle some of their land-based missiles. As they began sea trials of their new Delta-class missile-firing subs they should have dismantled 30 to 60 SS-7 and SS-8 land-based missiles.

They have not done so. They claimed "construction difficulties", giving vague assurances they would do the job in a few months. Apparently, we have gone along with this excuse instead of insisting that the submarine sea trials stop till the agreement is complied with.

Is this the "peace through strength" of which Mr. Ford speaks?
Is there any good reason why the United States should not insist that the Soviet Union comply with the terms of this agreement? SALT I
If there isn't, we should ask the Russians for immediate compliance.

DRAFT

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Indiana Events, Saturday, May 1, 1976

5/23/76

To Americans, nuclear war is unthinkable. It must never happen. But that is not the Soviet view, as Alexander Solzhenitsyn has warned us. They plan for it, not just as a possibility, but more as a probability. Solzhenitsyn is not alone in his assessment.

Richard Pipes, the distinguished Harvard historian says: "If one wishes to understand Soviet behavior, one must make every possible effort to place oneself not just in the shoes of Soviet leadership...but in their very skins. Culturally, the Soviet elite is descended from Russian peasantry...Life, as they have been taught by a thousand years of history, is a pitiless conflict in which there are, by the nature of things, those who rule and those who are ruled...

"The present leadership of the USSR, political as well as military, consists of Stalin's men. These people have gone through the most brutalizing political experience ever known and they are the product of a system of natural selection totally unfamiliar to politicians in any other part of the world...To attribute to people of this kind of experience the habits of Americans...is not unlike judging the behavior of animals raised in their natural wild habitat with that of tame domestic breeds...It is not an advisable method for anyone who must cope with creatures raised in a world of fierce competition where, in Lenin's words, the guiding principle is...'who eats whom'."

Foy Kohler, whose long diplomatic career included being Ambassador to the Soviet Union in the mid-Sixties, says, "Rare exceptions to the contrary, the main thrust of current Soviet public statements is that victory in war can still be obtained...Indeed, Soviet leaders are probably the only ones among the leaders of the world today who speak of victory in a nuclear war."

more--more--more

Leonid Brezhnev has made it clear that Victory in war is basic to their thinking. He has said, "Let it be known to all that in a clash with any aggressor, the Soviet Union will win a victory worthy of our great people..."

We all remember the warm, genial, bearhugging Mr. Brezhnev on his visit to the United States. Surely he must have shared our yearning for peace. I remember very well his personal assurance to me that he did. But since that visit he has said: "...it would be extremely dangerous if the opinion became firmly established in public circles that everything is now completely in order and that the threat of war has become illusory."

And, again, the bearhugging forgotten: "...it is a reality of our time that the threat of the danger of war persists so long as reactionary imperialist forces exist." By that he means us.

Then, while Henry Kissinger was saying the danger of nuclear war had been "reduced to negligible proportions", the last Soviet Defense Minister, Marshal Andrei Grechko was saying, "The danger of war remains a grim reality of our times."

While the Soviets have been building powerful strategic weapons designed to win a war, they have also embarked on a massive, nationwide civil defense program.

Soviet industry has been dispersed to make it less vulnerable to attack. Much new construction has taken place in central Siberia, out of range of our submarine-launched missiles. Underground factories of tremendous size have been built. Soviet subways are deep underground and have heavy blast-resistant doors.

Publicly, the Soviets have calculated that this huge civil defense effort could reduce nuclear strike losses to somewhere between five and eight percent of their urban population. This is less than their losses in World War II. Our own experts, such as Nobel Prize winner Eugene Wigner, confirm these levels.

Their civil defense program may involve up to 70 percent of their industrial work force. And, even the children take part. For two months last summer, 23 million Soviet teenagers were in the countryside learning survival under simulated nuclear war conditions.

Mr. Ford talks about a supposed U.S. advantage in some categories of arms, but does not tell us how the Soviets view their strategic missile forces. Marshal Grechko did, and he didn't leave much to the imagination: "The strategic missile forces,...intended for the destruction of the enemy's means of nuclear attack, his large troop formations and military bases,...defense industry, and the disorganization of his state..." That last item means us, the civilian population of the United States.

Soviet strategic nuclear firepower far exceeds our own, despite whatever margin we may have in warheads. That Soviet firepower is enough to destroy us.

The Soviets have fashioned their arsenal and civil defense system to win a war -- if they ever have to fight one. No matter how you define "superiority", if a nation has the will and the ability to defeat and destroy another nation without being destroyed itself, that is superiority.

Mr. Ford may find our strategic nuclear power "unsurpassed", but I think that an objective assessment of the situation will find otherwise. I think it will find that the Soviets are surpassing us, due to the relentless, determined actions of their leadership and the failure of ours to understand Soviet goals.

The question we must ask is, will our leadership take the steps needed to reverse these trends before it is too late?

#

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(Traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Calif. Peace Officers Assn. -- Anaheim, Wednesday, May 26, 1976

A dozen years ago, during the Goldwater-Johnson campaign, "crime in the streets" was the most debated, discussed topic of that national campaign. Since then, it has almost disappeared from the dialogue of our presidential campaigns. Rarely does a national candidate of either party raise the matter in a political forum.

And, yet, in the intervening years, the crisis of crime in America has deteriorated and deepened. The crime wave that began building almost two decades ago continues to roll unimpeded, across the landscape of our society. Consider the appalling statistics.

Since 1970, crime has risen 38% across the country. Taking a much broader view, going back to the days when John F. Kennedy ran for President, crime in America tripled between 1960 and 1975. For every felony committed in that presidential year, more than three felonies will be committed against the American people in their bicentennial year.

We pride ourselves on the achievements of the last decade and a half in improving the housing, the working conditions and the income of all our people. Our record on crime, however, is not something to be proud of; it is something we as a nation should be deeply ashamed of. Crime in this country is a continuing disgrace, an on-going indictment against our failed criminal justice system.

How can we call ours a "Great Society" when within the cities of this country, citizens black and white will not leave their homes to attend church, to go to the store or see a movie because of the fear that is the constant companion of urban life in America.

How politicians can chatter on about how much they have improved the

more--more--more

"quality of life" in our major cities -- while this crime wave continues--- is something I find increasingly difficult to understand.

What is the cause of crime in America? If one should listen to the Congress of the United States, its most vocal voice, you will hear the old refrain: Poverty is the root cause of crime; eliminate poverty and you will eliminate crime.

But time has proven these people wrong---dead wrong in too many cases. In 1920, almost half the American people were below the official poverty line in the United States and we did not have one-fifth the crime that pervades our society today.

In the last fifteen years, while major crimes have tripled poverty in America has been reduced by half. If poverty were the true cause of crime, why does criminal violence increase right along with affluence of American society? Why should crime rates in this richest of Western nations be vastly higher than in countries like Great Britain, which have nothing approaching our levels of affluence, or levels of crime?

If you want to know why crime proliferates in this nation---don't look at the statistics on income and wealth; look at statistics on arrests, prosecutions, convictions and prison population.

During the nineteen sixties, while the crime rate in the United States rose 144%, the reported arrests rose only 31%. The number of convicted offenders actually dropped during the period from 117 per 100,000 in the population to 95. In 1960, 118 persons out of every hundred thousand were in prison in the United States. By 1970--after the horrid crime wave of the sixties---that figure had fallen to 96, a drop of more than 20.

In these statistics, not in the poverty statistics of OEO, you can find the reason for the growth of crime in almost every jurisdiction in America. Crime is increasing, because crime has become a less hazardous profession for the men who practice it.

more-more-more

Consider comparative statistics between two of the world's greatest cities, New York and Tokyo. In 1972, the arrest rate for crime of assault in Tokyo was in excess of 90%. And 99% of all defendants were found guilty. In New York, only 19% of all reported crime led to arrests---less than one in five.

Indeed, of all the crimes committed in the United States, it is estimated that only 1% actually lead to the imprisonment of the offender.

For a graphic example of what society, and law enforcement officers confront, let us look to our nation's capital in Washington, D.C.

Many of you have read, I am sure, about the brilliant piece of police undercover work done by local officers and federal officials on what has been dubbed, The Sting.

Posing as representatives from organized crime, a handful of officers and federal officials set up a phony "fencing" operation in Washington for a period of months which won the confidence of countless local gangsters. To "celebrate" the operation's success, the officers held a "party" for all their clients.

As they walked into the trap, one by one, they were carted off to jail. In all, some 152 arrests were made in connection with the operation. It was a brilliant and praise-worthy piece of police work.

But then, some strange statistics started turning up. It seems that of the 152 arrests---105 were either free on probation or parole for some previous offense--or out on pre-trial release. About 114 had prior arrest records.

Not only that, within days of their arrest in the sting, 59 of those charged were out on bail--including one fellow who was put on bond for \$1,000 despite the fact he was a self-styled "hit man" who had applied to the undercover agents for a job with organized crime as a professional killer.

I am sure you gentlemen here have your own repertoire of such horror

stories. They would be amusing indeed were it not for the fact that thousands of criminals walking the streets of this country are an indictment of our criminal justice system, and, worse, a menace to the security and the rights of every American citizen.

Taking the nation's capital, again, where the Federal Government maintains a measure of authority and responsibility, statistics tell the same story:

Less than one in every three crimes in Washington, D.C. results in an arrest. Of those arrested two out of three are never convicted. Of those convicted only one out of two goes to prison. Of those who go to prison, two out of three are released the first time they come up for parole.

As a consequence, there are free today on the streets of our capital city in this Bicentennial year hundreds and hundreds of young men who are committed to a lifetime career in crime.

Can we really justifiably indulge in that old cliché crime does not pay when you hear from a New York State Prosecutor that of the "97,000 felonies in New York City in a year...only 900 defendants are tried to the point of reaching a verdict." And that 80% of all felony arrests in New York City were disposed of by the city criminal court by reducing the charge to a misdemeanor.

What is the answer to the crime wave?

Only part of the problem I believe lies in the arrest rate falling below the crime rate. The primary problem occurs not before, but after the original arrest is made. The primary problem is in a criminal justice system that seems to have lost much of its capacity to determine the truth, prosecute and punish the guilty and protect society.

Does the answer lie in more Federal dollars? I think not. During the past eight years, the federal budget for law enforcement has increased almost 600 percent, from half a billion dollars to \$3.5 billion, with hardly a perceptible impact upon the crime rates in the United States.

more--more--more

What is required is genuine reform, sweeping reform of the entire criminal justice system.

We must put on a back burner the idea of reforming and rehabilitating criminals, and get back on the front burner, the idea of prosecuting, punishing and putting them away. The cards have been stacked too long against the police and the prosecution in favor of the defendant and defense attorneys. This situation requires rectification. The safety of the people which is supposed to be the supreme Law of the land--has been lost sight of, as we have erected an elaborate and complex legal structure around the rights of the criminally accused.

We have to remember that when a case against a guilty man is thrown out because the constable erred in gathering the evidence, it is not the prosecutor or the government which pays the price--but the society into which that criminal returns.

Specifically, we should make it possible for once-convicted criminals, who are re-arrested, to be held in jail pending trial. We should add an additional penitentiary term for any crime committed while an individual is out on pre-trial release, probation or parole. We should keep youthful offenders separate from hardened criminals. But we should begin treating juvenile murderers and rapists as murderers and rapists. The idea of giving a light sentence to a seventeen-year old killer or rapist is to blind ourselves to the truth that, no matter their age, what is done to the victim remains the same.

We do have a problem with lenient judges, but far worse is the problem that laws, precedents, procedures and rules of prosecution are stacked on behalf of the criminal defendant---and hence against the society he threatens. If legislation is required at the federal level to unstack the deck against the prosecution, I am in favor of such legislation.

Criminal trials should become again a search for the truth--not a search to discover if the police made some error in the gathering of hard evidence.

In his brilliant new book, Punishing Criminals, Professor Ernest Van Den Haag writes:

"The longest criminal trial in England lasted 48 days and the longest murder trial 21. The trial of the Manson "family" in California lasted nine months. Selection of the jury for Bobby Seale (acquitted) took five months. In England it usually only takes a few minutes. There is no evidence that the quality of English justice, or juries, is inferior to our own."

Finally let me talk briefly about two issues which are of some controversy in this national debate: gun control and the death penalty.

I am against federal gun control for a variety of reasons. First, I find it a wholly ineffectual means of controlling crime; and secondly, it would create still another costly and intrusive bureaucracy, whose purpose as I see it would be to interfere with one of the basic rights of American citizens.

The proliferation of guns in American society is not a cause of crime; it is a consequence of crime. Like the rise in the sale of triple locks, long guns, burglar alarms and Doberman pinchers, the purchase of hand guns by Americans is a vote of no confidence in the criminal justice system in this country.

If we want to decrease the number of guns in society, we need only do a better job of protecting society against crime. As the Sullivan Act in New York demonstrates, the only effect of strict gun control is to disarm the law-abiding and leave the criminal class more secure in pursuit of its chosen profession.

The way to stop the use of gun crimes in America is to provide harsh and additional sentence for gun criminals.

As for the death penalty, I favor it today as I did when I was Governor of California. It not only deters crime; it is the ultimate and greatest deterrent because the criminal knows that from the imposition of this sentence, there will be no probation, no parole.

What other deterrent is there to the kidnapper not to murder his victim or the arresting officers? What other deterrent is there against the convicted killer who wants to take some revenge on a prison guard or fellow inmate?

When the death penalty was in use, 80% of the murders in New York City were crimes of passion; that has now fallen to 50%. And it is difficult not to conclude that criminals are murdering their victims because it decreases the chances of apprehensions while not increasing appreciably the penalty for conviction.

Finally, the best way we could work to guarantee a safer society for the American people is for you and me to put our shoulders to the wheel and see if we can't get convicted criminals out of circulation. That would do more, far more, toward improving the quality of life than doubling the size of the federal social welfare budget in the Congress of the United States.

#

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(Traveling with the Governor)

RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Statement made at news conference by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
Riverside, California, Wednesday, May 26, 1976

Last weekend I called attention to a Soviet violation of the Strategic Arms Limitation agreement -- the SALT Accords. I wasn't talking about those alleged violations of last winter which may have stemmed from ambiguous wording in the agreement, but a specific failure of the Soviets to dismantle some of their land-based missiles when they began sea trials of more than the permitted base number of missile-firing submarines.

According to news reports yesterday, the violation is indeed a fact. Apparently, it began last December. The Soviets even admitted it in March when the period for dismantling the land-based missiles was expiring.

The Ford Administration, which calls itself "open" and candid, did not let the American people in on the news at the time. It didn't lodge an immediate protest with the Soviets. It didn't insist on immediate suspension of sea trials of the submarines pending compliance with SALT. It didn't say a word. In fact, it wasn't till the following month that the United States protested Soviet foot-dragging.

We can only imagine how the Soviets would have treated any such American violation. With American shortcomings--real or imagined--covered enthusiastically by the Soviet press, it is hard to imagine tiptoeing around on such an issue.

Instead of having an unnamed "senior official" tipoff a trade magazine several weeks after the fact, as was done in this case, isn't it time Mr. Ford practiced the openness he professes by taking the facts to the American people, coupled with a prompt insistence for corrective action?

###

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,

California Events, Saturday, May 29, 1976

While the economy was showing signs of recovery for several months, I expressed my concern that record federal deficits and federal debt, coupled with policies designed to fight recession instead of its cause, inflation, would only bring on a much worse round of inflation next time.

Now, though Wall Street may be doing fine, Main Street is hurting. The signs are disturbing:

-- The wholesale price index is going up again. This time at an annual rate of 9.6%.

-- During the last two months the rate of growth of the money supply has been going up at more than 12% annually.

-- Housing starts fell last month.

-- And, the most worrisome sign, announced only yesterday, is the Consumer Price Index. The rate of increase has doubled in the last two months. In March it increased at an annual rate of 2.4%, double the February rate. For April, it shot up to a rate of 4.8%, twice that of March.

Mr. Ford asks us to trust his policies. Are these the signs of a healthy economy? Are they what he means when he talks about "prosperity?"

####

Californians -- especially San Franciscans -- have long looked westward across the Pacific for ties of trade and culture and-- in the case of those whose ancestors were Asian--for family ties as well.

Washington, on the other hand, seems to see only ^{The other} half ^{of the} a world. It looks toward Europe. Dr. Kissinger, for example, seems preoccupied with making deals with the Soviet Union. ~~Unfortunately~~ ^{best} Unfortunately, he--and we--always seem to come off second*when bargaining with the Russians. And, Mr. Ford, also casting an eye toward the Soviets, repeatedly says our defense capability is "unsurpassed", even though the facts suggest otherwise.

~~While they have concentrated on~~ ~~Detente,~~ While they have concentrated on ~~Detente,~~ they have been overlooking a new opportunity in Asia which ^{could make a major} contribution ^{global} ~~a great deal~~ toward restoring ^{global} balance ~~with the Soviet Union~~.

The 1972 rapprochement with mainland China first opened this opportunity, but relatively little has been done since to capitalize on it. AT first there was a flurry of trade, but that reached a peak in 1974 and fell by almost one-half last year. The opportunity is still there, but ~~it will not last forever~~ ~~it won't be forever.~~

Washington seems to have paid little attention to various signals the Chinese have been sending our way to indicate their desire to expand our relationship.

Perhaps the messages have been ignored because they have not come to us ~~in a straight line method~~ through official channels. I suppose it is natural for our State Department to expect them to, for its diplomatic techniques are based on European traditions. But

the Chinese way is different. Typically, the Chinese messages have been sent indirectly, by means of symbols, oblique references and hints to non-official American visitors.

Richard Nixon's invitation to visit Peking earlier this year is almost certainly an example. The Chinese probably overestimated Mr. Nixon's ability to serve as a carrier of their proposal for an expanded relationship, but the Nixon visit can ~~not~~ be interpreted as an indication of their frustration at official Washington's Pacific blindness.

Another example of Chinese indirection was the influence they ~~exercised~~ behind the scenes, ^{following} ~~after~~ the collapse of South Vietnam, to cool the belligerent ~~gestures~~ of Kim Il Sung toward South Korea. For a time, a North Korean invasion seemed imminent. But suddenly the saber-rattling stopped. ^{And} ~~And~~, at about the same time, reports began surfacing through a number of Asian sources that the Chinese wanted the United States to continue to maintain a presence in the Far East.

Throughout history the Chinese have often made proposals and inquiries by this indirect method, and often through middlemen. This gives them the chance to maintain public silence or to disavow the matter--and thus save face--should the other side ignore the message.

The basic message which the Chinese seem to have been trying to get through to Washington for months is that they want to explore an expanded relationship with us which also includes Japan. In short, a Pacific Triumvirate.

Despite the ideological gulf between us, the Chinese share with ~~us~~ and with Japan some common goals in the ~~Pacific~~ Pacific. And, they ^{have} ~~have~~ others that complement ours.

Each of us wants stability in the Pacific. The Chinese want technology and advanced industrial products. The Japanese have them and so do we. Japan and the U.S. want oil. The Chinese have it. Their reserves aren't yet fully proven, but they are likely to be on the order of those in the Middle East. The Japanese want raw materials and agricultural commodities/ which we and the Chinese can supply.

The relationship would clearly be one of quid pro quo, something for something. A major benefit ~~would be~~ would be its ability to dampen Soviet ~~enthusiasm~~ enthusiasm for expansionism. It could help restore equilibrium in the world.

There are three areas in which the relationship might operate. One is military defense. China has long distrusted the Soviet Union, with which it shares a long border. And, it is nervous that the ~~Hanoi~~ Hanoi might grant the Soviets a ^{Vietnamese} naval base at Cam Ranh Bay. China's ability to keep a million or so Soviet troops tied down on that long border discourages their use elsewhere.

Recently, there have been reports of consideration of ^{US} arms sales to mainland China. This should be studied very carefully. Perhaps the first and best way to expand our relationship in this area would be to share information from satellite reconnaissance and other data-gathering activities that relate to those Soviet forces ~~on the~~ on the ~~border~~ Chinese border.

Economically, the relationship can be beneficial to all three ^{gain} nations. We would ~~gain~~ another source for oil. This, if coupled with a new federal policy ^{designed} to encourage domestic production, would cut the ability of OPEC to control prices and threaten embargoes.

Diplomatically, ^{closer} ~~improved~~ communications would make ~~it~~ it possible to head off trouble in potential hot spots anywhere in Asia.

4-4-4

In fact, China has the potential for ~~swaying~~ swaying some of the Third World nations toward ties with us instead of the ~~Soviet~~ Soviet Union. This could be particularly helpful in the matter of ~~the~~ U.S. bases in key areas of the Far East.

(Chinese)

Can we afford to ignore the signals ~~any longer~~ --and these opportunities--any longer? I don't think so. Even though the so-called moderates within China predominate now -- and the new Prime Minister ~~Hua~~ Hua Kuo-feng must be considered one of them -- after Mao Tse-tung is gone forces that are more radical and pro-Soviet may try to gain the upper hand.

And what of ~~our~~ our long-time ally on Taiwan? In less than three decades they have produced one of the economic miracles of the age. Vigorous and highly productive, they have become a major trading partner with the United States. In fact, at more than three-and-a-half billion dollars last year, our trade with Taiwan was 7.3 times greater than our trade with the mainland.

We know from the Shanghai Communiqué^{as} of 1972 that Peking ~~regards~~ ^{regards} considers itself the only legal government of China and that it ~~considers~~ ^{considers} Taiwan a province. Will Peking insist on our severing our ties with Taiwan as a price for expanding our relationship with the mainland? Things are not always as they appear. ^{For example,} Peking has said that it wants us to withdraw our troops from South Korea, but that it wants us in Japan. The Japanese, on the other hand, interpret our defense treaty with them as ~~including the continued presence of~~ ^{meaning that US troops will stay} ~~that~~ ^{that} ~~U.S. troops~~ in Korea. And the Chinese are well aware of ~~this~~ interpretation.

~~Peking seems anxious to be reassured about our reliability.~~

No matter how much progress is made in ~~expanding~~ ^{improving} our relationship with the mainland,--and Mr. Ford and Dr. Kissinger have lost precious time--we must do nothing to jeopardize the safety of our ally on Taiwan. ~~Nor~~ ⁹ should we sever our ties with them. Peking seems anxious to be reassured about our reliability. Ironical as it may sound, I believe this approach ~~will prove reassuring~~ ^{that} is the best proof of ~~our~~ reliability.

For information:

Jim Lake, Press Secretary
(Traveling with the Governor)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,
California Events, Tuesday, June 1, 1976

The other day Mr. Ford depicted the administration's foreign policy as a string of successes. Does he include successes such as Vietnam? Cambodia? Helsinki? Cyprus? Angola and the Panama Canal?

The negotiations the State Department has been carrying on for months to turn over our Canal Zone sovereignty to Panama are hardly in keeping with Mr. Ford's claim of a candid and open administration. Indeed, for a time we were told they weren't negotiating such a give away.

Yet, it turned out in Congressional testimony that Ambassador Bunker had specific directions from Mr. Ford to do just that. According to a recent Washington POST story, a Panamanian official says that Mr. Ford, on the day he was sworn in as President, assured the Panamanian military dictator, General Torrijos, of his intentions to support Dr. Kissinger's proposal to turn over U.S. sovereignty.

The Canal issue has come to the surface in the campaign and I think that is healthy. In this constitutional republic of ours the people are part of the decision-making process.

Our present treaty says that the U.S. acts as the sovereign in the Canal Zone to the exclusion of Panama and that we have this right "in perpetuity". This underlies and guarantees our ability to operate and defend the Canal. A new treaty without sovereign rights could end up not worth the paper it's written on if Torrijos or some future Panamanian government should one day decide to nationalize

more--more--more

he Canal.

Though I do not believe we can afford to relinquish our sovereign rights there, we can and should negotiate other matters of mutual interest such as the proposed Third Lock plan to modernize the Canal

This would extend the Canal's usefulness for many more decades, would make it possible to handle all but a few of the world's largest ships and would be a benefit to Panama's economy both during and after construction.

The State Department, however, has embarked on a vigorous sales promotion program for the giveaway of our sovereignty.

A Panamanian newspaper columnist, Camilo Perez, has been given a State Department grant to tout the Torrijos line on our college campuses.

A recent issue of The Commanders Digest, used by U.S. military officers all over the world to orient their personnel to current issues, features an article titled "The Military Value of the Panama Canal". Nearly all of the eight pages are devoted to a rationale of the State Department-Torrijos line.

I doubt that U.S. taxpayers really want their money used this way. Recent public opinion polls show American sentiment running 75% or better against giving up the Canal Zone and the Canal. And, last year enough U.S. Senators signed a resolution to that effect to block any new treaty designed to give up sovereignty.

#