

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: I: HANNAFORD / CALIFORNIA
HEADQUARTERS

Subseries: A: Ronald Reagan Files

Folder Title: Radio Commentaries / Broadcasts:
Disc 76-8 through 76-10 (1977)

Box: 14

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/>

Tagging - 9/19/77

RONALD REAGAN

76-8A

Programs:

	<u>Titles</u>	<u>Time</u>
1.	Strategic Stockpiles	2:46
2.	Farewell Speeches	2:09
3.	Campaign Law Violated?	3:07
4.	Panama	2:53
5.	Television	2:52
6.	Korea	2:55
7.	People Power	2:50

76-8B

1.	Tax Limit	3:16
2.	Television & Profits	3:00
3.	Health Care	3:00
4.	Rapid Transit	3:06
5.	Junk Food	3:00
6.	Building Codes	2:50
7.	OSHA	3:08
8.	More About OSHA	3:17

Please retain your RONALD REAGAN program reprints. Reprints may be xeroxed to meet listener requests for copies of program scripts. Please do not forward these requests to us.

Correspondence from listeners for Governor Reagan should be forwarded to:

Governor Ronald Reagan
10960 Wilshire Boulevard - Suite 812
Los Angeles, California 90024

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Strategic Stockpiles" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Soon after World War II, our nation began to build up stockpiles of strategic materials that would be needed in case we were cut off from foreign sources in the future. Just as you and I put money away for a rainy day that may never come, Uncle Sam was stockpiling such things as silver, antimony, tin and industrial diamonds -- all resources essential to industrial production.

Now, there's a bill before Congress -- Senate Bill 3344 -- which would authorize the executive branch to sell off large quantities of these strategic stockpiles. Every one of these minerals and metals is important to our defense effort.

By 1961 our stockpiles had been built up to the point where the government decided it could reduce some of its existing stocks. In silver, for instance, the stockpile has gone down from two billion troy ounces 16 years ago to about 139 million ounces today.

Supporters of the bill argue that U. S. silver production is great enough to take care of our needs. But it's only 39 million ounces a year. Together with the proposed new level, it still adds up to less than 10% of what we consumed during World War II.

Americans don't like to think about civil defense or the remote possibility of another world war. None of us wants one, of course. But the Russians think about it all the time and civil defense involves protection of resources and industrial capacity as well as protection of citizens.

But thinking the unthinkable for a moment, we know that if there ever were another war, it would not be a conventional one like World War II, yet this move to cut our strategic stockpiles seems to be based on belief that it would be. Instead, such a conflict would defy comparison with the past. It could involve extensive disruption of communications and transportation. At the very least, we would need ample supplies of vital materials placed around our own continent in order to keep our defense effort going.

We can't afford to plan our stockpiles on the assumption that we would be fighting a conventional war of two, three or four years duration and that our supplies would continue to flow in uninterrupted from overseas.

Let's assume that the Soviet Union doesn't want a future conflict any more than we do. Still, we know that they have developed their defense capability and their civil defense with the intention of surviving and winning such a conflict should it ever take place. Can we afford to do any less when freedom is at stake? Keeping our strategic stockpiles at realistic levels is as important as having the will to defend ourselves.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Farewell Speeches" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Shortly before the changing of the guard in the nation's capital, the former Secretary of State addressed the Washington press club. In his address, he vehemently denied that we had lost military supremacy to the Soviet Union. He spoke somewhat harshly of those who claimed otherwise, which I assume included me. But to tell you the truth, he didn't change my mind.

About the same time, the just retired head of Air Force intelligence, Major General George J. Keegan, Jr., gave an interview to the New York TIMES. He said flatly that the Soviet Union has already achieved military superiority over this country, QUOTE -- "By every criterion used to measure strategic balance", he said, "that is, damage expectancy, throw weight, equivalent megatonnage or technology I am unaware of a single important category in which the Soviets have not established a significant lead over the United States". - UNQUOTE.

The General spoke of the one thing that, until recently, has not been very much publicized by our side and that is the Soviet emphasis on civil defense, including shelters and stockpiling of food and supplies. He expressed the view that we are probably no longer capable of carrying out our assigned war time task of crippling the Soviet industrial capacity, nuclear stockpiles and the basic fighting capacity of the Russians.

General Keegan expressed his own view that the Soviet Union is not only trying for superiority but is preparing for war. He based this somber assessment on a collection of thousands of photographs, pamphlets and documents on Soviet military sites and civil defense projects.

In the TIMES interview, he said, -- QUOTE -- "In the military area alone they have hardened command posts for the civil military leadership within the 75 underground command posts for the civil military leadership within the Moscow Beltway alone". He also said, "some of these structures were several hundred feet deep and wide and capable of withstanding 1000 pounds per square inch of blast pressure." -- UNQUOTE. According to him, the hardened sites included headquarters of all the major military services, duplicate reserve installations for each and for the entire nuclear chain of command. In addition, according to Keegan, 10,000 surface to air missile sites have been hardened and 4,500 early warning and ground control intercept radars are in the process of being hardened.

Evidence was given of worker shelters in industrial areas capable of protecting more than 60 million workers. Some one-fourth of all factory workers are in training programs preparing them -- QUOTE "for civil defense leadership roles". -- UNQUOTE. The General declared, "The implication is that they have quietly and at extra expense taken measures to assure that the essential, civilian-military leadership, the fighting capability and the production capacity can continue to function under conditions of total war." -- UNQUOTE. The majority opinion among qualified experts as to the relative strength of the Soviet Union and the United States is not on the cheerful side. It's time to ask ourselves if we can afford not to believe them.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Campaign Law Violated?" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Recently, the National Right to Work Committee presented evidence to the Federal Election Commission which it says shows that the AFL-CIO and its allegedly non-partisan Committee on Political Education (COPE) engaged in "massive violations" of the Federal Election Campaign Act during the 1976 campaign.

In a complaint filed with the Commission, the Right to Work Committee said that the labor organizations illegally spent millions of dollars of union treasury funds on partisan registration and get-out-the-vote campaigns.

The Committee's complaint said, QUOTE -- "By various public accounts, the AFL-CIO and COPE spent in excess of 3 million dollars on voter registration campaigns, get-out-the-vote drives, and candidate-oriented communications aimed at their members." --UNQUOTE. For such expenditures to be legal, they must, under the law, be non-partisan.

The Right to Work Committee said in its complaint that the word "non-partisan" is more than superficial in its meaning.

Webster's Seventh New Collegiate Dictionary defines "non-partisan" as "free from party affiliation, bias, or designation". Thus, to determine whether a union's registration and get-out-the-vote activities should be exempt, . . . it is important to determine whether they were "non-partisan" or not.

The Right to Work Committee says, "Not only were the AFL-CIO's activities and those of COPE in this area not "non-partisan", and hence violative of . . . (the law), but they were coordinated with the Carter presidential campaign and hence, by the law's standards, in-kind contributions rather than independent expenditures. Thus, such expenditures made by the AFL-CIO itself. . .are clear violations of the law."

". . . If the law is to be applied equally and fairly the mere size and seriousness of these abuses mandate the Commission's priority attention. If this does not occur I know that . . . millions of individuals . . . will be left with one unmistakable conclusion: the very size and political power of this special interest group exempts it from the law." -- UNQUOTE.

The Right to Work Committee cited some examples of its allegation that the AFL-CIO and COPE were engaged in partisan election campaigning. They contended that Mary Zon, the COPE research director, was working three days a week on the Carter campaign payroll as a liaison between the campaign and organized labor. And that Alexander Barkan, national director of COPE, served simultaneously on the Democratic National Committee's 42-member campaign steering committee.

The Right to Work Committee also charged that between March 1975 and June 1976, some \$600,000 was transferred from the AFL-CIO's general treasury to the COPE education fund. During this same period of time, some \$385,000 was diverted from the education fund to COPE's political contributions committee.

With all the recent sound-and-fury over election reform, the Federal Election Commission has a responsibility to investigate this complaint.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Panama" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I'm not going to talk about the Panama Canal -- just Panama and what has happened to freedom there.

I've received a copy of a family Christmas letter written by a Panamanian -- now a refugee in the United States -- to an American friend. I'll read as much of the letter as I can, omitting for obvious reasons, anything which might be a clue to his identity.

He says there are absolutely no civil liberties, and violations of human rights are a daily occurrence. Then his Christmas letter goes on. "A year or so ago a large group of private sector organizations held a public meeting, inviting all top government officials to discuss private sector problems.

"That same night, Omar Torrijos (Panama's dictator) returned from Cuba. He listened to the tapes of the public meeting (in today's Panama every conversation seems to be secretly recorded), and immediately ordered the expatriation of 14 leaders of the private sector organizations. (President of the Chamber of Commerce, president of the Cattlemen's Association, etc.).

"A few days later, as I drove my children to school, an unmarked car violently crossed in front of mine and two armed members of government goon squads jumped into my car. I was allowed to drop the kids off, and as they screamed in horror and dismay, I was QUOTE disappeared -- UNQUOTE.

"At the same moment, the same violent type arrests were being carried out in another 13 Panamanian homes, of men who had dared be critical of governmental policy. We were secretly held, searched, photographed, pushed, shoved and yelled at for six hours. No accusations. No interrogations. All family inquiries turned away alleging they knew nothing of our whereabouts. We were then put on a Panama Air Force plane with armed guards. Destination unknown.

"Five hours later we arrived in Ecuador, where for 45 days we were virtually under house arrest. Newspaper accounts accused us of economic conspiracy and of being friends with the U. S. A meeting held to protest our expatriation, at the Panamanian Businessmen's association, was roughed up by government goons with knives and rocks. Later the association's building was confiscated.

"Arrests and expatriations have continued but now include women and children, who have been severely beaten and tortured. This has been a shocking experience. As a businessman not involved in politics, one normally feels this will never happen to me. But the protection of Democracy and Liberty is a job for all, and, as our experience shows, affects all!

"Today, we are finally together again and living our exile in your country with an even deeper conviction of our principles, with a hope that the freedom loving people of these United States demand of their government a morality in foreign policy that will terminate the support of the repressive Panamanian dictatorship. This will permit us, through our own efforts to regain our Liberty, and to restore a true democracy to our beloved Panama." I hope he gets his wish.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Television" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Not too long ago on this show, I was critical of the news media, particularly the TV news programs plus a few talk shows, for what I called an anti-business attitude. In fact, while admitting I couldn't claim to have seen all the shows, I said I couldn't recall ever seeing any advocates of free enterprise holding forth on TV.

Well now I can! T'was the night after Christmas and there on the set was a story that proved we have a good bet. Forgive me for that, it's the season. I was watching CBS News, and, if you were, too, you saw a story about one of our fellow citizens who hadn't done any of the things for which a person usually winds up in the headlines.

A goodly portion of the evening news was devoted to this 45-year-old man, father of four, son of an immigrant father. None of that is what you might call earthshaking or even newsworthy. There isn't a headline in the fact that he was a high school dropout or even that he served in the army. Too many Americans have done both.

But to it's credit, CBS News did a heartwarming story about this resident of one of our eastern cities. First of all, he didn't settle for being a dropout. He took advantage of the educational opportunities the military offered and wound up with a college degree.

He and his brother have an auto repair shop and they are the repairmen. He also has a talent in the kitchen which he has used to good advantage. In the evenings he cooks sauces for spaghetti, shrimp, and so forth. His family helps and they package and sell the products to marjets and other outlets.

There are, however, some evenings when he isn't in the kitchen. He plays in the city's philharmonic orchestra and you can't do that without putting in a fair share of time at rehearsal.

I hope I haven't given the impression that this American citizen is just a terribly energetic, ambitious fellow, moonlighting and driving himself round the clock to keep up with the Jones and the cost of living. No, the subject of the CBS News special places a great importance on living. He enjoys what he's doing.

Some way he's found time to develop an appreciation of fine wine, join a wine tasting society and accumulate knowledge to match his appreciation. A number of people aspiring to the same appreciation, call on our citizen for help in acquiring the knowledge to go with it.

Before that CBS News special feature ended, this American citizen told the rest of us how much opportunity there is in this land -- in this way of life -- we call America. And, he made it very clear he wasn't just touting the Babbit line of how to make a buck. He was talking about living and he made us realize he truly enjoyed his life and everything he was doing. And, he made us realize the same joy is available to anyone who'll take advantage of being an American. The last we saw of him he was putting the finishing touches on a fender in the auto repair shop. Thank you CBS News.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Korea" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

News leaks from the inner sanctum of the Justice Department have led to a journalistic carnival over the doings of a South Korean businessman, Tongsun Park, who used to domicile in Washington, D.C.

According to the headlines, Mr. Park and unnamed officials of the South Korean government eased the rigors of life in the U.S. Congress by showering on an unspecified number of Congressmen gifts, cash and trips to Korea.

The objective was to solidify opposition to those who would have us withdraw our forces from South Korea. Now, no one can condone bribery or influence-buying, but certainly we can understand the fear which might have prompted such an attempt. South Korea has known freedom from colonial rule for such a short time. And in that brief period of freedom the Communist forces of North Korea swept across a border only 20 miles from the South Korean capital and almost imposed a new slavery on the emerging free nation. We freed them from colonialism and stood beside them against Communist aggression.

Let's get to the bottom of possible wrongdoing in our capital, but let's not fall for the idea that our Congressmen were innocents seduced into accepting gifts against their will.

In getting to the bottom of this sordid affair, we shouldn't try to fix a one-sided blame in such a way as to weaken the seams of an alliance which is every bit as valuable to the United States, to the Republic of China on Taiwan, to Japan, Australia, and the other free nations of the Pacific as it is to South Korea.

If trips by Congressmen to South Korea are unquestioned evidence of illicit gifts and bribes, then shouldn't we look at the justification for fairly recent junkets to Moscow, Peking, Havana, to several new African capitals? Will Congress investigate itself with the same killer instinct it displayed when it went after the C.I.A. and the F.B.I.?

What should bother us most is the onesided attention some elements of the press have been giving to the suspected South Koreans who allegedly gave the gifts and so little to the recipients of those gifts. As the saying goes -- it takes two to tango.

What makes the bias all the more evident is the contrast in the way one major paper has treated a scandal involving scores of North Korean diplomats in several Scandinavian capitals who were trafficking in smuggled liquor and drugs. It titled the story, "The Gang that Couldn't Smuggle Straight", and treated their criminal acts as a kind of lighthearted escapade. The same paper printed ads paid for by the North Korean government, which railed against QUOTE United States Imperialists and their henchmen -- UNQUOTE. The ads called us criminals who occupied South Korea by force. But no South Koreans are chanting "Yankee go home" It would seem the campaign is on to persuade us to abandon another ally -- this time it's South Korea.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "People Power" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Twenty seven years ago British author George Orwell wrote a famous book, a fictional projection of the world of 1984. Orwell wrote of a totalitarian state that rewrote history, relentlessly punished nonconformity, and rigidly controlled the lives of its miserable subjects.

That terrible vision of 1984 has haunted us ever since. We have seen our national government intrude ever further into our schools, workplaces, and homes. And we have had as an ever-present model the brutal and oppressive regimes of the Soviet Union and other communist nations.

Now comes an important new book called Peoplepower: The Alternative to 1984. It's written by Morgan J. Doughton, a onetime president of the U. S. Jaycees who has devoted his life to encouraging peoplepower at the grassroots.

Peoplepower is not an answer to Orwell's dismal prophecy, at least not directly. Indeed, Orwell's work is scarcely mentioned in the book. What Doughton sets out to do is explain to Americans how grassroots self-help efforts can deal effectively with problems. Provided, however, that those efforts are not stifled or gobbled up by some blundering government program.

Doughton's examples are many and detailed. He tells how Detroit's Positive Neighborhood Action committee won victories for a black neighborhood in recreation, housing, education, and job training. He tells how a private volunteer effort called Placement Services in that same city was able to place hundreds of unemployed black men and women in jobs, with no help from the many government agencies supported by the taxpayer for that same purpose.

Doughton tells how a group of unskilled workers at Houston's Diamond Alkai company determined to improve their skills -- at their own expense -- and climbed from a deadend labor pool into far more rewarding and better paying jobs. He tells how Dr. Cleo Blackburn generated four hundred self-help homes in an Indianapolis ghetto -- not by seeking government money, but by relying on the potential inherent in as many poor people who had the desire to become homeowners and improve their children's lot in life.

These and many other stories emphasize Doughton's point: if the dead hand of government can be lifted --or ignored -- groups of citizens can and will come together to deal effectively with problems facing them. The key is in devising a system in which power and responsibility are dispersed at the grassroots, instead of being concentrated in a hierarchy of bureaucracies and institutions. The key is what people themselves can do, not what others can do for them. Unleash that spirit, and American need have no fear of 1984. And you know what? I think he's right.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Tax Limit" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A few weeks ago, I spoke about the Michigan tax limitation plan that was defeated by the voters on November 2nd. It had been based on the California plan which was defeated in 1973. Very simply, both plans called for recognition that all efforts up to now to control government spending have failed and that the answer lies in establishing what percentage of the total earnings of the people the government should be allowed to take in taxes. The Michigan proposal would have set that percentage at the present level, 8.3%.

The same groups opposed the plan in Michigan as in California and used the same methods -- namely, falsehoods and distortions. In both states the opponents were mainly those who have a personal stake in not limiting taxes because they live on tax dollars. And, the falsehoods were that state costs would be transferred to local government, causing an increase in property taxes. In Michigan and California, the measures specifically prohibited such a transfer. In California, we've just had a huge increase in property taxes, without the limitation.

The Michigan Education Association is ecstatically claiming credit for the defeat of the tax limitation plan. But, in their November 8 bulletin, they generously give credit to the other organizations who helped. They list 44 groups, 31 of which are organizations dependent on tax dollars for their existence. Among the others are groups who generally lobby for so-called social reform programs.

But, the Michigan Education Association has the right to take credit even though the Governor sent state employees on state time into the hustings to campaign against the limitation. The Association spent \$20,000 on polls in September which revealed the people were in overwhelming support of a limit on state spending and taxing. This triggered the frightened 93,000-member teacher organization into putting \$228,000 into the campaign.

The Executive Director of the Association, Herman Coleman says "There is no question that Proposal C was seen as a threat by our union members everywhere in the state." He also says, "The vote means M.E.A. has come of age as a significant political force in this state. We have the ability to deliver." Incidentally, the second largest contributor was the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees. Coleman further explains that a fair, flexible tax system is essential to upgrade the teaching profession, including salaries.

A Democrat State Senator, who chairs the Senate Taxation Committee, sums up the teachers' interest by saying, "If the issue had passed, they wouldn't have their cookie jar anymore." The educators have a pending demand for a two percent increase in the state income tax plus the right of teachers to strike.

In the November 8 bulletin of Coleman's organization, there is a claim that they elected 75% of their endorsed candidates to the legislature. Their parent organization, the M.E.A. boasts that on November 2nd, they elected 83% of their candidates to the U.S. Congress. Mr. Coleman says, "We think we know how the game is played and how to succeed at it."

It is time for the taxpayers to learn how the game is played. With our employees lobbying for tax increases, we'd better realize that a percentage limit on taxes is our only hope.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Television and Profits" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A couple of months ago, I ran across a news item in a Boston paper, telling that two of the major TV networks turned down a special series of spot ads produced by the Advertising Council and the Department of Commerce. The ads were designed to explain how the American free enterprise system works. The networks, it seems, had learned they would be challenged for equal time by Jeremy Rifkind, founder of the so-called "Peoples' Bicentennial Commission."

I don't know what Rifkind's group will call itself now that the Bicentennial year is past, but its main purpose was not exactly to celebrate the bicentennial. It was an anti-business organization which wanted us to believe our founding fathers were blood brothers to Lenin, Castro and Che Guevara. Jeremy Rifkind is a one-time student rebel of the 60's. If his group could get equal time to dispute ads explaining the workings of our accepted economic system, there is something wrong with the Federal Communications Commission.

Well, the news item brought to my mind how little we hear on the TV news and talk shows of anything favorable to business. An increase in profits for any corporation is announced as if there were something obscene. Never can I recall an explanation that corporate profits average not more (and usually less) than five cents on the dollar.

It seems also that guests on the talk shows very often turn out to be anti-business, grinding an axe for some cause or other in which business is the villain. Can you recall any of these shows on which a top business executive -- employer of thousands of people -- is invited to talk about this problems; or the part our economic system plays in making possible our standard of living? Now, maybe I just haven't been seeing all the shows and, if so, I'll stand corrected. But the only dramatic shows on the tube dealing with the business world certainly aren't designed to make heroes out of business people.

May I suggest there is something a little hypocritical about the anti-profit and anti-business tone of television? In the first place, advertising by business pays the freight for every minute that TV is on the air. And, in the second place, it does so to the generous extent that television is one of the most prosperous of industries in America, by far.

In 1974, when the oil industry was being lampooned for the boom it was enjoying, network profits were 68% higher than oil profits. They were 80% higher than the average of all industry.

During the last three years, network profits before taxes have averaged more than twice as much as the average of all other industry; more than three times as high as food producers and almost 15 times as high as food retailers. This is something to remember the next time we hear the somber voices of the commentators telling us food prices are going up.

And, by the way, the average profit rate for individual stations is higher than that of the networks. I wish they'd reconsider those ads explaining free enterprise.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Health Care" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last October, the Social Security Administration made an announcement that the new year would see a 19% increase in the hospital fees for Medicare patients. In November, Leonard Woodcock of the United Auto Workers wrote in the N.E.A. REPORTER, the publication of the National Education Association, that America needs a national health insurance plan. He said such a program would stop the "insane inflation of health care costs."

Strangely enough, the U.S. Public Health Service had already released a report in which it said: "It may well be that the federal government itself has contributed to cost increases by increasing demand but failing to provide adequate anti-inflation safeguards in its programs."

There has been increase in health care costs greater than the general rate of inflation. Since 1965, the cost of the average hospital stay has tripled as have total health care costs. On the average, we spend \$547.00 per person for health care compared to about \$200.00 in 1965. But during that same period, Medicare and Medicaid funding multiplied almost six times. Government sources account for 40% of personal health care spending. In 1965, it was only 20%.

Let me give you an example which might explain why the increase in public spending so far outstrips private costs. A few years ago, a young staff member of mine in Sacramento rushed his wife to the hospital for the birth of their first child. It was 15 minutes to midnight when they arrived. The lady at the admittance desk asked if they were on Medicaid. When told no, they were paying their own way, she asked the young wife if she thought she could wait there in the anteroom for 15 minutes. If so, they'd save \$50.00 because midnight would be the beginning of a new day. To take the hospital room for those 15 minutes before midnight would be the equivalent of occupying the room an additional day.

They waited. But, had they been on Medicaid, the woman would have sent them right up because the government was paying. When someone else is paying, there's no incentive on the part of the patient to be thrifty. The average length of stay in the hospital for similar ailments is longer for Medicaid patients than for others by several days.

In one county in an Eastern state, the total Medicaid costs last year pro-rated out to \$1700.00 for each person in the county -- not who received care -- but who was eligible for government-paid care.

It makes no sense at all to suggest that putting all of us in a compulsory government financed health care program would somehow lower costs. True, the bill wouldn't be as visible. It would be hidden in our taxes but, make no mistake about it, those taxes would go up by a considerable amount.

In health care as in everything else, the rule of supply and demand works. Government increased the demand, and the price went up.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Rapid Transit" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In the last election, the people of Los Angeles once again voted "no" on a several-hundred-mile fixed rail rapid transit system. But the proponents of such a system didn't get the message. They are still planning, with only one change in direction. They now seek aid from the federal government, meaning the proponents of such a system didn't get the message. They are still planning, with only one change in direction. They now seek aid from the federal government, meaning the people of Illinois, Iowa, New York and all the other 50 states will help pay for it with their federal taxes.

In the 1960's and early 70's, Washington spent some \$4 billion promoting mass rapid transit. Then, two years ago, Congress passed an \$11.8 billion subsidy bill. Some \$210 million of this was spent in Chicago, where rapid transit is already established by way of the famous "Elevated" and where the city's geography is ideally suited to a fixed rail system. The idea was to lure more people out of their automobiles and thus reduce downtown traffic. The new system attracted passengers but only 8% of them came from automobiles. The rest simply moved to the new system from the "L", as it's called, and the buses. In fact, it put one bus line out of business. In Washington, "Metro", an elaborate subway system, is supposed to have 100 miles of track at a cost of two-and-a-half billion dollars. That cost figure has already doubled; it is years behind schedule and only four-and-a-half miles of track are open for use at a loss of \$55,000 a day.

Here in California, the pattern remains the same. San Francisco, much more geographically suited to a fixed rail system than Los Angeles, has "BART" -- the Bay Area Rapid Transit. The original cost estimate has doubled.

In 1976, a projected 11 billion dollar operating surplus turned out to be a \$40 billion deficit. The number of trips were only half of what had been projected and most of the passengers came from buses, not automobiles. Buses, incidentally, are anywhere from one-eighth to one-half cheaper than BART. As a matter of fact, driving a sub-compact car is cheaper than BART.

Environmentalists support rapid transit as an answer to air pollution and a saver of energy. There can be no argument that both of these aims would be advanced if rapid transit could replace travel by private automobile. But at what cost? Even where rapid transit has been long established, it only handles a tiny fraction of the passenger load carried by automobiles.

Most cities, including those of modest size, once had "rapid" transit. The clang of the trolley car's bell was a familiar sound until people abandoned public transportation for their own set of wheels. The automobile gave man one more freedom. The freedom to choose his own timetable and route of travel on a portal-portal basis. He has shown he does not intend to give up that freedom, and government has no right to take it from him by a program of deliberately planned congestion.

We need improvement in fuel consumption and the elimination of air pollution, perhaps even a new energy source for our cars. How much progress in these directions could we have bought for the \$16 billion the federal government is spending on rapid transit which will not appreciably reduce traffic and which apparently the people don't want?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Junk Food" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Just recently, the Arizona Republic carried an editorial about the latest caper in public education as carried out in Washington, D.C.

The editorialist opened with a provocative line that contains more than a kernel of truth and, apparently, more understanding of youngsters than some educators possess. He wrote, "You can lead a high school kid to yogurt, but you can't make him drink."

Now, this isn't a criticism of yogurt, which is unquestionably a fine, healthy source of nourishment. It is, instead, a story of about \$64,000 worth of foolishness by the Washington, D.C. school board.

Of late, there has been much ado about so-called "Junk food" in schools. Like so many of the "do-gooder" causes, a grapevine communications system carries the word all over the land. But, in the nation's capital, they had their way.

The Washington school board banned the sale of QUOTE --"junk food" -- UNQUOTE in schools and even at football games. Happily, the school nutritionists went to work on a new menu for teenagers. And, from a health standpoint, you can't fault them. The soft drink machines were emptied, bake and candy sales were halted and the cheering sections at football games carried on without hot dogs, cokes, popcorn or potato chips. Available were milk, hot chocolate, vegetable juices, hard boiled eggs, sandwiches made of whole grain enriched bread, unsalted nuts and yogurt.

Now, I'd have no quarrel -- indeed, I'd help in a program to educate and convince all of us that such things are good for us. Good heavens, as an ex-sports announcer, I remember when the great Babe Ruth missed a ball game because he ate 13 hotdogs washed down by as many bottles of root beer. But, kids are kids and sometime persuasion is better than dictatorship.

When the lunch bell rings now in the Washington schools, the students happily flock to the nearest places where the so-called junk food is for sale. The school "eat shops", with their healthy new menus, are deserted. One school reports it used to net \$2,000 a year from soft drink sales alone and an equal amount from such things as candy. All this profit went to support sports and other school activities. It even bought gasoline for the lawn mowers.

You might think the school board would admit it had made a mistake. But, no, the ban on junk food remains and here is where you and I come into the picture. To make up for the loss of profits, the school board is giving the principals of the various Washington schools a total of \$65,000 from federal impact aid money. In other words, the nations' taxpayers will underwrite this failing experiment in nutrition. What ever happened to "Eat all your spinach, Junior, or no television to - night?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Building Codes" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Several years ago a number of dropouts from urban life migrated to the hills and valleys of Northern California's sparsely populated Mendocino county. Most of them were young people with little or no money, but a willingness to build a new life for themselves in a healthful rural environment.

These new arrivals bought up remote forest plots and, like the pioneers a century before, set about building their own homes out of whatever could be found.

The influx of these "alternative life stylers" caused alarm among the county fathers. They often wore strange looking clothes and had too much hair to suit the local establishment. And so the county government decided to try to drive them off.

Their weapon was the California building code, a weighty document prescribing how all new structures must be built. It didn't matter that these do-it-yourself homes were usually located in remote forest areas. The county decided to enforce the Code against them.

So out came the Code inspector, by jeep as far as it would go, and then on foot. On each offending dwelling he placed a red tag that marked it as unfit for human habitation. The inhabitants were required by law to evacuate.

It would not have been surprising if these homeowners had reacted with violence to this obvious persecution. But to their credit they did not. They came down from the hills to form an organization called United Stand. They shaved and dressed up and set about to convince the citizens of Mendocino county that oppressive and unreasonable enforcement of the building code against their homes was thinly disguised tyranny.

Over a period of three years they won their fight. Two red tag victims accused of substandard plumbing went to trial, and despite the obvious truth of the charges, a Mendocino county jury refused to convict. United Stand was able to persuade officials in the state capitol to draft a new section of the Code to deal more leniently with self-help buildings. A United Stand leader was named to the code study commission.

This summer they won a last ironic victory. The State Fire Marshal arrived at the Mendocino county courthouse, home of the local code enforcers. He informed county supervisors that the court house did not meet state fire safety standards. The supervisors, reported United Stand's newspaper, were "disturbed by the cost of compliance" and "rebelled at having to take orders from the authorities." Undeterred, the fire marshal said that he might be forced to close the court house and issue a criminal complaint for the supervisors' failure to comply.

Thus, those who had sought to employ the power of the government to drive out peaceful residents living in their own homes, themselves fell victim to the dictates of a higher authority. The point is this: Once we accept the idea that government power may properly be used for any purpose, we may find the enforcers transformed into victims. That's worth thinking about.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "OSHA" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Not too long ago, I told you of the lady in New Mexico (President of a small company) who turned away inspectors for the Occupational Safety and Health Administration -- OSHA, as it is called -- on the grounds that her constitutional rights under the Fourth Amendment were being violated. Her case was that the government inspector had no right to come into a privately owned business on a hunting expedition for possible violation of safety regulations adopted by the government agency unless those inspectors had a warrant showing probable cause. Her case was upheld by a panel of three federal judges.

Now, a member of Congress, Representative George Hansen of Idaho, has become the founding chairman of an organization called "Stop OSHA"; a happy brainchild of the American Conservative Union. This doesn't mean that Representative Hansen or the ACU want to see workers maimed and killed by accidents in the places where they work. It does mean they recognize that OSHA hasn't succeeded in reducing hazards for the numbers of workers suffering injury. But it has added billions of dollars to the cost of doing business, to say nothing of the cost of OSHA itself. Nearly 600,000 people have been killed at their jobs since OSHA started and there has continued to be a steady increase in job related injuries. Nothing, however, can match the increase in regulations spawned by the busy bees at OSHA.

Ironically, the General Accounting Office, which is set up to ride herd on its fellow bureaucrats reports there are more than 300 hazardous conditions in -- guess where? -- the working quarters of OSHA in Washington, D. C. ! In fact, G.A.O., in its own sleuthing, found violations in several other government agencies in the capital, a goodly number of which would have resulted in costly fines had they been found in private businesses.

Congressman Hansen has done more than put his name on the new organization's letterhead. He encouraged and backed a South Dakota businessman who, like the lady in New Mexico, is fighting OSHA as a matter of principle.

Let me repeat -- no one, least of all the average employer, wants his employees to risk life and limb in the pursuit of their job. There are hazards to safety in many occupations and no one can guarantee that accidents won't happen. But OSHA, spawning regulations by the thousands (regulations that no one can possibly be familiar with) and refusing to help employers by looking at their operations and pointing out where safety can be improved, has done nothing -- as figures indicate -- to reduce worker related accidents.

What if OSHA, instead of snooping, busied itself with studying the causes of industrial accidents and offered its services to employers to help reduce those causes? What if OSHA started out by believing that employers do want to protect the health and safety of their employees and, believing that, provided a consulting service to help them? What if OSHA remembered that this is a nation created to be run by its citizens and those citizens are the employers of everyone who works for OSHA -- not the other way around?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "More About OSHA" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The other day, I said it was possible to fight city hall and even the marble halls in Washington. Here is confirmation of that fact.

I mentioned a businessman in Idaho who had been encouraged by his Congressman, George Hanse, to stand up to OSHA. This isn't a case of "lets you and him fight" -- Congressman Hansen has accepted the chairmanship of an organization called "Stop OSHA".

Bill Barlow and his four sons have a plumbing, heating and electrical sub-contracting business in Pocatello, Idaho. They have 35 employees in their family-owned business.

Bill said he knew that OSHA would get around to him sooner or later. So, in the meantime, he did a lot of studying and thinking. He came to the conclusion that such inspection of private property by government was a violation of a constitutional right under the Fourth Amendment. Incidentally, OSHA bases its right to search without a warrant on Section 8(a) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Well, when the inspectors finally reached the Barlow firm, Bill said "not without a warrant". You'll remember that, earlier, a lady in New Mexico had done this and was upheld by a federal court. In Bill's case, however, OSHA declined to get a warrant and obtained a court order instead. Bill refused to obey the order and was cited for contempt of court. He petitioned for the empanelling of a three-judge court, challenging the constitutionality of Section 8(a) of the OSHA Act. On December 30th, the U.S. District Court ruled in his favor, ruled that Section 8(a) is, indeed, unconstitutional and that it "directly offends against the prohibitions of the 4th Amendment of the Constitution of the United States of America."

Bill Barlow still faces the contempt citation but is hopeful it will be dismissed. So am I. Here is a citizen who, like the farmers at Concord Bridge, took a stand for what he believes is right and, thanks to him, freedom is a little more secure for all of us.

This may well be a landmark decision. OSHA has announced it will appeal to the U.S. Supreme Court but, in the meantime, suspend further inspection in Idaho. Congressman Hansen has said this isn't good enough; that, pending a Supreme Court decision, inspections everywhere should be suspended. He is introducing a resolution to that effect in Congress.

Powerful forces are rallying to support OSHA and first in line is the AFL-CIO. Bureaucracy itself feels threatened because OSHA isn't the only agency that has been guilty of search-and-find-guilty missions. The AFL-CIO claims that all government inspections are threatened, but this is a scare tactic exaggeration.

The court, in its decision, specifically stated that heavily regulated industries; those, for example, having to do with food and drugs could be subject to warrantless inspections as a condition for obtaining licenses and that this would not be a violation of constitutional rights.

The people should be on the side of Bill Barlow. All that he is asking and all that the District Court upheld is that shopkeepers, farmers and manufacturers should have the same constitutional protection we give to suspected criminals; they can't be searched without a warrant showing probable cause.

Taping 2/2/77

RONALD REAGAN

76 - 9A

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. The Real China?	3:16
2. Capital Gains	3:12
3. More About Taxes	3:02
4. Postcard Registration	3:06
5. Poverty	3:08
6. Amnesty	3:00
7. Foundations	3:09

76 - 9B

1. Conservation	2:50
2. China	3:12
3. Tom Wolfe's New Book	2:48
4. Torrijos, Human Rights and Money Lenders	2:42
5. I.B.M.	2:58
6. Congress	2:58
7. Civil Service	3:02
8. Rhodesia	3:20

Please retain your RONALD REAGAN program reprints.
Reprints may be xeroxed to meet listener requests for
copies of program scripts. Please do not forward these
requests to us.

Correspondence from listeners should be forwarded to:

Governor Ronald Reagan
10960 Wilshire Boulevard - Suite 812
Los Angeles, California 90024

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Real China?" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

There is a weekly publication called Human Events published in Washington, D.C. It contains a great deal of news about government, international affairs and politics not always available in the daily press or TV news. A month or so ago it carried an article by a well-known scholar, a professor at Dartmouth, Jeffrey Hart. Professor Hart wrote of a study by two of his contemporaries, Miriam and Ivan London, having to do with what he called the obscurity that is Red China.

All of us have been subjected to the reports of Americans and Europeans who have journeyed to Peking and returned with glowing accounts of the orderly society that has been created there. The publisher of the New York TIMES has proclaimed, -- QUOTE -- "I have immense admiration for the accomplishments of the Maoist revolution...which for the first time in recorded history can feed and clothe its vast population adequately and by its own efforts". -- UNQUOTE.

Miriam and Ivan London, writes Professor Hart, have managed to penetrate the before mentioned obscurity by modern techniques. They have taken the testimony of the thousands of refugees who continue to pour into Hong Kong and pumped it into computers. Admittedly refugee information tends to be unreliable. But, the computer rejects the accounts which disagree with each other and puts together the stories from separate individuals which are in agreement until they have a "province by province" account of what is actually going on in China. They have also cranked into the computer veiled accounts from official directives, broadcasts, and so forth. Their findings will appear in a book.

But, in the meantime, an ugly picture of the China behind the showcase for foreign visitors emerges. It is a China of corruption, of pickpockets, thieves and prostitution. Ration coupons are sold and an underground commerce is carried on. Peasants labor endlessly for meals of rice gruel and sweet potatoes. In this China, there has been massive famine and, say the computers, -- QUOTE -- "beggars still swarm from disaster areas in the north into the more fortunate south" -- UNQUOTE.

Even while our own journalists were writing of Mao's triumph over hunger in the years 1958 to '62, one of the most disastrous famines in modern history took place. The Londons go on to say this was not the result of a natural disaster. It was caused by mismanagement and misguided Communist party zeal. Crop failures took place in virtually every province. They quote a Peoples Liberation Army officer who went home to find his grandmother and uncle had starved to death. He told of trees stripped of bark by the hungry people.

Professor Hart says the London's overall conclusions are grim: food production lagging behind population growth; a bare subsistence economy with no surplus to cover disasters, but plenty of food in those cities where foreigners are allowed to visit -- the showcase cities. I hope when the London's book is ready Human Events will announce it.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Capital Gains" --
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

It's hard to get a great many people excited about the capital gains tax. Because of that fact, politicians aren't inclined to do anything about it except possibly increase it, which they've just done. A capital gain is what happens when someone sells something of value for more than he paid for it. Government says a profit has been made and such profit must be taxed.

That sounds fair enough, and since such capital transaction most often involve people with enough means to make investments in real estate, stocks, bonds, and so forth, it's easy to see why there isn't widespread concern among the general public. But what about that once in a lifetime windfall? Take the small struggling farmer who finds himself and his farm in the path of progress. His scrubby acres become real estate -- quote/unquote -- and after years of scraping along he sells for a price that puts him on easy street -- or did until government claimed its share.

Now an argument can be made as to whether there should be such a tax at all. Indeed in many countries far less free than ours there is no such tax. In 1942 the executive committee of the American Federation of Labor (believe it or not) angrily demanded of President Roosevelt that the capital gains tax be cancelled. And they spoke truly when they said, in support of their demand, that such a tax reduced the investment in industry needed to provide workers with jobs. Those really were the good old days.

Today, the A.F.L.-C.I.O. is the most powerful force urging a higher capital gains tax. Walter Reuther has left this vale of tears, but it would seem his influence lingers on.

I remember a night when George Meany sat in our living room talking of the struggle for power in the newly merged labor organization. He said Reuther openly advocated socialist measures in the executive committee meetings. One of his goals was to reshape one of our two major political parties in the image of the Labor-Socialist party of England. Meany at the time led the opposition to such a course.

But, I'm not going to argue whether or not we should have a capital gains tax. I'll save that for another time. Right now we have the tax and I'd like to point out an unfairness in it that literally puts our government in the position of stealing from its own citizens.

We have and have had for many years a continuing inflation which reduces the value of our dollar by several cents each year. This is not provided for in government taxing policies. Suppose you are that struggling farmer I mentioned or you invested in some real estate, or stock or whatever -- say ten years ago. You sell and you actually get double what you invested then.

The government says half of what you get is profit and it takes upward of a third of that supposed profit. But today's dollar is only worth 40¢ compared to the dollar you invested ten years ago. So, you didn't double your money. You got twice the number of dollars, but you actually lost 20% on the sale -- before the government took its bite. You got back \$20.00 for every \$1.00 invested, but the \$2.00 today is only equal to 80¢ in the money you spent ten years ago. Simple honesty dictates that government should compute capital transactions in constant dollars to see if there actually was a profit and if so how much to tax accordingly. That's called "Indexing" and it's overdue.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "More About Taxes" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

When someone talks about estate or inheritance tax, he runs the risk of appearing to be carrying a torch for the downtrodden rich. So let me say in advance I'm going to talk about estate taxes even though I think the wealthy can probably take care of themselves.

We tend to forget that a family farm (and 98% of our farms are family owned) is an estate subject to inheritance tax when the farmer passes on and leaves it to his wife and children. The family owned store on the corner, the repair shop, or small business is the same.

These farms and small businesses are really the backbone of our free enterprise system -- millions of individual citizens making their own way, gambling that they can provide a service or product that people need and will buy.

Not too long ago the estate tax was no problem to these private entrepreneurs. The assessed value of the farm or business was low enough that it could be passed on with no financial strain to the sons and daughters who had grown up working with their parents in the family enterprise. But then came inflation. The family scale of living did not change or improve, but the assessed valuation of the property was vastly increased. Estate taxes following the death of the family head made it impossible for the heirs to keep the farm or business. It had to be sold to meet the demands of government.

Now a Wisconsin Congressman, Henry Reuss, has introduced a bill H.R. 967, which may well be the final straw to break the camel's back. Not only will the estate tax continue to be a confiscatory tax grab based on an inflated increase in assessed value which really is nothing more than the reduced value of our money, but a new tax will be added to make sure there will be nothing left.

Let me reiterate, inflation has literally doubled the dollar price of business properties and for that matter the house you live in. But you don't really own twice as much real value. It's just a phony paper increase.

H.R. 967, if passed, will add a capital gains tax on top of the estate tax. In other words, government will tell you, if you are an inheritor, that phone increase represents a profit and therefore it must tax what remains after you've paid the estate tax.

Congressman Reuss has an answer for those who say his bill can well mean the end of family-owned enterprises. He is quoted as suggesting they -- QUOTE -- "Sell out to big corporations or conglomerates" -- UNQUOTE. How does that fit in with the anti-big business attitude of the majority in Congress who talk of breaking up the corporations and conglomerates?

There is one unarguable answer in this time of inflation to the unfairness prevalent in our tax system. It is an answer to the problem of capital gains tax, estate taxes and the income tax which moves you up into a higher tax rate when your increase in pay is only enough to match the increased cost of living -- it is called indexing. It means to adjust the tax rates to reflect the reduced value of the dollar due to inflation.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Postcard Registration" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Everyone talks about the weather, but no one does anything about it -- or so the saying goes. For the last few years, maybe not everyone but quite a few, have been talking about the number of Americans who don't take advantage of their hard-fought right to vote. Unfortunately, some decided to do something about it.

In my own state (California) the legislature, with great fanfare, adopted postcard registration. There are now 14 out of the 50 states in which voter registration can be accomplished by mailing in a post card. The reasoning behind this is that the low voter turnout is due to the slight difficulty in going to a registrar of voters. Of course, no one has pointed out that the same individual who finds this an insurmountable obstacle might also find going to the polls too inconvenient.

In California, now that you can register by postcard, we had nearly half a million fewer eligible voters register than in 1972 and a little over a million fewer actually voting. In the 14 states that have adopted this method of registering, eight had decreases in registration and six had a slight increase. But, 12 reported a decline in the number who actually voted. In Texas, one of the two showing an increase, registration went up by over a million, but there was no appreciable gain in the number of people who voted.

In spite of these questionable benefits, you can bet that Congress is going to try to pass a national postcard registration plan. The argument, of course, will be that citizens yearning to vote are prevented from doing so by the horrendous barrier of having to appear before a registrar. The answer to that is one the American general gave to the German demand for surrender at the Battle of Bastogne during World War II -- QUOTE -- "Nuts" -- UNQUOTE.

It is true that a great many citizens don't register and many who are registered don't vote. Some just can't be bothered, but too many are disenchanted with the political process. There is a disillusionment with government; a feeling that government has failed us and that the political parties no longer have meaning. Too many Americans feel government has grown so big that they as individuals can have no effect on it.

The answer to this and the responsibility of both parties is to show that only by participating can they help change the things that are wrong. Government by the people won't work if the people won't work at it.

When Congress tries to present postcard registration as the great solution, will they tell us it will also be a nightmare leading to another bureaucratic monster with a cost estimated at \$100 million and up? I'm sure they won't tell us how much it will open the door to massive voter fraud, always a threat to the democratic process.

The experience in the states where postcard registration is already in effect gives proof that fraud will be attempted and that there is virtually no protection against it under this system. In one of the 14 states, one individual sent in 108 applications and only by accident was the fraud uncovered -- but he or she was never identified.

One application turned out to be a city park -- hardly a qualified voter. Another was a gas station. There was a boarded up warehouse, a power company, vacant lots, and a playground among others. Why don't we try reverse psychology and make it harder to vote? That might also make it more desirable and attractive.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Poverty" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Our government has set a level of income below which everyone is to be considered as living in poverty. Incidentally, that income level is 800% higher than the world's average income -- not the world's poverty level -- its average income.

Last Fall the Census Bureau released figures indicating that in the war on poverty, poverty is winning. The Bureau said that in spite of the billions and billions of dollars we take from the workers and producers and redistribute to those below the poverty line there are more poor people than there were a year ago. The present total according to the Census Bureau is roughly 25.9 million of our fellow citizens.

Now comes a different figure from a different source. According to the New York TIMES, the Congressional Budget Office (which I will refer to for the rest of this broadcast as the C.B.O.) says the Census Bureau only uses cash income in arriving at its figure of 13.8% of Americans living in poverty. But in the last ten years non-cash help -- fringe benefits with a definite cash value -- have gone up from less than \$2½ billion to more than \$40 billion. So adding in such things as food stamps, housing aid, Medicare and Medicaid, C.B.O. says that after taxes only 6.9, not 13.8% of Americans are living below the poverty line. That figures out to just half the number of poor the Census Bureau found or just under 13 million people.

There is an interesting point which prompted me to use the term a few seconds ago about "after taxes". C.B.O. found that the poverty total was only 6.7% of the population before subtracting taxes. It jumped to 6.9% after taxes were paid. The principal tax paid by the poor is the Social Security tax. Somehow it seems that one of the aids to the truly poor would be to exempt them from giving that money to government, which government then returns to them in the form of grants. But, that's probably too simple a solution for government to think of.

But, to get back to the main point -- roughly 13 million Americans living below the poverty line are helped by government funds either in direct cash, food stamps, public housing, medical care, etc. The total bill for this government help is, according to the report, roughly \$200 billion to bring 13 million people up to at least the poverty line, which is \$2,800 for a single individual, \$5,500 for a family of four, and proportionately higher for larger families.

Divide 13 million into 200 billion and we come out with about \$15,000 for every man, woman, young person, child and baby. That would be \$60,000 for the average family of four.

Well, we know, of course, that those who need help aren't receiving anything like \$15,000 a year so there is only one conceivable answer. Like so many other things done by government there must be a huge administrative overhead. What would government have to say if it were discovered that a private charity was taking in more than \$15,000 for every \$2,000 or \$3,000 it gave to the needy? This is something to think about when Congress talks of federalizing welfare or forcing us all into a government run health insurance plan.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Amnesty" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

With the pardon of those who not only didn't heed the call of duty, but went so far away they couldn't hear it, memories of the Vietnam war, pleasant and unpleasant, are reawakened. One that came back to me was of a unique incident. In fact, it's hard to believe it wasn't considered newsworthy. I can assure you it wasn't, certainly not by the media which found so much immorality in our participation in the war and so little to criticize about Hanoi.

The story has to do with ten separate individuals who fought in Vietnam and returned to this country over a period of about five years. Some were officers, others enlisted men. They had served in the Army, Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force.

Their paths had never crossed in Vietnam. They didn't know each other and upon their return they were scattered all over the United States. They had only one thing in common besides being veterans of the Vietnam war. Each of them was convinced of the rightness of our being there to help the Vietnamese people. Each of them wanted to do more to help.

Ten men in a nation of more than 200 million. What would the odds be against even two of them ever coming together? But they evidently talked about what they felt and what they wished they could do. A listener would hear and say, "you ought to know so and so, he feels the same way". A street address would be given. Two men would correspond. To brief it down, eventually these ten men, strangers all, were in touch with each other.

There came a day when they journeyed to Washington. Their request sounded simple -- "We are Vietnam veterans who want to do something to help the Vietnamese people before the American withdrawal. Will you send us back"? It sounded simple, yes, but it took quite a bit of doing. They were now civilians asking to be sent to a war zone and they finally made it.

Their destination was the village of Cat Lai and they had decided on their mission. They wanted to build houses for disabled Vietnamese veterans. They called themselves the Cat Lai Commune.

Day in, day out, they worked. The villagers accepted them and quietly understood. One of the happiest notes in this story is the lack of surprise on the part of the people in Cat Lai. What these ten young men were doing was keeping with what the Vietnamese had come to believe was typical of Americans.

In the evenings they would sit around in the warm twilight having a beer with the villagers and the disabled men they were trying to help. On one of those evenings they told a young Vietnamese officer that, back in America, there were many Americans who thought the people of Vietnam would be better off under Hanoi. He replied, "I think my country is the hell of the world and you have come to this hell to help us. We have been at war for thousands of years. We want peace more than anyone, but we want peace without communism."

I don't know what finally happened to those ten men or when they came home. But as the planes from Canada and Sweden bring others home, I'm going to try and remember the Cat Lai Commune.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Foundations" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

We are a charitable people. So ingrained in our American culture is the voluntary support of good works, that we exempt from the income tax gifts to charitable and educational institutions.

This basic generosity has led to the creation of great multimillion dollar foundations staffed by eminent scholars and researchers. Their endowment is invested in stocks, real estate and bonds, in short, American industry. The income from which is tax free and finances the foundations contributions to educational research, public services and good works in general.

Whatever the reason, many (if not most) of the great foundations have more and more tended to believe in big government. Their scholarly works explore more ways for government to busy itself in the peoples' affairs. Often, they present studies to show how much more government we can afford, urging the people to recognize that government is a good buy.

Of late, their pro-government and anti-marketplace bias has caused some to question their continued right to tax-exempt status. The case made is pretty legitimate. We have never recognized the influencing of legislation as deserving of favored tax treatment. Naturally, those who bring this up are denounced as quote, "right wing", unquote. Or something similar, "reactionary, unprogressive, neanderthal, etc."

One of the greatest of the foundations was set up by the heirs of the original Henry Ford who launched the great motor company which bears his name. The Ford Foundation, with virtually unlimited resources, subsidizes battalions of intellectuals who devote their energies to whittling away at the economic system which created and supports their source of affluence -- the foundation itself.

Recently, after thirty-three years of service, Henry Ford II resigned as a trustee of the foundation. Mr. Ford has tended to be quite liberal. More often than not, he supports Democratic candidates for public office. All of which makes his farewell address to the Foundation -- which bears his name -- more than a little surprising.

"The Foundation exists and thrives on the fruits of our economic system", he said. "The dividends of competitive enterprise make it all possible. A significant portion of the substance created by United States business enables the Foundation, and like institutions, to carry on their work. In effect, the Foundation is a creature of capitalism -- a statement that I'm sure, would be shocking to many professional staff people in the field of philanthropy. It is hard to discern recognition of this fact in anything the Foundation does. It is even more difficult to find an understanding of this in many of the institutions, particularly the universities that are the beneficiaries of the Foundation's grant programs." So said Henry Ford the Second.

Plainly, Mr. Ford seemed to be suggesting that the largest tax-free foundation in the nation was using tax-free money to undermine the economic system without which it couldn't exist. An official of the Carnegie Foundation was outraged. "Is that what the Ford Foundation is set up for -- to promote free enterprise?", he asked. Funny -- he never questioned it's right to destroy free enterprise.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Conservation" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Every month, the Federal Energy Administration mails me a news release tallying domestic demand for petroleum products, and the news it has been bringing isn't good. The further those long gas station lines recede from memory, it seems, the greater our demand for gasoline.

In December, 1976, for example, demand was up more than 12 percent over the previous December. It was nearly 9 percent greater than December, 1974 and 13 percent more than December, 1973, about the time the energy crisis began. A short trip on most any major highway shows you why this is happening: the 55-mile-speed limit is virtually being ignored.

Now, an argument can be made that the speed limit should be raised on the great superhighways out in the country and maintained on metropolitan freeways, but until that issue is debated and settled the limit remains 55 throughout the country and we are using about 400 thousand barrels of gasoline more a day than last year, partly because we aren't observing that speed limit.

So, conservation is a matter of out-of-sight-out-of-mind, or, no-long-lines-no-conservation. It seems to take an abrupt awakening, such as the Arab oil embargo three years ago, or this winter's bitter chills and storms, to get our attention.

Conservation, to be effective, is the sum total of many small actions. When President Carter, as one of his first decisions in office, had the White House thermostats turned down, it was a reminder to all of us. Didn't you find yourself glancing at your thermostat to see if it was up around 70 or so? If it was, you probably nudged it down a few degrees. Multiply that action a few million times and you get the picture about conservation's impact.

This winter many public utilities have been urging their customers to put insulated "blankets" around water heaters and use other conservation techniques to save natural gas. Over and above conservation, though, even crash programs aren't going to eliminate our dependence on petroleum, natural gas, coal and nuclear power for about some uses of solar energy for homes, offices and factories. I've received quite a few letters asking for more information. And, I received some issues of a new publication about solar energy. It's called Solar Engineering. If you have an inquiry, I'll be happy to pass it along to them. Just drop me a note care of this station.

Meanwhile, you can even put a bit of solar energy to work in your home this winter, without installing any new equipment. On days when the sun shines, open the draperies and curtains to let in all the warmth you can from the sun. Then, when the sun heads for the western horizon, close them to keep the heat in. Remember, glass is a great conductor of heat -- both ways. Every bit you keep in helps with the heating bill and puts you in the ranks of the conservationists.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "China" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last year the death of Mao Tse-tung brought a spate of eulogies from prominent figures here in America. The general tenor was that he had been a great leader who brought order to the vast reaches of China. Some of our own elected officials were practically euphoric and came close to conferring sainthood on this -- QUOTE -- "great and good man" -- UNQUOTE.

Echos in the same euphoric tone have been heard from some observers who have visited Red China since his death. I commented on this and disputed their findings recently on one of these programs calling attention to the great famines the people of China suffered under the rule of Chairman Mao. These famines were not imposed by natural causes, but resulted from just the plain mismanagement and inefficiency which characterizes communism.

Now, there are rumblings and tremors hinting at internal disorder in the great land mass of China with its 700 million people. Apparently Chairman Mao, in his 27 year reign, not only failed to create a system of orderly transition of power but was also pretty thorough about getting rid of anyone who might look like a possible successor.

Mao's declared principle was that China must be in a state of QUOTE -- "permanent revolution" -- UNQUOTE. But, he stage-managed a destructive system in a way that reveals him to have been a devious man, cunning and suspicious. Fearful of anyone who might challenge his authority, he took action against anyone who displayed ability or a talent for organization.

In 1959, his old friend and comrade-in-arms, Minister of Defense Marshal Peng Te-huai, who had reorganized the armed forces, a strong and capable member of China's top echelon, was eliminated. In 1965, Liu Shao-chi, an able party administrator, was officially designated as Mao's successor. He was destroyed in short order. By 1971 Lin Piao was named successor and polished off before he had time to recognize that the honor carried with it a death sentence. Came 1976 and, over a period of several months, cancer stricken Chou-En-Lai and the only other friend and member of the leadership circle, Marshal Che Te died and with them Mao Tse-tung himself.

Red China was left without any unified system of authority or leadership. A curtain of silence has tried to hide this fact, but now and then a momentary lifting of the curtain reveals sporadic incidents of disorder and even insubordination in the provinces.

There is a feeling of instability; an expectation of change. Increasing cases of anti-Communist sabotage have resulted in military forces being put on constant alert in a number of provinces. In one, 12,000 outside troops were brought in to put down the disorders and prevent sabotage by the -- QUOTE -- "class enemy" -- UNQUOTE.

Uneasy rests the crown on Mao's successor, Hua Kuo-feng. His lack of leadership is revealed in the positions he continues to hold. It is, of course, obvious he cannot function efficiently in all of them; Chairman of the Party, Prime Minister, Minister of Public Security, Chairman of the Military Commission, Member of the Politburo, First Secretary of the Hunan provincial committee and First Commissar of the Hunan military region.

It all suggests this is no time for the U.S. to be without an effective counterintelligence apparatus.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Tom Wolfe's New Book" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Do you remember when Tom Wolfe burst like a rocket on the literary and journalistic scene about a dozen years ago? His collection of essays published under the title THE KANDY-KOLORED TANGERINE FLAKE STREAMLINE BABY spawned a whole school of writing that imitated his rapid-fire delivery, his eye for colorful detail and vivid words describing the sounds of everything from slot machines to stock car races.

Wolfe (no relation to the late, famed novelist of the same name from Asheville, North Carolina), became known as the master of trivia in journalism, reflecting the minutest aspects of America's manners and morals of the 1960's. And, a few years ago he coined the phrase "radical chic" when he covered a fund-raising cocktail party which symphony conductor Leonard Bernstein gave in Manhattan for the Black Panthers.

Now, Tom Wolfe has turned his attention to the current scene in one of the funniest, and perhaps wisest, books to come along in quite awhile. This new book has another unlikely title, Mauve Gloves & Madmen, Clutter and Vine, (which refers to a catering firm and a florist). It will both amaze you and make you laugh.

He launches propositions that may seem outrageous at first. He says Chicago's O'Hare Airport is the new intellectual capital of the United States, for example.

Ridiculous? Maybe, but, as Wolfe points out, it's where the intellectuals change planes as they endlessly crisscross the nation on the lecture circuit.

He describes one of the intellectual's lecture events, taking in all the ironies, such as the speaker's somber-to-strident denunciation of the American system before an audience of young people who have thrived under that system. Here's a sampling of Wolfe:

"The conference is about to begin. The students come surging in like hormones...Here they come, rosy-cheeked, laughing with Shasta and 7-Up pumping through their veins...looking, all of them, boys and girls...as if they had spent the day hang-gliding and then made a Miller commercial at dusk and are now going to taper off with a little Culture before returning to the coed dorm.

"They grow quiet. The conference begins. The keynote speaker, a historian wearing a calfskin jacket and hair like Felix Mendelsshohn's, informs them that the United States is a 'leaden, life-denying society.'"

You'll have to get Mauve Gloves & Madmen, Clutter & Vine to get the rest of Tom Wolfe's razor-sharp and ironic humor, but I'll share one of his conclusions with you. Wolfe is unabashedly patriotic about his country. He says that the ordinary American is "the first common man in the history of the world with the much-dreamed-of combination of money, freedom and free time." No wonder the liberal book reviewers don't know what to make of Wolfe's latest book. They can't seem to understand anyone who isn't dumping on America.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Torrijos, Human Rights and Money Lenders" - Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

One of the most curious things about some of those who pontificate from newspaper editorials, television screens and various magazines is their double standard.

They remind us of the importance of -- QUOTE -- "human rights" -- UNQUOTE -- and the violations of those rights in many nations of the world. But, for some strange reason, the nations always seem to be strongly anti-communist, or leaning to the right, or at the very least, not leftist.

So it is that when the discussion turns to Panama and the future of the Panama Canal, they tell us we must rid ourselves of what they say is a last vestige of "colonialism" -- the Canal Zone; we must hurry and turn it over to General Torrijos or we will bring down on our heads the wrath of all Latin America.

Let's set aside the "colonialism" argument for the moment, it's a phony one anyway; and also the matter of Latin America being unanimously against us (it isn't, by a long shot). Let's ask a few questions about some of the motives behind the big Canal treaty hullabaloo and the kind of government Torrijos runs.

General Omar Torrijos (he wasn't a general then) was part of a military coup in the fall of 1968 that kicked out the elected government and sent the President, Dr. Arias, into exile. The new government suspended civil rights and disbanded the elected National Assembly.

Apparently, Torrijos, who floated to the top of the military junta a few months after the coup, is afraid of what might happen if his citizens had full human rights. There hasn't been an election in the nearly nine years since the coup, and the censored press is his propaganda tool.

I have an opportunity regularly to see examples of the Soviet press and the Panamanian press in translation, and there is an uncanny resemblance in the rhetoric. Uncle Sam is always pictured as a greedy orge. Novosti, the Soviet Press Agency, has had a fully staffed office in Panama City for two years, but there isn't even a Soviet embassy in Panama.

A recent issue of the American Legion Bulletin reports that the Moscow-Narodny Bank has made substantial loans to Panama City's largest hotel, and the Pacific - Atlantic Bank.

But, United States money is the main prop to Torrijo's regime. A half dozen of our leading banks plus the U. S. Agency for International Development (AID) are among the lenders. Of course, the economy is inflated with Panama's national debt increasing by 33% in just one year. That leads to an ironic possibility: Some observers say Torrijos' government is near bankruptcy. This, together with the sabotage threats, could lead to U. S. bankers, corporations, and bureaucrats joining the liberals and leftists' in shouting turn over the Canal—to protect their investments.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "I.B.M." -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Out of all the trauma of the last few years came legislation nationally and statewide to eliminate conflicts of interest. The new -- and sometimes ridiculous -- election laws are examples of government by hysteria.

There was the offer of I.T.T. to guaranty a sizeable portion of the sum offered by merchants, hotels and restaurants to lure the Republican National Convention to San Diego in 1972. Never mind that cities customarily do this in the competition to host the national political conventions. Never mind that the Republican National Committee turned down the offer by I.T.T. and then took the convention to Miami. I.T.T. was involved in legal difficulties with the Justice Department and the odor of chicanery was in the air.

Now we have the new laws and assurances against conflict of interest, but is anything really different? William Safire has written a column proving it isn't. He points out that never in our history has one corporation so completely dominated the top levels of an administration. And, he isn't talking about I.T.T. or 1972.

Our new Secretary of State has been a director of I.B.M. and a member of the Executive Committee. The Secretary of Defense has also served as director and chairman of the audit committee. The Secretary of Housing and Urban Development (H.U.D.) has been a director of I.B.M. and adviser to management on executive compensation. The new Attorney General and the top adviser to the President both come from a law firm that represents I.B.M. in Atlanta. The Under-Secretary of State is a partner in the firm that represents I.B.M. in the far west.

The President's science and technology adviser is a Vice President and Chief of Technology for I.B.M. Two of the President's original choices for other cabinet positions were an I.B.M. Director and a former Vice President.

Now Mr. Safire does not hint at collusion, or suggest that any of the individuals he has mentioned are in any way questionable as to character. But one can't help but be aware of a greater tolerance in this instance than was afforded in some earlier incidents.

You see, for a year-and-a-half, the United States government and I.B.M. have been engaged in the most extensive anti-trust case in our history. The government won't be finished presenting its case until the end of next summer and then I.B.M. will begin presenting its hundreds of witnesses.

The new Attorney General will have to remove himself from the biggest case in the Justice Department. But, as Mr. Safire points out, the Justice Department lawyers can not forget why. It's like inadvertently seeing an opponent's hand in a card game. No matter how honest you are, you can't force your mind to forget the cards you saw. Will I.B.M. competitors, trying to do business with government, be able to believe there is no prejudice when they run into this I.B.M. alumni group?

Again, Mr. Safire does not suggest conspiracy but he does suggest no one thought to look at the way the puzzle, when put together, would spell out the potential for conflict.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Congress" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Congress is back in session and, with great fanfare and self congratulation, informed all of us that a new code of ethics would bring the looks of Camelot to the House of Representatives. The bearer of this good news was the new speaker of the House, Congressman Tip O'Neill. Either he lost his voice after that announcement, or decided one such gift from on high was enough. There was no fanfare when he changed the House rules by way of a, "privileged resolution". A "privileged resolution" is one that slides, smoothly and almost secretly, through the legislative process without debate or explanation. This one had to do with the customary procedure when a court or grand jury decides it has to look into the doings of a Member of Congress.

For example, up til now, if the court or grand jury issued a subpoena for the payroll records or expense accounts of a member, or members, of the House, the subpoena was printed in the Congressional record and voted upon by the House. Publicity followed, as a matter of course, and the capitol press corps was made aware. You and I would then read about it over our morning coffee.

The new speaker just pulled the curtain on that. From now on, when a House member's records are subpoenaed only he (or she) and Speaker O'Neill will know about it. There will be no voting on it, nor will it be announced in the Congressional record. Now, here is an interesting aspect -- if the subpoena should be directed to the Speaker himself only he would have knowledge of it. What was all that furor about an "imperial" Presidency? The Senate was busy doing a little changing on it's own and, in my opinion, democracy was the loser. Once again it was the new leadership, Senator Robert Byrd called it, modernizing the Senate. Actually, it makes it easier for the majority to ram through legislation without some of the debate that, now and then, takes place.

I'm sure all of us from time to time have wondered about the filibuster and whether it was a legitimate tool in the legislative workshop. Then we'd find ourselves thankful when a controversial matter came along and we were on the side of those who filibustered. In the movie, "Mr. Smith Goes To Washington", it was the only weapon Jimmy Stewart had to block a nefarious special interest bill and, thanks to him, evil was thwarted and right triumphed.

Two years ago, the Senate weakened the filibuster by reducing the two-thirds vote required, to limit debate, to only 60%. Now Senator Byrd's resolution provides that after the 60% have voted, individual Senators' speaking time will be cut in half, a time limit will be imposed on total debate and by a two-thirds vote debate can be virtually ended.

One Senator, of the majority leader's own party, has described what's going on as "cutting off a dog's tail one inch at a time". What makes, or has made, our Senate a unique deliberative body is protection for the minority view point. It is not unusual for a filibuster to focus the people's attention on an issue that such an extent that the majority view in the Senate is discovered to be at odds with the will of the people and a mistake is avoided.

Isn't it strange that some who have argued the loudest about the right of dissent would deny that right to their fellow Senators?

RONALD REAGAN

Disc 76-10

76-10A

Programs:

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. <i>Civil Service</i> <i>Rhodesia</i> Minimum Wage	3:00
* 2. Taxes I	2:47
* 3. Taxes II	3:06
* 4. Taxes III	3:10
5. Agriculture Day	3:00
** 6. Update On Cuba	3:00
7. Cuba II	3:14

76-10B

Programs:

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. England	2:58
2. Seabrook	3:12
3. Germany	3:05
4. Added Inflation	3:15
5. Census	3:00
6. Sports and Religion	3:05
7. Amtrak	3:00
8. Free Press and Property Rights	2:42

PROGRAMMING NOTE:

- * To be aired on consecutive days
- ** To be aired after March 21, 1977

Please retain your program reprints.
Reprints may be xeroxed to meet your
listener requests for copies of
program scripts. Please do not forward
these requests to us.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Civil Service" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

My first experience with the multitudinous rules of civil service and the evil they can do came during World War II. I was adjutant of an Air Corps installation under the direct command of Air Corps Intelligence. We had approximately 1300 men and officers and 250 civil employees. One day a Major, doing some significant technical writing, came to me and said he couldn't stand it any longer, his civilian secretary couldn't spell "cat". Dutifully I called in the head of the civilian personnel office and told the Major to tell her his story. She couldn't have been more cooperative. Cheerfully she told the Major she'd draw up the charges for his signature and set the date for a hearing. Suddenly the Major grew wary -- "What do you mean, charges?", he asked. She explained that what would have to take place was similar to our military court martial. The Major would testify to the secretary's incompetence in her presence, etcetera. The Major's reaction was -- "No, not even if we lost the war."

Well, I asked the Civil Service chief what possible alternatives there were. It was easy as pie. She could transfer a very capable girl, not then doing secretarial work, to the Major's office and move the offending secretary to another less demanding spot. The catch was that under civil service rules, the incompetent secretary could only be moved by giving her a promotion. And that's how it was worked out. Forgive us, there was a war on.

A short time ago a visiting bureaucrat here in California created one of those man-bites-dog stories. He publicly called for reform of Civil Service. S. John Byington, Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, referred to Civil Service as, "a rigidly structured -- almost fully tenured -- bureaucracy which answers to no one".

He pointed out that when Civil Service was adopted, it only covered about 10% of government employees. Today, the figure is 85%. Now admittedly, government being what it is, there can be no quarrel with some kind of protection for workers who might be capriciously fired for political reasons. No one wants a return to the spoils system that gave birth to Civil Service. But we are denied, in the present system, the basic tools of management; the ability to hire, to fire and to demote.

That war time story I told? Had we filed the required charges the hearing could have taken from six months to a year. Mr. Byington is urging that career civil service restrictions be removed from a certain level of management positions. Maybe it should be pointed out that a great many of those management positions were not civil service only a decade or so ago. Then an outgoing administration, turning the reins over to an administration of the other party, would freeze its appointees into permanency by way of Civil Service. Gradually, layers of government that were once intended to reflect the policies and philosophies of elected officials, began to reflect only their own philosophies. They have taken to determining policy to a greater extent than any of us know when we cast our votes for legislators and executives.

It shouldn't be impossible to continue the protection for the bulk of public employees while, at the same time, determining what layers of management personnel should be appointed by incoming administrations to help carry out the promises made by the candidates.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Rhodesia" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Our former Secretary of State, on his mission to Africa, had persuaded the government of Rhodesia and Great Britain and a number of African Nationalist leaders to agree to a plan for a temporary government of Rhodesia while a transition to black rule took place. Geneva, Switzerland was agreed upon as the site of the conference to iron out details of the majority government that would, in two years, take over the reins in Rhodesia. More recently, Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith has announced his government will no longer attend the Geneva meetings. Why? What happened? There will be many answers to those questions, plus charge and countercharge, but there is only one correct answer. Very simply, the African Nationalists, once they arrived in Geneva, conveniently forgot that they had agreed in advance to every detail of the Kissinger proposal. The representatives of Great Britain were willing to let them forget and it was only the Government of Rhodesia that escaped the spreading amnesia. And, I wasn't aware that rhymed until I said it.

This action has prompted a former minister in the Labor Party government of Britain, now an independent member of the House of Lords, to utter a few pithy words about what went on in Geneva. Lord Chalfont says, "The British government's attitude toward the Geneva Conference is symptomatic of the desperate paralysis, which seems to afflict the West, confronted by the very real possibility of strategic disaster in Africa". He says, "If the whole of Southern Africa becomes a Russian colony, someone will be on hand to tell us that the communist threat is being disgracefully exaggerated and that African nationalism is stronger than international Communism". His Lordship then adds, "I also confidently predict that there will still be people daft enough to believe it".

I'm sure an effort -- an herculean effort -- will be made to place the blame for the breakdown in negotiations on the Ian Smith regime; to charge that Rhodesia is balking at giving up white rule. That is not the case. The real struggle involves a Soviet-backed black minority which wants to rule over a black majority. Two of the African nationalist leaders in Geneva were not chosen by the several tribes in Rhodesia as their representatives. They are self anointed and they have the backing of the Soviet Union. They are Robert Mugabe and a man named Nkomo. They have made it clear that no matter what happened in Geneva their guerrilla troops, supported by the Marxist dictator of Mozambique, will fight on until there is a socialist government in Rhodesia.

The London-based Institute for the Study of Conflict is quoted as saying whatever the final outcome of the Geneva Conference, Soviet policy envisions a Marxist revolutionary regime in, "liberated Rhodesia". SPOTLIGHT ON AFRICA, published by the American-African Affairs Association asks a question that may cause some sleepless nights in Washington -- what will the United States do if a popularly elected, black, majority rule is threatened by a widescale guerrilla war backed by the Soviet Union? SPOTLIGHT asks, "Congress may well be able to ignore the geopolitical, military and economic issues at stake in a Southern Africa increasingly falling under Soviet influence, but, would it be able to avoid providing the only tangible western aid possible to a besieged, black, majority in Rhodesia"? That's quite a question. In the meantime, without agreement in Geneva, Ian Smith, with the support of many blacks in Rhodesia, is proceeding to implement the Kissinger proposal as he said he would.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Minimum Wage" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The other day, in answer to a question from an audience, I expressed my view that the minimum wage is a factor in unemployment. Criticizing the minimum wage can lead to arguments high in emotional content, but low on reason.

It is pure demagoguery to charge that questioning the minimum wage means one wants to see workers reduced to a starvation level income. I think all of us would like to see everyone who works for a living rewarded with enough to have some of the luxuries that make life worth living. But the minimum wage is not going to bring that about, or even help bring it about.

We have an overall unemployment rate of nearly eight percent. The smallest group of unemployed, fortunately, is made up of heads of households. The largest--teenagers. Teenage unemployment is about two and a half times the rate for all workers, or about 20%. For black teenagers double it. The rate is 40%.

Now let's look at a little history. In 1954 the minimum wage was 75 cents and black teenage unemployment was 16.5%. By 1968 the minimum wage had risen to \$1.60 an hour and unemployment of black teenagers had gone up to 25%. Remember, too, that in 1968 we had full employment because of the Vietnam war. Now the minimum is \$2.30 and, as I said, unemployment among black teenagers is now 40%.

Actually, that \$2.30 should be considered as closer to \$3.00 because of about 70 cents in additional fringe benefits. But the push is on to make the actual cash level \$3.00 with, of course, a proportionate hike in those compulsory fringe benefits. Based on past performance that would further hike unemployment in general, teenage unemployment in particular and especially among young black Americans.

I'm aware that there is little chance of persuading the present Congress to cancel the minimum wage, nor am I suggesting such a move, even though fact and figure indicate that it has eliminated a great many marginal jobs. But with all the evidence available why should even an irresponsible Congress be unwilling to try a two-tier system designed to meet the problem of the greatest group of unemployed? By two-tier, I mean continuation of the present minimum for the general working population, but a lower minimum for teenage and part-time workers, beyond the minor, temporary instances in which it can now be used. I know that labor leaders have complained that employers would substitute teenagers for adult workers, but I don't think we're even talking about the same kinds of jobs. Western European countries have tried the two-tiered system and find it works well, and does not in any way threaten the jobs of older and more experienced workers.

We might find we had not only reduced our overall unemployment, but had achieved some beneficial side effects. We could concentrate on the most important unemployment problem -- the family wage earner. Juvenile delinquency might be reduced if idle young people had something to do and honest earnings to spend. And, a lot of resources now being wasted on ineffectual social tinkering could be put to better use.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Taxes I" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

With the 1500 pages of income tax reform Congress passed last year, we're all going to find it's harder than ever to tell the tax collector how much we owe him. Two men in Texas -- one an employee of a radio station, the other a certified public accountant -- have written an article outlining the procedure in appealing an income tax case. But, they've done more. Maxwell Green and Roy Carden have, at the same time, revealed the virtually unlimited power the Commissioner of Internal Revenue has over all of us. They've also suggested a Constitutional remedy available to us. And, they have generously told me I can pass their findings on to you.

Most everyone has to employ outside help these days in figuring out his or her income tax. Yes, there is the simplified form; but, lately even that is getting complicated. If you are one of those who seeks out a tax adviser, you know that when the job is done you both are confident that the deductions you've taken are allowable. You send your tax forms and money off to Washington -- poorer but square with the law.

Of course, you don't expect to be one of those whose tax return will be audited. But a certain percentage are each year. When and if it happens, you may be shocked, angry and frustrated. The I.R.S. Agent may tell you that you owe the government more money -- additional tax, plus interest, plus penalties -- because the Commissioner has ruled that some of the deductions you took are not allowable. And they are not allowable because he says so. You go to your tax adviser to find out what you can do. This will usually add to your anger. He'll ask how much they want, and usually it will be an amount that will cause him to say, "pay it". His explanation will be that it's so much less than the cost of fighting that you are better off. Of course, it's a chunk of money you don't think you owe and that you hadn't counted on having to give up, which adds to its value in your mind.

What are your choices? The tax adviser will tell you that under the tax law the Commissioner has authority to interpret the code and write the regulations. So, if he has interpreted your deductions as non-allowable, he has the unlimited resources of government to fight any legal action you may take. In effect you will be paying your own costs, and as a taxpayer, contributing to his. But, if you want to go ahead, you can appeal. If that doesn't work, you can go to the appellate division. In the first appeal, you and your accountant or lawyer will face an Audit Supervisor, but he works for the Commissioner. If you choose the appellate division, you face a panel of hearing officers -- who are also on the payroll of the I.R.S.

If they rule against you, you still have some choices: the small tax case procedure (if amount is less than \$1,500.), or Federal District Court, or Claims Court in the District of Columbia. I trust you are remembering a little something called court costs. Tomorrow I'll let our two authors take you down that road a ways.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Taxes II" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Yesterday I listed some of the things you can do if these fellows at I.R.S. come around to tell you they've decided you owe more than you paid in any one of the previous three years. You are mad at the agent delivering the bad news that on top of disallowing some of your deductions you owe interest and a penalty -- they don't call it a fine.

You file a written appeal. You are then invited to what I.R.S. calls an informal conference with -- guess who? -- the agent's boss. He checks the agent's findings, makes sure you and the agent aren't having a personality clash, and barring a miracle, decides against you.

Now you carry on and head for the appellate division. This is a panel of hearing officers also employees of the I.R.S. So are the people who will present the agent's findings. You and your tax adviser are the only people in the room who aren't members of this club. About your only chance is if your tax man can come up with some provision of the tax code the agent slipped up on. Then you hang him out to dry. That isn't likely.

Alright, so now you are two down and headed for the small tax case procedure of the Tax Court. The amount at issue has to be less than \$1500 for you to take this route. Everything is real informal -- you won't need a lawyer (they say). No rules of evidence. Just a bunch of good old boys who want to get to the bottom of this. Of course, the judge -- a lawyer himself -- can't really forget all the law he's learned. The I.R.S. agents are legally trained and very experienced in taking cases through the small tax case procedure. You are outgunned and outnumbered. Three down.

Whether your case is under the small case or regular procedure in Tax Court, remember, the judge will attempt to make a ruling based on the Tax Code. That is if the Code is specific enough to make such a ruling possible. If not, he'll probably rule in favor of I.R.S. You're not likely to win unless there has been a flagrant violation of the Code by the revenue agents. Remember, through all these steps you and your adviser are the only members of the cast whose wages aren't paid out of the funds collected by International Revenue. Four down.

Of course, there is the Federal District Court and here there will be a jury of your peers who are not on the federal payroll. First, however, you must pay the I.R.S. the disputed tax, the interest and the penalty. Then you sue to get it back. If the jury decides in your favor that's what will happen -- or will it?

The Commissioner of Internal Revenue can appeal the case to the Circuit Court of Appeals. That's really no hardship for him -- he has the unlimited resources of the federal government to call on. You, of course, are paying for a lawyer, your tax adviser and possible clerical help as well as other expenses. The decision will be reviewed by a panel of three federal judges strictly on the basis of the law and how it applies to your case. Again, it becomes a question of whether I.R.S. is in gross violation of the code and, remember, I.R.S. wrote the regulations that implement that code.

If the lower court decision is reversed you are down to big casino or perhaps I should say up. Your last recourse is the U.S. Supreme Court. Is it really worth it in cash or are we doing this for principle? Tomorrow, the last chapter -- tune in and find out what happens to John. Q. Taxpayer.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Taxes III" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

In the last two days, I've followed the course of an income taxpayer who has been told by auditors of Internal Revenue Service that deductions he took in his tax return are being disallowed. Yesterday we had him up to the United States Supreme Court — the highest tribunal in our land. Well, first of all the Supreme Court accepts only those cases it chooses to hear so it isn't a sure thing that you'll have your day in court. At least in that particular court. But, let's cut through all the "ifs" and say the eminent justices found in your favor. You don't owe the added tax, the interest or the penalty. Let's not even talk about whether the cost of all you've done is several times greater than the disputed amount of tax. You've struck a blow for freedom. A Supreme Court ruling will stand as a precedent for years to come, sparing all citizens with similar problems from ever having to endure what you've gone through.

Sorry. The ruling you've won applies only to you. The Commissioner of Internal Revenue has the right — a unique right — to non-acquiesce. He has to give you back your money, but he reserves the right to go after the next fellow as if the court had never ruled in your favor.

I know most of us believe the Supreme Court has the final word in any court case and they do as far as criminals are concerned. But, in a sad way, where a tax case is concerned, it would seem the Commissioner is more powerful than the United States Supreme Court. But what about the Bill of Rights — our Constitutional guarantees. Well, in a case filed November 15, 1976 the authors of the article I've been quoting from for these three broadcasts, Mr. Green and Mr. Carden, tell of a citizen versus I.R.S. who based his case on the Bill of Rights. He refused to answer questions put to him by the revenue agents by invoking the Fifth Amendment. The judge overruled him. The judge's justification is frightening. He said — QUOTE — "We believe the need for requiring voluntary disclosures of income transcends any personal right to thwart national objectives by allowing an undisclosed self-determination of possible self incrimination to excuse non-compliance with the income tax laws." — UNQUOTE— In other words, the objectives of the state are more important than the rights of its citizens! Do you know, that is one of the basic precepts of Karl Marx.

Defenses allowed a common criminal are denied a citizen with a tax problem. How far we've come in our income tax that in 1927 was only 1½% to a top of 5%, and now begins at 14% and goes to 70%. Mr. Green and Mr. Carden suggest the answer might lie in a Constitutional convention which can be called by the legislatures of 38 states to adopt an amendment limiting the percent of earning subject to tax. There is no limit now. Under the 16th Amendment the government could take 100% of every dollar earned. They also suggest an amendment to limit the size of the national debt and to provide for paying it off in forty years at 2½% per year. To start with that would be a \$15 billion payment. Well, that makes more sense than adding \$50 billion a year to the debt.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Agriculture Day" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last year the American agriculture industry held it's first American Agriculture Day. In 30 states, Governors proclaimed an agriculture week. This year they are hoping for 50 plus the White House. I hope they made it, because March 21st, was again American Agriculture Day and John "Duke" Wayne is National Honorary Chairman. The aim is to establish communications between town and country so as to bring about a better understanding between those who raise the food and fibre and the consumers. And, in this particular business we are all consumers -- you can't live without eating.

A farm recognition day wasn't necessary a little while back because 85% of us worked and lived on a farm. Today in America (and I stress -- in America) only 5% -- 4 million people raise everything we eat. One farmer feeds 53 people and exports to a hungry world one-fourth of all he produces. Today the American farmer produces two-and-a-half times as much as he did 60 years ago on one-half the acreage and with one-third the number of man hours of work. He stands alone in the world in his capability. Almost three-fourths of the people on earth are engaged in farming -- most of them scratching the soil for enough to feed themselves and their families. The doomeriers who think we're plowing up the wilderness should know that if all those other farmers were as efficient as an American farmer we could feed the world on one-tenth of the land now under cultivation. In this time of inflation it's hard not to become angry as prices -- particularly food prices go up. Well, here is the time to set the record straight. If we take the increase in wages over the past 25 years and matched it with the same percentage increase in food prices, round steak would be \$3.00 a pound, a quart of milk 70¢ and eggs would be \$2.00 a dozen.

The average American family spends about 17% of income after taxes on food for the entire family. We eat more and better for less than any other people on earth. In Asia food takes 83% of the family income. Yes, you can buy a chicken in Asia -- a bird hung up by its neck in an unrefrigerated display. We can buy the whole chicken, or selected parts, raw or pre-cooked in handy throw away packages, frozen or refrigerated with cleanliness and non-spoilage guaranteed.

A group of scholars recently did a price comparison of food items in the Soviet Union and here in America. To make it a fair comparison, the price on each item was translated into how many minutes or hours one would have to work at the average wage in each country to buy food. With only one exception, the Russian must work from two to ten times as long depending on which food item he is buying. The one exception was potatoes. The price tag on the Soviet potato bins was lower than in our own markets. There was one problem, they didn't have any potatoes. As Duke Wayne says -- let's appreciate the American farmer and not cuss him.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Update on Cuba" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Last October the Castro regime in Cuba invited seven members of the Ripon Society to tour their country. Now, the Ripon Society is a liberal Republican organization whose membership might be a little less skeptical of the glories of Castroism than the ordinary Republican — or at least that's what the Cuban government must have thought. And, frankly it's what I would have thought. I'm delighted to find I was wrong. The report of the Ripon excursion has appeared, authored by Richard W. Rahn, and I'm afraid the Cubans have discovered their pesos were misspent. The Ripon visitors were, to be sure, appreciative of the hospitality shown them. But their reports of life in this socialist paradise are not very flattering for Castro's image.

To begin with, author Rahn inspected his first class hotel accomodation in Havana. There was plenty of hot water -- boiling hot. There just wasn't any cold water. The toilet bowl gave off steam and it was impossible to use the shower.

The group dined well in several excellent restaurants. These restaurants were also used by the toiling masses, explained the Castro guides. But the Americans found that every time they dined in a restaurant, they were virtually the only diners present. Cuban citizens must have ration coupons to buy almost any necessity, the group learned. There are so few goods to go around that the average worker can only get enough coupons for two short sleeved shirts a year. With governmentally-fixed wages much higher than what can be consumed, due to the rationing, Cuban workers are forced into very high rates of savings. The government encourages savings accounts in the Bank of Cuba. The accounts, however, bear no interest.

At the University of Havana the American group was treated to a lengthy lecture by the vice minister of higher education. From him they learned that in Cuba "minorities have no rights whatsoever" only the proletariat majority have any rights." Cuba held its first national election since the Castro takeover during the Ripon visit. Local Communist party committees nominated four candidates for each post on the equivalent of our county boards and city councils. Candidates were not allowed to campaign, the visitors learned, because under previous regimes candidates had not been truthful in their campaign statements. Therefore, in order to prevent exaggerations, candidates were forbidden to say anything. Voters made their choice solely by reading the candidates' biographies, posted near the polling place.

With a depressed market for sugar, Cuba's principal export, Cuba is staying aloft only because the Soviet Union is buying 45 % of the crop — at triple the world price. The conclusion of author Rahn was the U. S. should be very slow to "normalize" relations with Castro, expecially since Castro needs better relations far more than we do. Any such agreement, Rahn says, should require an end to Cuban intervention in Latin America, compensation for the expropriation of some 1.8 billion dollars of property owned by Americans, and freedom to emigrate for political prisoners. I hope the State Department is listening and I'm glad I was.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cuba II" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A few weeks ago our new ambassador to the United Nations publicly expressed the view that we should "normalize" relations with Cuba. By coincidence, I assume, Dictator Castro appeared on television two days later and expressed his desire for normal relations with the United States beginning with resumption of trade. That would be a good beginning — for Mr. Castro. He has much more to gain from trade with us than we do. His country's economy is creaking along, with consumer goods of every kind in short supply and productivity far less than it was in the bad old days of freedom.

The question is, should trade be the first approach to normal relations, diplomatic recognitions and so forth? We are signatories to the United Nation's declaration of Human Rights. We rationalized signing the Helsinki pact on the grounds that it might make life easier for some of those enslaved behind the Iron Curtain and elsewhere. Why shouldn't we tell Castro that normal relations might follow the adoption by him of some of the simple humanitarian customs we consider normal?

Chile, a country often accused by some of denying civil liberties to its people, nevertheless has offered to exchange political prisoners for some of the people being held by the Soviet Union and other Communist countries. On December 18 they had their first success. The Soviet Union freed and exchanged Vladimir Bukovsky for a veteran Chilean Communist, Luis Corvalan. But so far they have had no success in trying to exchange another jailed Chilean Communist for a Cuban prisoner, Major Huberto Matos, imprisoned by Castro in October of 1959, almost eighteen years ago. It seems that his crime was in saying that the Castro government was being infiltrated by Communists and that he didn't want to be associated with it. This was only a few months after Castro had seized power and Matos was one of the military leaders who had helped him do this. He was removed from military command, placed under arrest and jailed for — QUOTE — "betraying" — UNQUOTE — The Revolution. For the last five years he has been allowed no visitors. Our government is aware of his situation. His wife, Maria, has been seeking help to obtain his release. She has written President Carter, asking him to intercede; to appeal to Castro to accept the Chilean offer of an exchange.

She has also met with staff aides of Senators Case and Kennedy and Representative Edward Koch (COKE), all of whom have been quite vocal in their protests about human rights in Chile. So far she's had no success. In her letter to the President she wrote, "Can you provide the needed hand to obtain the release of my husband? You have called for a new morality in foreign policy and I believe that you are genuinely interested in human rights. That is why I'm asking you to appeal directly to President Castro urging him to accept the Chilean offer." Mrs. Matos' last word from her husband was a letter smuggled out of the prison two years ago. He said, "if my spiritual state is holding up, I cannot say the same for my physical state." He told her his left arm was paralyzed and he was nearly blind, then added, "I am old and ailing. I am a shadow of the man who entered prison in 1959." Major Matos is just one of thousands imprisoned in Castro's Cuba. Let normalization of relations with us begin with justice for all of them.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "England" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

We of the World War II generation remember only too well the admiration approaching hero worship we felt for those who lived Britain's finest hour. In this time of threat to the "right little, tight little, isle", I find myself praying, that somewhere in the British soul there is still that gallantry and fortitude that meant so much to western civilization almost four decades ago. Winston Churchill called socialism a "philosophy of greed". Great Britain turned to that philosophy and, it would seem, has confirmed his words. Colin Brogan, writing a letter to National Review magazine, cited some examples of present day British life.

He writes of a ticket collector in the London subway who watched a police woman struggling with a purse-snatcher. Repeatedly, she called out for help, he did nothing. When questioned in court he said there was nothing about helping a police woman in his rule book. Item Number Two, under the heading "law", he told of two young men beating an old woman to get money to go to a football game. As a result of the beating she died. The young men asked the arresting officer if they'd get out in time for the Cup Final. That's the equivalent of our Super Bowl.

On other fronts, Brogan told of a school built for one hundred pupils, but only two were enrolled. It stayed open with a headmistress, a classroom teacher, cook, cleaner and part-time secretary. If the school had sent the two pupils to the nearest school twenty miles away by taxi everyday, they would have saved 17,000 dollars a year. The school finally closed when fifty percent of the student body — one girl — transferred to another institution. Then there was the milk program on the Isle of Aran. Each child received a third of a pint of milk each school day supplied by local farmers. Then it turned out the local plant couldn't completely pasturize the milk. It would cost 68,000 dollars to fix it so that it could. Instead, they are bringing in milk from the mainland at a total cost of 144 dollars a pint. There is more in Brogan's newsy letter. When accountants found that hospital technicians could earn more than 170 dollars for standby duty on Sundays, a union official said, "the accountants should find something better to do". He meant, of course, better than checking up on that kind of extravagance.

Every British dock worker has a job for life at 119 dollars a week. He draws this salary even if there is no work at his port or any prospect of work. But Brogan adds a topper — more than 300 London dockers are paid extra wages and handsome expenses to work at Tilbury docks while 300 Tilbury dock workers get the same deal for traveling to work in London. The Dock Labor Board offered them each 1700 dollars to stop this nonsense, but when the dockers learned they'd have to pay tax on the 1700 dollars, they demanded 850 dollars extra.

Colin Brogan is an invalid but no crybaby. He writes that due to a number of ailments a large portion of his intestine has been removed. He also has an almost unpronounceable disease in which the bones are softening and his vertebrae are literally melting together. He says, "almost gutless, almost spineless, I am the very image of Britain".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Seabrook" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

We all want clean air, clean water, the beauty of nature preserved and, on the side, a place to live, to work and a certain amount of comfort. A great many people in the East were denied the latter this winter when fuel ran low, businesses closed and homes became frigid, unheated ice boxes. There can be no denying that excessive regulation of the energy industry set us up for the horrors of this, the coldest winter in a century. Recently, the Wall Street Journal recounted the problems of one utility company in trying to add to the available supply of energy. They named their story, "The Seabrook Scandal". Seabrook is the location picked by the Public Service Company of New Hampshire to build two nuclear power plants to provide power for all of New England.

The company was given a go ahead by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to start construction last summer. The approved design was for plants that would pump sea water into the cooling system and then back into the ocean through an elaborate tunnel. The environmental administration in the area declared the plants met Environmental Protection Agency standards. Everything looked fine at that point even though construction had been delayed two full years by the regulatory bureaucracy. Then the regional administrator reversed himself last November. This threw the problem to his superiors in Washington. So far they have made no decision. The hang up happens to be over whether harm will be done to some clam larvae. Since the Environmental Protection Agency won't give an answer, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has now become doubtful about letting construction continue. The answer may be to scrap the tunnels and use cooling towers. This could mean having to find an entirely new plant location. In the meantime, while the bureaucrats do what bureaucrats do best, "hem and haw and stall", each month of delay costs the utility company fifteen million dollars. Not only does no one know what the answer will be — they don't know when it will be. At fifteen million dollars a month that is heavy. With the right or common sense answer New England could be getting electrical power by 1981. That is more delay than is necessary, but if the decision is cooling towers, there is no way of knowing when, if ever, there will be power because it is possible that the plants can't be built at all.

Already years have been spent getting the original permission. Then in good faith, Public Service Company started construction — one hundred forty million dollars worth so far. Total investment is estimated at around six hundred million dollars. How much of that can be salvaged, if any, is anyone's guess — that is if the project must be called off. Once again we run into the economic mythology so prevalent that lets us think somehow a corporation absorbs and writes off a loss of this kind. First of all, what business can absorb six hundred million dollars in dead loss? The truth is, all of this will have to be recovered from future sales of electric power. Which means the people of New England will pay hundreds of millions of dollars more in utility bills just because some bureaucrats fumbled and stumbled. But we can spread the blame a little. It is doubtful there would have been the costly delays and reversed decisions if there had not been a radical fringe of the environmental movement determined to halt the development of nuclear power at any cost. Now as the Wall Street Journal says, they've learned they can kill off the generation of electric power simply by causing delays that make the costs prohibitive.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Germany" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A nationally syndicated columnist, Lawrence Fertig, back in 1961 wrote a column that became front page news in some papers. Among other things, he told of an economic report written in 1951 which had been classified "Secret" for ten years. It was the report of a group of American economists who in 1947 and '48 were in Germany to tell that defeated, war-devastated country how to get back on its feet. Many of these economists were advisers to our own government and, indeed have continued to influence policy over the years even to the present. When the report was declassified, Mr. Fertig revealed that our traveling think-tank had told German Finance Minister Erhard in 1948 that he had "an excessive concern for price stability"; that Germany should go in for deliberate planned inflation and easy (meaning printing press) money. Minister Erhard was also told that interest rates high enough to encourage personal savings were bad and would limit investment.

When the Germans allowed fast depreciation of capital investment and tax breaks to business and industry to increase their investment in new equipment and plants, the Americans said it was "an expenditure of tax funds the government should collect instead". Most significantly, the Germans were literally told that capitalism as we have known it here in our country — capital investment in industry — was no longer the modern way. Always the Americans urged that government should be dominant in the economy. Well the American economists, having imparted their wisdom, returned to America and West Germany became the economic miracle of our time. Never had a nation so totally destroyed, recovered so quickly and become so prosperous. And for about ten years people kept asking, "What is their secret? How did they do it"?

Mr. Fertig made their secret public with the publishing of the report. Once Germany was back on its feet, Finance Minister Erhard revealed that his government had listened to all the economic advice from the American experts and then taken an opposite course. They maintained a sound currency, a balanced budget, eliminated all price controls, provided, as I've said, strong incentives to business and individuals to save and invest; in short they rejected a government-directed economy and encouraged private enterprise.

Now — as to learning from history, it seems the latest American official visit to Germany may have attempted to repeat some economic advice similar to the kind given in 1948. At any rate, the West German Prime Minister made a polite statement which indicated Germany would continue on its own course. As I've said, some of those economists who were proven so wrong are still advising our government to do the things Germany refused to do. Germany, its great cities bombed into rubble, its industrial capacity at near zero, came back to be one of the most stable, prosperous nations in the world. The United States, victorious, its industrial capacity untouched, took the advice the Germans rejected and now has economic problems, inflation, unemployment and a national debt of incomprehensible size. Worst of all, Washington still turns to those same economists for advice.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Added Inflation" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Many times on these programs I've talked about government regulations and how they impose on your freedom. I've also talked about taxes and given examples of how so called business taxes wind up in the price of the products you step up to the counter to purchase. To inflation and taxes let's add another cost to all of us which is the indirect inflation brought about by excessive regulation and government statutes.

In spite of all the talk and Congressional debate, regulations are multiplying like spores on a fungus. In 1974 all the talk seemed to be heading toward some kind of action. But also in 1974 the Federal Register needed 45,422 pages to list all the new United States government decrees and regulations that year. That was a twenty five percent increase in pages over the preceding year. Funk & Wagnalls new encyclopedia -- twenty five volumes -- a stack of books three feet high -- had only 12,000 pages! Those regulations add to the cost of doing business in many fields and in many ways which means they add to the cost of the things we buy. Congressman Bill Armstrong of Colorado says, for example, "Restrictive rate policies of the Interstate Commerce Commission add five billion dollars per year in excess freight rates passed on to the consumer".

Senator Jim McClure of Idaho confirms this by calling attention to Brookings Institute study which put the economic loss caused by I.C.C. regulations in 1968 alone as ranging from a low of some three point eight billion dollars to a high of almost eight point eight billion dollars. Congressman Armstrong also gave an example of what we pay for some of the reform programs over and above the tax cost for implementing those programs. Obviously, we all support anti-pollution efforts but we'd like to know whether we are getting cleaner air and water at the best possible price. In 1972 Congress jumped on the pollution bandwagon. It was the newest and best political cause since motherhood. In just four years -- by 1976 -- one hundred and twenty seven billion dollars had been added to industrial costs which of course, added to the inflationary spiral. Prices went up in each of those four years for industrial products we buy.

Last year, Congress adopted rule reforms including a requirement that new spending schemes carry an "inflationary impact statement", an estimate of what effect the spending program would have on the rate of inflation. You can't fault that as an idea for slowing down the increase in the cost of living. But, apparently Congressmen reserve the right to disobey their own rules or at least to make exceptions. It took one of their colleagues, Representative Bob Bauman of Maryland, to blow the whistle on the growing practice of committees which pass spending programs out to the floor with the simple assurance that there is -- QUOTE -- "no inflationary impact" -- UNQUOTE. He gives an example; the suspension of food stamp regulations which wound up adding up to a billion dollars in cost. All told, he says the total inflationary impact of eleven different bills is about twenty-two billion dollars in added government cost. Yet all eleven were reported out of their respective committees with the flat declaration that they would not contribute to inflation. When we are already spending some fifty billion dollars over and above our revenues there is no way you can increase that deficit by almost fifty percent without adding to inflation.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program titled "Census" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

The Constitution — Article 1, Section 2, — provides that the government shall conduct a head count of all of us at least once every ten years. The purpose is sound; to make proper allocation of seats in the House of Representatives. This should be underscored — the only purpose of the census is to insure the proper distribution of Congressional representatives. The first census was taken in 1790 and the only questions asked were name of the family head and the number of males and females in the household over and under sixteen years of age.

The last census was taken in 1970 and it had grown extensively in size and complexity. That simple head count had become a sociological survey. Free American citizens are now asked how many marriages; the number of children born to the woman of the house (including miscarriages), value of property, how many bathrooms and on and on. There can be no real reason for these questions other than curiosity and, possibly, the need to justify an ongoing bureau whose only function takes place at ten year intervals. The Ninety Fourth Congress, just prior to it's adjournment last summer, passed a bill giving the government the power to take a mid-term census. Which means the snoops will be out every five years instead of ten. If it's any consolation — thanks to the efforts of Representative John Ashbrook of Ohio — Congress did eliminate government's right to put you in jail if you refuse to answer all the questions. They can, though, still fine you up to five hundred dollars. Institutions, businesses and religious organizations can be fined as much as ten thousand dollars. For some time now there has been an agricultural census every five years and it is an even longer, more complicated set of questions than that inflicted on the city folk. Farmers are independent people. On the last go-round almost one third of them threw the questionnaires away. This, of course, led to an exercise of government's coercive power. There were followed up inquiries and threats of prosecution. But even so, at last count, about half-a-million farmers are still holding out.

When government stops respecting the people, the people stop respecting government. What is happenig to all of us is really too bad. We want to respect our government, but bureaus and agencies carried away with their own purposes are making that extremely difficult. I'm sure the Census bureau with it's warehouse full of files takes a pride in knowing how much information, how many facts (including trivia) the bureau has on all of us. Those employed there probably get a sense of satisfaction in knowing their capability to answer virtually any question about us. But government isn't a glorified quiz show. What purpose can it serve for government to know how many families have more than one bathtub? Does knowing such a thing make government any better able to serve it's citizens? The answer, of course, is no.

Government has to know how many of us there are for purposes of Congressional representation. I'll even include knowing our ages and the breakdown on how many are male and female, but beyond that they are invading our privacy under threat of punishment if we say it's none of their business. And it is none of their business.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program titled "Sports and Religion" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

A few weeks ago having covered the news section, then the comics and the editorial page of the morning paper (and I do it in that order), I turned to the sports section. This doesn't mean that sports come last on my list of priorities — far from it. I'm just a creature of habit, set in my ways. My eye was caught by a four column photo of a basketball team and coach on the bench, heads bowed, or resting, on their crossed arms. I read the caption, thinking this must be a team that had just suffered a terrible defeat. I was wrong. Their heads were bowed not in grief but in prayer. They play under the title "Athletes In Action" (A.I.A.). And, as the caption writer couldn't resist pointing out, they are a team that prays together and plays together.

A.I.A., the sports arm of Campus Crusade for Christ, is headquartered in Tustin, California and hopes to represent the United States at the world championships in Manila in 1978. They may very well make it. Recently they overwhelmed the country's leading team, the University of San Francisco, 104 to 85; then rode over the highly ranked Nevada (Las Vegas) 104 to 77. Nevada went into the game averaging 53 rebounds a game — they got only 33 and A.I.A. had 64.

This is an amateur team that plays colleges and universities who can take the defeats handed them because they don't appear in their win/loss record. A.I.A.'s record at the time of the photo was 78 wins, 14 losses. Their total record for the season is 25-6 —all on the road. They have no home base. One of the players turned down a no-cut, two-year contract with a pro team that would have brought him 230,000 dollars. There are other former university stars who were high draft choices for pro ball. Their income is 700 dollars, if single, 900 dollars if married and it is not for playing basketball. They are ministers. When half time comes they don't go to the locker room for the coach's input on what to do in the second half. They towel themselves off, pick up microphones and tell the crowd of their belief in God.

The news article said the reaction is mixed. Sometimes they get attentive audiences but sometimes, on college campuses, they are booed, jeered and cursed by small, noisy groups. As one of them said though, "We just try to rise above it". And they must succeed, because between two and three thousand people have responded to their half-time messages by accepting God. In addition another 10,000 have responded by mail, asking for more information. Wherever they are, at home or on the road, they address civic groups, speak in churches and hold clinics in high schools and with coaches. And, they have a basketball team that some say could go up against the pros and give a good account of itself. After all, they have beaten the number one college team and, in the Midwest, broken a 48-game home winning streak of another top ranked university team. They have a faith that has enabled them to gamble that they can buy television time for thousands of dollars and put their games on television as delayed telecasts. I'm going to start looking for them. They just may be the best amateur team in the country and can get even better. Some of the nation's top stars are interested in joining them when their college days are over and the bait isn't basketball — it's faith in God.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program titled "Amtrak" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Fifty years ago Benito Mussolini began his career as dictator of Italy by making the trains run on time, a feat which brought him the admiration of many Americans. It was even seen by some as evidence that state-owned railroads were more efficient than privately-owned ones. Amtrak should forever end that delusion. Although it's only six years old, America's experiment in government-owned rail passenger service has already proved that anything private enterprise can do badly the government can do worse. Amtrak was created by an Act of Congress in 1970 to provide modern, efficient intercity rail passenger service at a profit. Private railroad companies put up nearly \$200 million in "seed" money to add to the original \$40 million federal grant. In its first year Amtrak lost \$148 million. Its losses have grown every year, and this year will exceed \$400 million. Amtrak itself says that its annual deficit will reach \$650 million by 1981. So much for profit. How about the modern, efficient service? Admittedly, privately-owned trains used to run late sometimes, but at least they got to their destinations. Amtrak is rapidly building a reputation for not getting there at all.

Take, for example, two recent incidents involving Amtrak's California Zephyr, which makes the 2000-mile run from Chicago to San Francisco. Just before Christmas the Zephyr left Chicago four and a half hours late with 280 holiday travelers. It got as far as Galesburg, Illinois, about 150 miles from Chicago, before it stopped. The cause? Flat spots on the wheels of its diesel locomotives. New locomotives were sent for, but they broke down before they reached Galesburg. The solution? Amtrak simply abandoned the train, which by then was 12 hours late, and sent its passengers to their destinations by bus and airplane.

In another incident the Zephyr ground to a halt just outside Reno, Nevada, 13 hours late and 200 miles short of its destination. There had been no mechanical failures on this trip, just a series of bureaucratically inspired delays, including the lack of a crew to replace one which had exhausted its allowable work time under federal regulations. Amtrak had to call police to keep order as it packed 200 angry passengers aboard buses bound for San Francisco. Is this any way to run a railroad? No, but it seems to be the only way, if you try to run it from Washington, D.C. Maybe we should have looked at the nationalized railroads in other countries. Canada has one privately run and one government operated. The government railroad has an annual loss of millions of dollars, the private one makes millions of dollars and pays taxes. In England, France, Japan and several other countries the railroads are government operated. In every country they lose money and, in some, charge higher rates than we do.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program titled "Free Press & Property Rights" -
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Does freedom of the press stand above and beyond the ordinary freedom of citizens to own and use their private property? Funny, but some American newspaper editors seem to think so. As one editorial put it not long ago, — QUOTE — "freedom of the press is not a property right. It is an intangible individual right which the Federal Constitution places at the top of the list of individual rights, without which all other rights are cheapened if not directly threatened..." — UNQUOTE.

The editorial writer either forgot or didn't know about the many attempts during history to control the freedom of the press by attacking the property rights of the publishers. Queen Elizabeth I of England, for example, was certainly no novice about employing the power of the state to stifle effective dissent. In 1568 she secured passage of a law that limited the number of printing presses that could exist in England. The law also zoned all of England (outside of London, Cambridge, and Oxford) as a "no printing zone". A man in Leeds or Manchester could own a slaughterhouse, but not publish a newspaper. That enabled the Queen to keep a close eye on what was published in her realm.

Other rulers have learned the same technique. During the Russian Revolution of 1917, before Lenin and the Bolsheviks had completely consolidated their power, the government's control of electricity was used to stop the publication of the anti-Bolsheviks anarchist newspaper. How? Lenin's henchmen simply turned off the power needed to run the anarchist press.

In the 1930's Governor Huey Long of Louisiana tried another version of controlling freedom of the press by striking at private property. He imposed a tax which fell only on the leading newspaper chain in Louisiana, a chain which was hostile to his programs. Fortunately, that law was struck down by the United States Supreme Court. In the brief Marxist regime of Salvador Allende in Chile, yet another attack on the property of the press was invented. Allende nationalized the banks. In this way he was able to refuse vital commercial credit to the newspapers unless they provided him with political support.

History is a good teacher, if we'll pay attention to its lessons. In this case, it's that freedom of the press, like every other human right, is based squarely upon the human right to acquire and possess private property. If that human right to property is undermined or destroyed, none of our rights and freedoms will be worth much for long.