

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

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

**Subseries:** A: Bob Garrick File

**Folder Title:** January 1976-February 1976  
(Copies of Statements) (2 of 2)

**Box:** 431

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

Ronald Reagan's reply to Boston GLOBE questionnaire:

DETENTE

I favor a policy of detente. It can be successful if it is a two-way street; a matter of equitable give-and-take. Its success rests, in turn, on equitable Strategic Arms Limitations (SALT) agreements. When we sit down at the bargaining table, we must always remember that the Soviet Union's representatives across the table will up as little as they have to, and take as much as they can get. They have a history of being tough negotiators. We ~~must~~<sup>must</sup> be, too.

In SALT I, we compromised our clear technological lead in the anti-ballistic missile system (ABM). Now we again have a technological lead with a new weapons system, the cruise missile, which could reverse our 25-year dependence on nuclear weapons for security. We must not sacrifice this advanced technology for some cosmetic concession by the Soviets.

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

There is nothing so complex about these matters that the facts about them should be withheld from the American people. In our constitutional republic the people must take part in policy decisions. When it comes to SALT II, our government should make public the tentative terms of any agreement before it goes to the Senate for debate as a treaty.

The balance of forces has been shifting gradually toward the Soviet Union since 1970. In order to negotiate successfully we must be strong enough militarily to assure ourselves and others that we are second to none.

We should not, however, use food as a "weapon" in negotiating with the Soviet Union. Food is not a finite commodity, like oil. New crops are produced each year and new technology continues to increase production levels. Brazil's production of soybeans, for example, has increased from 1.1 to 9.6 million tons in just six years.

Our government tried to use food as a weapon in the recent negotiations for ~~oil~~ <sup>oil</sup> with the U.S.S.R. By putting an embargo on American grain sales to the Soviet Union ~~last September~~, Washington simply encouraged the Russians to go elsewhere to buy 15 million tons of grain. The government, by changing the rules on our farmers in the middle of the game, caused them to lose sales of at least \$2.2 billion.

Sales of U.S. agricultural products to the Soviet Union in recent years have been a most important factor in converting American agriculture from an industry heavily dependent on federal subsidies to one of the most fully-employed and productive in the U.S. today.

Agricultural exports from the U.S. have gone from \$7.6 billion in 1971 to \$22.6 in 1975, improving our balance of trade. Yet, only 5% of our population is engaged in agriculture, compared with more than one-third of the Soviet Union's. Several poor harvests in a row have made the U.S.S.R. increasingly dependent on grain purchases. For the grain it has bought from us, it has paid U.S. dollars. In order to get those dollars, it has had to sell large amounts of its gold reserve on the world market.

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

RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 10, 1976

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

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

"In the last few decades a fourth branch of government has developed

Crossfiled Under:

Govt.  
Federal Reg. & Bur. 1-2  
Federal Spending 2  
Education - Federal Aid 2-3  
U.S. Foreign Policy 4-7  
Balance of Power 7-8  
SALT 7-9  
Panama 10

Boston Globe

Ronald Reagan on the People's Republic of China

For both the People's Republic of China and ourselves, rapprochement can offer benefits. The relationship can provide a counterweight to Soviet expansionism if it is nurtured carefully. At the same time, we have a commitment to our ally, the Nationalist Chinese government on Taiwan, and we should not withdraw our recognition of it. Indeed, even the mainland Chinese themselves might have doubts as to our reliability if they saw us forsaking our commitments.

2/13/76

Ronald Reagan's reply to Boston GLOBE questionnaire

U.S. WORLD ROLE

If our friends know they can rely on us in international matters, we won't have to worry about playing the role of "world policeman". But, unless we as a nation can achieve consensus -- a sense of unity and national purpose -- on international goals, our friends cannot be certain.

~~\_\_\_\_\_~~

I believe the American people will support a foreign policy that is well conceived and well-coordinated if ~~we~~ they have the information with which to understand the goals, objectives and stakes involved.

For now the proposed Defense Department budget for Fiscal Year 1977 appears to provide an opportunity for sufficient military defense capability. But, what is necessary to insure that we be second to none is always dependent upon the strength of our negotiating ~~posture~~ posture and the other side's military growth. We must spend what is necessary to keep pace.

Boston Globe

Ronald Reagan on Covert Activities

As a general matter I am not favorable to covert activities. If we in the United States can achieve consensus as to our goals internationally, the likelihood and need for them will decline.

Meanwhile, covert activities must be weighed one-by-one. If we were to always proclaim what we would or wouldn't do in advance, we would tie our hands and give warning to potential adversaries. Some situations might occur in which covert aid to our friends could discourage or blunt covert action by adversaries.

In cases such as Angola, where covert action becomes public, no purpose is served in failing to tell the American people what stakes are involved, what the objectives are and why the people should support them. These things were never fully explained, all the while the Administration and Congress were warring with each other over the issue.

2/13/76

RONALD REAGAN ON THE MIDDLE EAST

Ronald Reagan's reply to Boston GLOBE questionnaire:

MIDEAST

The United States has acted as a mediator in helping build a fragile but hopeful peace in the Middle East. The Arab-Israeli dispute is complex, partly because it is a case of there being "so much right" on both sides. We must continue to work carefully to move ~~forward~~ toward a settlement acceptable to both sides. Insuring the future of ~~the~~ the state of Israel must be part of a final settlement. The voice of the Palestinian Arabs must be heard, but I am not yet convinced that the PLO speaks for them.

Lebanon, prior to its current civil war, had been one of the few sources of stability in the Middle East. A peacemaking effort by neutral nations might have spared much of the bloodshed between Moslems and Christians. United States leadership in the matter, however, was absent. Now, the Palestine Liberation Army, acting as a proxy for Syria, seems to be the principal gainer in the Lebanon conflict. The delicate Arab-Israeli peace could be threatened by any further tilt in the balance of power.

I can foresee no circumstance in which the U.S. might resort to the use of force in the event of a new Arab oil embargo. Full development of our own petroleum, coal and nuclear resources -- augmented by more exotic sources -- will hasten the day we can be independent of Arab oil.

2/13/76



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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 14, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks  
by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
Orange County Florida,  
Republican Lincoln Day Dinner,  
Disney World,  
February 14, 1976

"Washington has set out to solve a great many problems. Often it has ended up making them more complicated. Take Social Security. It was predicated on the idea that the number of workers would always increase faster than the number of retired people. Now, it has turned out that the reverse is true.

"Today, there is a fiscal imbalance; an actuarial imbalance. For a short term this does not create a serious problem. For the long term -- by that I mean the year 2005 -- it will be serious if we don't take steps to avoid it. There are also inequities in the program. Women -- particularly those who work -- aren't treated equally. And, I have always believed that when we do reform Social Security, people who want to continue working after retirement age should be able to do so without losing their benefits.

"Studies are being made of the problem. The Quadrennial Advisory Council on Social Security completed its report last year. The House Ways and Means Committee, the Senate Finance Committee, the Office of Management & Budget and the Domestic Council are all studying it.

"What I believe is needed now is a Presidential Commission to give the problems comprehensive study and a complete airing. Its objectives should be to focus national attention on the problems; and to make recommendations that will strengthen and improve the Social Security program. Its members should be the best, most highly qualified people in the country.

more--more

"Such a Commission's guiding charge should be that any reform guarantees first that the benefits for those now receiving them, and those who expect to, will continue -- with adequate protection against the effects of inflation."

# # #

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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Manchester Armory, Manchester, New Hampshire  
Saturday, February 21, 1976

"The other day someone showed me a Gallup Poll and it's a poll that made me angry. And it continues to make me angry. This was, who in the country is best suited -- which party -- to solve the economic problems that confront us. And there it was, once again, our opponents at better than two-to-one: 40% to 18%. How long is it going to take us as Republicans to let the American people know that our opposition, the Democrats have been running the store for the last 40 years. There isn't an economic problem confronting the country that is not the direct result of the government interventionism that was spawned as a part of the Democratic philosophy, the kind of philosophy that made me leave that party a few years ago after spending most of my adult lifetime in support of the party of Jefferson and Jackson. Well, I found out that Jefferson and Jackson had been kicked out of the party a long time ago and so I followed them. Economic problems, they can solve unemployment? How have they solved it? In just my own lifetime, we've known four wars, all under Democratic Administrations. The only peace time full employment we've known under the Democratic Party has resulted from those wars. Check me on this. This isn't just a campaign statement of a Republican in an election year. They have never solved our economic problems. I'll tell you what they have done. Our ancestors landed in this country on a hostile shore, many of them, in the dead of winter. There wasn't even the most primitive shelter until they built it. They and their descendents went on through the years to build great cities. They

, more--more--more

2--2--2  
spread across the prairies creating farms, towns and cities -- St. Louis, Chicago, Kansas City and Denver. They became we and were built without an area redevelopment program of urban renewal. When a city like Chicago burned down, we built it up again without writing letters to our Congressmen. We've taken care of our needs. We've been the most independent people in the world. But what has happened to that America? Sure--there were jokes about our lack of sophistication -- the typical American tourist, Brash and conspicuous as he began to visit the old world, bent on acquiring a little culture. He was pretty much typical mainstream America and, yes, he was a little cocky like the one who stood listening to the tour guide, tell him all about the great power and heat generated by the volcano Vesuvius (sp?). He said, 'We've got a volunteer fire department at home that'll put that thing out in 15 minutes'.

"But today it seems we think out total responsibility as a citizen is to write to Washington asking for help. We have an intellectual elite that tells us as parents we don't know what our children should learn in school. Teachers picket and strike, not alone for more pay but for the right to tell us what our children will read; what textbooks they'll use; how they'll be taught, and what they'll learn. We're not supposed to have a voice in any of this. We've seen a philosophy of permissiveness that tells us we're responsible for crime in America. The victim should be blamed, because somehow we've created the social conditions that have made some among us turn to crime. Did poverty bring about crime? Go back and check the crime records during the depths of the great depression, when we knew greater poverty than at any other time. The crime rate was lower in America than at any other time in our history. I'd like to have some social scientist explain how it is that a family of 11 kids can be raised under one roof and only one becomes a criminal and the poverty of his childhood is to blame. What happened to

• more--morw--more

the other 10? Why didn't they turn to a life of crime? In these last four decades, power has been centralized in Washington. If you raise your voice and suggest giving power back to the people, returning authority to the local and the state levels of government as the Founding Fathers intended, you run afoul of an all powerful bureaucracy and one accused of everything intended, you run afoul of an all-powerful bureaucracy and one one accused of everything up to and including eating your young. Well, I don't eat my young, but I'm going to keep on preaching that we should give things back to the local and the state level and to the independent people of this country.

"We've had four -- or is it five, I lose count, but no more than that -- declared wars in our two hundred year history. Yet in our 200 years we have committed our armed forces to military action 158 times not for imperialism, nor to impose our will on others, but almost without exception to protect the freedom of others who couldn't protect their own. But only in this new era under that same leadership that has told us we can spend our way to prosperity did we commit what to me was a most unforgivable sin, a violation of our very belief in the sacredness of the individual. Young Americans were asked to fight and die for their country in a cause they were not allowed to win. That must never be allowed to happen again. There was a time, not too many years ago, when the differences among us stopped at the water's edge. We had a sense of national unity and purpose in the world. We lost it somewhere in Vietnam. We must regain it if we and our allies are to stay free in a world where others seek ultimate domination.

'How do we counter this external threat of communism? There is only one sound answer to this, and that is by increasing the strength and unity of the free world. We can end the conditions which invite Soviet aggression in only one way -- by transforming positions of weakness and positions of strength

and this cannot be done by any magic words, by slogans or radio exhortations. It can only be done by hand, patient building strength in the free world, enough military strength to deter overt aggression and enough economic and political and moral strength to deter subversion and infiltration. And this means collective strength, that is, strength exerted by the free peoples in concert so that, to an ever-increasing extent, the security of one becomes identical with the security of all.'

"Those words are not mine, but I am in complete agreement with them even though I did not support the author when he sought the presidency. The late Adlai Stevenson spoke those words nearly 24 years ago. They demonstrate as well as any words can the sense of national unity we once had.

"Today, we are told that our best hope for a secure future is a policy of detente with the Soviet Union. I favor the concept of detente, but it must be pursued with the understanding that we shall be second to none in our military defense capability.

"At the heart of detente are the Strategic Arms Limitations agreements -- SALT, as they are called. Detente can succeed only if we do not grant unnecessary concessions, as many believe we did in SALT I.

"SALT II is being negotiated now. We must proceed with great care, determined that any concessions we grant are matched equally by concessions from the other side.

"And, once a tentative agreement is reached, surely there can be nothing so secret about it that its terms must be withheld from the American people. In our constitutional republic, the people must participate in the development of policy. The only sure way to again reach national unity in the matter of our position in the world is for the people to be armed with the facts. They must know what is at stake, and what the alternatives are. Yet, it has been a long time since a President has specifically addressed the American people on the subject

program is actuarially out of balance. That is not a short-range problem, but it will become one by the year 2005 if we don't start taking steps to correct it. I have proposed that a Presidential Commission be established -- including the best minds in the country on the subject -- including the best minds in the country on the subject -- to study the problem and propose solutions. I have also said -- emphatically -- that the charge to such a Commission should begin with a guarantee that those who expect to will receive their benefits, and that those benefits will include safeguards against inflation.

"Some would have you believe that I advocate voluntary Social Security or investment of the funds in the stock market. I advocate no such thing and those of you who have heard me in these past weeks know that. I'm afraid some of those who have mis-stated my position know it too. We can only solve the problems in the Social Security program together -- with all of us a part of it.

"The decision that led to my being here tonite, asking you, my fellow Republicans in New Hampshire to approve my bid for the nomination was not a decision I made lightly. I am convinced we can not continue down the road chosen for us by the leadership of the Democratic party. A Republican victory is essential if this way of life we call America is to continue for our serves, our children and their children.

"I believe also that millions of Americans -- Democrats and Independents will rally to our support if we make it clear that we are determined to chart a different course; not just offer more of the same under different management. Thereofrm, victory for our party was a very important consideraton in making my decision.

"I pledged to you when I announced my decision that my campaign would be directed against the Democratic leadership, not my fellow

more--more--more

7--7--7  
Republicans and that I would do nothing divisive. I have and will continue to honor that pledge.

"Now, however, there are those who would invoke memories of 1964, suggesting that if I were the nominee, our party could not have the victory we all seek; that somehow my voice can only reach a very narrow segment of our people.

"This was said of me in 1966 when our party in California was still bitterly divided by the blood-letting of two years before. We Republicans are outnumbered more than three to two by Democrats in California and a large number of Californians remain independent with ties to no party. In 1966, I won election to the Governorship by a million votes and re-election in 1970 by almost 2/3 of a million.

"Tonight, I stand before you to ask your help Tuesday to get out to the polls every voter who shares our beliefs. For more than four decades, Washington -- with its buddy system, its establishment whose purpose seems to be self-perpetuation -- has been sapping the power of the people and their state and community governments. Administrations change; elections come and go, but the trend goes on. This time, I am asking your help to stop the trend. To turn it around. It's taken me awhile to get used to the idea that I'm standing here asking your support for the office of President. I feel a self consciousness that I'm sure all of you can understand. Whatever the circumstances that find me here in this position, let me tell you that I haven't got any instant solutions; but I do have a great belief in you and in the people of this country and, I'd like very much to get to Washington, D.C. and to try to put into practice the things that I believe and that I know will work in this country, as they worked in California. I've come to the conclusion that the best qualification that I have is that I'm not a part of the Washington Establishment; and I don't consider that a disadvantage.

(Q&A follows)

# # #



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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

Excerpts of remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Manchester Armory, Manchester, New Hampshire  
Saturday, February 21, 1976

"The other day someone showed me a Gallup Poll and it's a poll that  
made me angry. And it continues to make me angry. This was, who in the  
country is best suited -- which party -- to solve the economic problem

Crossfiled Under:

*Foreign Policy - 3*  
*SALT - 4*

For information:

Lyn Nofziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with the Governor)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 27, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Sertoma Dinner, Tampa Florida,  
February 27, 1976

"Recently, a story came to light which raises doubts as to just how well detente with the Soviet Union is working out. Early this month, our ambassador in Moscow, Walter Stoessel, Jr., told embassy personnel that the Soviets were beaming high intensity microwaves at the embassy as part of electronic eavesdropping on our communications.

"When he told his staff about the serious potential health hazard, he said the risk was greatest to pregnant women, with even a danger of leukemia. Americans working there were offered transfers elsewhere.

"It has been reported that our embassy in Moscow has also had a U.S. doctor examine two cases of lymphatic cancer and one of anemia to see if they are linked to the Soviet microwave radiation.

"Ambassador Stoessel's office gets most of the radiation and he has been identified as an anemia victim. He had the condition earlier, but it may have been aggravated by the microwaves.

"Low level microwave emissions had apparently been beamed at the embassy for several years, but why did the Soviets turn them up to high levels last spring? Why, when Dr. Kissinger protested, did they continue?

"Why, for that matter, was this danger kept secret for months from our people working in the embassy? Are we so awed by the Soviet leaders that we must be more concerned about their tender feelings than the health of our own citizens?"

# # #

Speech File

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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 21, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks  
by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at the Manchester Armory,  
Manchester, New Hampshire,  
Saturday, February 21, 1976

"There was a time, not too many years ago, when the differences among us stopped at the water's edge. We had a sense of national unity and purpose in the world. We lost it somewhere in Vietnam. We must regain it if we and our allies are to stay free in a world where others seek ultimate domination.

'How do we counter this external threat of communism? There is only one sound answer to this, and that is by increasing the strength and unity of the free world. We can end the conditions which invite Soviet aggression in only one way -- by transforming positions of weakness and positions of strength and this cannot be done by any magic words, by slogans or radio exhortations. It can only be done by hard, patient building of strength in the free world, enough military strength to deter overt aggression and enough economic and political and moral strength to deter subversion and infiltration. And this means collective strength, that is, strength exerted by the free peoples in concert so that, to an ever-increasing extent, the security of one becomes identical with the security of all.'

more--more--more

"Those words are not mine, but I am in complete agreement with them even though I did not support the author when he sought the Presidency. The late Adlai Stevenson spoke those words nearly 24 years ago. They demonstrate as well as any words can the sense of national unity we once had.

"Today, we are told that our best hope for a secure future is a policy of detente with the Soviet Union. I favor the concept of detente, but it must be pursued with the understanding that we shall be second to none in our military defense capability.

"At the heart of detente are the Strategic Arms Limitations agreements -- SALT, as they are called. Detente can succeed only if we do not grant unnecessary concessions, as many believe we did in SALT I.

"SALT II is being negotiated now. We must proceed with great care, determined that any concessions we grant are matched equally by concessions from the other side.

"And, once a tentative agreement is reached, surely there can be nothing so secret about it that its terms must be withheld from the American people. In our constitutional republic, the people must participate in the development of policy. The only sure way to again reach national unity in the matter of our position in the world is for the people to be armed with the facts. They must know what is at stake, and what the alternatives are. It has been too long a time since a President has specifically addressed the American people on the subject of national defense. It is time we told the American people what our adversaries must surely know. I am convinced that Americans want to preserve freedom and will do whatever is necessary to maintain a strong defense -- if they have the facts.

"Next Tuesday, the nation, even the world, will be watching New Hampshire. For the last seven weeks, I have visited villages, towns and cities all over your state. I have met thousands of you and addressed many more. Your sense of independence and pride is very apparent, and to me it is also inspiring.

"I have opened myself to your questions every chance I could get, so that I could find out what problems concerned you and what directions you want to see this nation take.

"In the course of this campaign, I have spoken often about the need to reverse the flow of our power in Washington. To bring back to state and community control programs which are neither efficiently managed by Washington nor responsive to the people's needs. Some 'candidates' for transfer are welfare, food stamps, education, housing, revenue sharing, regional development and Medicaid (but not Medicare).

"I have said that the process of transferring such programs -- along with the federal tax resources to pay for them -- will take time. It must be accompanied by a systematic blueprint for balancing the federal budget, but begin it we must, if the people are to regain the control over their own lives.

"Some have tried to make it appear that I favor transferring the programs, but not the tax resources. I think you know differently. Some even talk as if money from Washington was actually 'free'. Yet, you and I know that New Hampshire sends more than a dollar to Washington for every dollar it gets back. Washington simply extracts a freight charge as your money makes the round-trip.

"Many of you are concerned about the news that our Social Security program is actuarially out of balance. That is not a short-range problem, but it will become one by the year 2005 if we don't start

taking steps to correct it. I have proposed that a Presidential Commission be established -- including the best minds in the country on the subject -- to study the problem and propose workable solutions. I have also said -- emphatically -- that the charge to such a Commission should begin with a guarantee that those who are receiving their monthly benefits -- and those who expect to -- will get them, and that those benefits will include safeguards against inflation.

"There are inequities in the program. Women -- especially working women -- are not treated equally. And, one reform that I think should be high on our list is this: people who reach retirement age and want to work a few more years should be able to do so without losing their benefits.

"Some would have you believe that I advocate voluntary Social Security or investment of the funds in the stock market. I advocate no such thing and those of you who have heard me in these past weeks know that. I'm afraid some of those who have misstated my position have been badly advised. We can only solve the problems in the Social Security program together -- with all of us a part of it.

"The decision that led to my being here tonight, asking you, my fellow Republicans in New Hampshire to approve my bid for the nomination, was not a decision I made lightly. I am convinced we cannot continue down the road chosen for us by the leadership of the Democratic party. A Republican victory is essential if this way of life we call America is to continue for ourselves, our children and their children.

"I believe also that millions of Americans -- Democrats and Independents -- will rally to our support if we make it clear that we are determined to chart a different course; not just offer more of the same under different management. Therefore, ultimate victory for our party was a very important consideration in making my decision.

"I pledged to you when I announced my decision that my campaign would be directed against the Democratic leadership, not my fellow Republicans and that I would do nothing divisive. I have honored that pledge and will continue to do so.

"Now, however, there are those who would invoke memories of 1964, suggesting that if I were the nominee, our party could not have the victory we all seek; that somehow my voice can only reach a very narrow segment of our people.

"This was said of me in 1966 when our party in California was still bitterly divided by the political wounds of two years before. In California, we Republicans are outnumbered more than three-to-two by the Democrats, and a large number of Californians register as Independents, with ties to no party. In 1966, in that non-Republican state, I was elected Governor by a million votes. We swept six of the seven statewide offices and nearly overturned the Democratic big majority in the State Assembly. Four years later, I was reelected by more than half-a-million votes and we again took six of the seven statewide offices.

"Tonight I stand before you to ask your help to get to the polls next Tuesday every voter who shares our beliefs. For more than four decades, Washington -- with its buddy system, its establishment whose purpose seems to be self-perpetuation -- has been sapping the power of the people and their state and community governments. Administrations change; elections come and go, but the trend goes on. This time, I am asking your help to stop the trend. To turn it around.

"It's taken me awhile to get used to the idea that I'm standing here asking your support for the office of President. I feel a self-consciousness that I'm sure all of you can understand. Whatever the

6--6--6

circumstances that find me here in this position, let me tell you that I don't have any instant solutions. I do have a great belief in you and in the people of this country. And, I'd like very much to get to Washington, D. C., and to try to put into practice the things that I believe and that I know will work in this country, as they worked in California. I'm not a part of the Washington Establishment. I don't consider that a disadvantage. In fact, it may turn out to be the best qualification I have.

# # #



*Speech File*

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

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 21, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks  
by the Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at the Manchester Armory,  
Manchester, New Hampshire,  
Saturday, February 21, 1976

"There was a time, not too many years ago, when the differences  
among us stopped at the water's edge. We had a sense of national unity

Crossfiled Under:

*Detente 2*  
*SALT-2*  
*Social Security 3-4*

~~copy 5~~

February 28, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at the Young Republicans State Convention,  
Jacksonville, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

"There is one concern over all others about which people ask questions. It is our national security. They want peace; they would like a detente that works, but they are concerned.

"Well, so am I. Recently, the new Secretary of Defense described our strength as "roughly equivalent" to that of the Soviet Union. This raises a serious question. Are we second to none in our defense capability? Or, are we just second?

"Earlier this month, the Library of Congress released an 86-page study compiled by its senior national defense specialist. It stated that the Soviet Union has more missiles, more submarines and more men under arms than we do, and the superior quality of some of our equipment has, according to the report, 'never compensated completely' for the Russian advantage.

"According to the report, '...the quantitative balance continues to shift to the Soviet Union'.

"On the heels of this, we now learn that we have been badly misled in regard to the Soviet Union's commitment to military power. We had been told by our government that the Russians were spending between six and eight percent of their gross national product on their armed forces. The fact is they are spending twice as much as we had been told.

"The American people have a right to know to what degree our own defense posture and our foreign policy planning have been based on erroneous figures."

\* \* \*

"People are concerned about the Panama Canal. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States. A 1904 Panamanian court memorandum and a 1907 U.S. Supreme Court decision reinforced it. So did a 1972 U.S. federal

court decision. Unfortunately, Dr. Kissinger appeared to ignore this in early 1974 when he signed a memorandum with Panamanian Foreign Minister Juan Tack calling into question our sovereignty over the Canal.

"Why our government wants to give away the Panama Canal I cannot understand. There has never been a full explanation. State Department actions for several years have suggested that they are intimidated by the propaganda of Panama's military dictator, Fidel Castro's good friend, General Omar Torrijos. Torrijos and a military junta overthrew an elected government in 1968. They suspended civil rights, censored the press and haven't permitted an election since.

"Although Panama's economy and standard of living -- one of the highest in Latin America -- depend upon continuous successful operation of the Canal -- our State Department apparently believes the hints regularly dispensed by the Torrijos leftist regime that the Canal will be sabotaged if we don't hand it over.

"Our government has maintained a mouse-like silence as criticism of a giveaway has increased. Virtually unnoticed by the U.S. press is a February 18 article in Times of the Americas, reporting a telecast in Bogota, Colombia by Juan Tack, appearing on a program called 'Five Reporters and the Personality of the Week'. According to Tack, 'The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal and the 1,400 square kilometers that surround it because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty.'

"According to the Times of the Americas, 'Tack said that President Ford, in a message that has not been made public, proposed a compromise formula in which Panama's sovereignty over the Canal and the Zone is accepted. He said in the new round of talks which begin this month in Panama, "Agreement could be attained in the search for a new treaty draft which recognizes Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal".'

"Tack reportedly also supplied information exclusively to the Spanish News Service (EFE) to the effect that sovereignty over the Canal will be transferred on December 31, 1995.

"If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. They are due a full explanation. Presumably, Mr. Ford has not been fully informed by the State Department, for if he were I cannot imagine he would knowingly endorse such actions.

"I'll tell you one thing: If I am elected President, I will name my own Cabinet and that will include a new Secretary of State. "

# # #

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

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Young Republicans State Convention,  
Jacksonville, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

It's a great pleasure to be here and I am appreciative to you for giving me the opportunity to come and speak to you and perhaps say a few things that maybe I haven't had a chance to say along the campaign trail so far. I've been telling some people that, you know, the campaign trail and what you say or don't say, or the way you say it, can have great repercussions; and pretty soon you find yourself not knowing what to answer when they ask you do you want coffee or tea for fear it might be misinterpreted. I've illustrated that by telling about the young lady that left home for a few days and put her house and her cat in charge of the village handyman (Story). .....

You know, I'm sure that many of you, over the year 1975, and at least up until November 20, thought that perhaps I was playing some kind of a game with regard to a decision that I felt I had to make, but that I didn't know what it was going to be. It was no political game. I don't think anyone has ever prayed harder and hoped more that there would be no necessity, or need at all, for any other candidate to enter the Republican race. In making my decision, part of the decision was based on, first of all, a consideration -- the most important consideration of all -- that our party must be victorious. This country cannot continue down the road we have been going for the last four decades.

Barry Goldwater walked his lonely road 12 years ago, trying to warn the people; but the people weren't quite ready. He was a sort of John the Baptist. Today, I think the people are aware and ready to accept that we cannot continue -- that we have come to the moment of decision -- a real time for choosing. And, so, this was a part of my trying to make up my mind. What I might do for, or against, that possibility of victory. Next, of course, was the fact that, the concern that I might be divisive if I made the decision. There are so many of you; and as I went around the country speaking, writing my columns and doing the radio program, it seemed to me there was a sizeable element within our party that believed there should be a choice, that the decision had not been made by them, or for them, and therefore they believed we should continue with the open primary. Now, finally, I made the decision. Electability, of course, had to be part of the consideration. Now that has

more--more

become a part -- an issue -- in this campaign. Not by me. I have tried my best to not be divisive and I don't intend to be divisive. I will abide by our 11th Commandment. But the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said it is possible to be loyal to your government and still disagree with the policies of those in power. And I feel that there are some disagreements.

With regard to electability, the two candidates that you will choose between March 9 here in the primary, one has been elected and reelected many times from his Congressional District and has served his Congressional District well. The other one has been elected twice as Governor of a state -- the State of California. Now, as to electability, because this has been made an issue suggesting that perhaps I have a narrow base of a segment of our party, part of my decision was based on the knowledge that the Republicans are now only 20% of the registered voters of this country and no one is going to get elected on the Republican ticket, even if he has 100% turn-out of Republicans -- that we're only going to win in November if we can raise a banner that will attract a surrounding of Democrats and Independents -- Americans all of whom are concerned about the state of this country and the fact that it has been brought to the brink of economic ruin.

In California, in 1966, the Republican Party was as shattered as a party can possibly be. The very bitter primary -- the most bitter, I think, in the entire nation -- had taken place there. Barry Goldwater had run and had won, but the Republican Party was a shambles. Two years later -- or less than two years later -- confronted with the Gubernatorial race -- when I entered that race -- we put the Republican Party together. But more than that, California is Democratic better than three-to-two in registration. California has a bloc of independent voters and had even then outnumbered Republicans. We won by a million votes and won reelection four years later by what was called a landslide margin -- not quite as big as the million, but better than a half-million votes. Electability, therefore, of course in New Hampshire I was kind of excited when -- not only by the fact that we got better than 49.5% of the votes, but also by the fact that more than 1500 Democrats at latest count had written my name in on their side of the ballot.

Now, there has also been the suggestion that there are no differences in the campaign. Some have said to me that by observing the 11th Commandment I have helped bring this about -- that there are no issues -- that the two candidates are so much alike -- and then some, of course, naturally on the other side suggested if that is so, then why don't we stay with the incumbent. I would like to discuss that a little bit and I'll start with

something that maybe some of you have heard me talk about before.

The state of California is a microcosm (sp) of this nation. It's the largest, most populous state in the Union; 22 million citizens; 1100 miles of coastline; and from the north with the great lumbering industry, we go to the south with the fishing industry. Down in our central valley, we have the largest agricultural state in the nation -- 40% of the vegetables and fruits on the dining tables of America come from California. We have great manufacturing; and we have great cities with all the urban problems that confront the nation. California, if it were a nation, would be the seventh ~~ranked~~ ranking economic power in the world. That state, and its state government when I became Governor, was virtually in the same condition as New York City is today. The previous Administration had been a little brother to Big Brother in Washington for the preceding eight years. Every time Washington sneezed, the gazundtheit (sp) was heard in California. The state was spending a million-and-a-half dollars a day more than it was taking in. They had covered with the bookkeeping tricks the fact that they had been spending on a deficit basis for several years before. They had used up a reserve which the Attorney General, when it was discovered, told us that we were now in charge -- that it had to be put back in the remaining few months of the fiscal year because of the Constitution, or we would be in violation of the Constitution. A tax increase was necessary at that particular time. The Teachers Retirement Fund was an unfunded \$4 billion liability hanging over every property owner in the state. The water project was underfunded and unfinished. When we raised the taxes because of the absolute necessity in the first few months of my term, I said to the people that as soon as it was possible -- I considered it temporary -- we would return that money to the people. We turned to the people of California -- and perhaps this is one of the differences between the candidates in this primary. I happen to believe that government belongs to the people -- and faced with the great problem -- the disaster hanging over us -- and it's a disaster, as I said, like New York -- but, you know, New York's disaster is not too different from that of Washington. The only difference between the two is Washington has a printing press. But, we gathered in a room the people of California that represented probably the most expert, talented people in their various lines -- a number of activities -- gathered them and told them what our proposal was -- that we needed them -- we needed their services and we needed them at no cost to the taxpayers. Hundreds of Californians volunteered. Literally the leadership of the state. They organized themselves into task forces -- the leading hotel men in the state went into our prisons and hospitals to see how the housekeeping chores were being done. They went into 64 agencies and departments



of state government and came back to us with 1800 recommendations as to how modern business practices could be employed to put the state back on a sound footing and to make the state government more efficient -- more economic. We implemented more than 1600 of those recommendations. And, then, eight years went by and we turned over to the new Administration just a little over a year ago, a balanced a budget. They were the first new Administration in a quarter of a century to be handed such a thing in California. We handed them a \$500 million surplus. The government had been increasing its payroll by 5,000 to 7,000 new employees each year -- we turned over to them virtually same number of employees we had inherited eight years before, although the workload was increased due to our increase in population was such that many departments had absorbed the 66% workload increase with the same number of employees. One department not only had done that, but was turning out the work in one-fourth the time it had previously taken.

The Teachers Retirement Fund is on a sound actuarial basis -- fully funded. We gave the \$500 million surplus, as I said. But, in addition, we completed the water project without going to the taxpayers for more money; and we returned to the taxpayers, as we promised we would, in rebates and tax cuts, \$5,761,000,000. In addition to the temporary times, these people gave up 117 days -- this is what they averaged full-time -- at no cost to the taxpayers -- away from their own businesses and their own professions. We went farther with regard to the people that we would choose for appointment to government -- who would hold the appointed positions and the Cabinet positions in our government. We appointed a committee that we said was not a screening committee -- it was a recruiting committee. I gave them two directives -- the one ahead of this, the obvious directive, of course, was that they be the best qualified for the job -- but then I told them that I wanted people that met two requirements: Number one, that they did not seek a job or career in government. Now, this may sound like just window-trimming; it isn't. One of the great problems of government is the professional person in government who empire-builds and makes government bigger because it enhances his own position and his importance if he can add to his own department or agency or whatever it is and make it larger and larger and employ more and more employees; so the first requirement: they didn't want a career in government. The second requirement: they'd be the first to come and tell me if their job was unnecessary. And, I had one do it -- within four months, walked in and threw the key to his office on my desk; told me he'd wound down the agency completely; it no longer existed; he was going back to his regular job; and to this day I've never found out where the agency was. We've never missed it.

more--more



The welfare program was runaway. It was increasing in California at a rate of about 40,000 new recipients a month. We turned again to the people for a task force. For seven months they gave of their time and then came to us with the most comprehensive program of welfare reform that has ever been attempted. We implemented that program of welfare reform. Not as easily as I make it sound because we had a hostile Democratic Legislature. I've been answering questions of audiences all around in this campaign so far, and many times they say, "How would a Republican President fare with a Democratic Congress?" Well, I think they should go beyond that: How would it fare with what I believe is the most irresponsible Democratic Congress that we've had in my lifetime? But, I had a Legislature for seven of the eight years that was just as irresponsible; just as liberal; and just as Democratic as the Congress of the United States. And I learned something else. Again we went to the people -- on the matter of welfare reform, on other great issues, reforms that we needed, the tax reform, even the giving the money back to the people. When I proposed that, I have described that as like getting between the hog and the bucket. One Democratic Senator said to me that giving the money back to the people was an unnecessary expenditure of public funds. But, we did it. We went to the people on these issues and I've described what happened as the people not making the Legislature see the light, but making them feel the heat. I believe it is long since time that a President of the United States, confronted with what the Republican Presidents have been in the last few sessions, should take his case over the heads of the Congress to the people of this country and tell the people of the problems ~~fixing~~ confronting us, tell the people what the solutions are that are proposed and what the result would be if those are put into practice and I believe the people of this country would make the Congress of the United States respond.

Now, I realize that a number of things have been said in this campaign about positions of the two and whether, as I said before, there are any differences ~~between~~ between us. I believe there are. I believe there are differences between us with regard to the domestic situation. And one of the reasons I made my decision was because as of yesterday morning, I received a call from Washington that the United States government had gone \$95 billion into debt than it was just one year ago yesterday morning. We cannot continue down that path; we cannot continue on a path on which a budget is submitted that tells us that we're going to have a deficit next year of \$43.5 billion and then we find out that bookkeeping tricks have been used and that a half-dozen government programs are not included in the budget -- including the post office. They, too, will have a deficit, but that doesn't show up in more--more

advance. We'll only know it when the books are balanced at the end of the year. We can't continue this way. We can't continue a government of deficit spending that is added to the inflation -- or created the inflation -- and that, in turn, has brought about the recurrent recessions and the unemployment. Someone said to me today, "Yes, but things are looking better now -- they're looking up." That's right. And in the so-called Nixon recession of 1970, when we took such ~~xxxrmp~~ a drubbing in the campaign of that year, in 1971 they started looking up with the '72 election ahead because we resorted to all sorts of expedients and temporary recession emergency measures, and so forth, and unemployment began to climb again and inflation went down. We had an unemployment rate then of six or seven percent. We had an ~~inx~~ inflation rate of six percent that went down to 2.4% and the '72 election was a triumph for Republicans. And, then, in 1973, if you will remember, the inflation became 12% and the unemployment rate became nine or ten percent, and on through '74. Now we're seeing the result of the same kind of pallatives (sp) that we saw before, and I'm quite sure that the rest of the year will look fair. But what's going to happen in '77 and '78? No, disaster lies down that road. What is needed? I heard a voice from Washington the other night saying that what we need is a continuity of government. That one of the reasons that one of the candidates should be chosen is ~~thatxxxxwillixx~~ because we will continue. Well, if we'd have had a continuity of government in California, the state would have been bankrupt. I do not believe that we can afford a continuity of government if it means simply continuing at perhaps a slower pace, but down the same path of adding to the power and strength of the bureaucracy, deficit spending, tinkering with the economy now and then to give first aid, and then going into worse recessions, and worse unemployment and higher inflation all of the time. I believe we've come to a moment where, just as nine years ago in California we needed it, what we need is a turn-around, a change of direction and course at the national level.

I do not believe it is divisive, but I believe that there's going to be a choice -- that you have a right to hear what I think are some of the differences between the candidates. I have told you what my view is with regard to the kind of people you seek for government. I would seek my Cabinet and I would seek appointees from the ranks of the citizenry, from people who do not consider themselves career government employees, but people who were willing to give some of their time to serve their country ~~inx~~ in public office with the thought of correcting the problems that are wrong -- not continuing in office indefinitely. I happen to disagree ~~xxxxx~~ with the idea that you can continue to fill the appointee ~~ix~~ positions in government with former members

xx of Congress and members of the bureaucracy, and people who have been part of the establishment for the last four decades have been bringing on the problems confronting us today. I do not believe that we can continue with the kind of energy legislation we have had and solve the problem of energy shortages that is going to confront us in the very near future. I believe the energy legislation now, in effect, is a disaster. We were only importing 14 to 16 percent of our oil from the Arab nations a few years ago when we lined up in those long lines at the oil stations when the embargo was put on. We're rapidly approaching an import level of 40% now x and very shortly it will be more than half and what do we do then if there is an embargo? I do not believe that we can continue down this same road of trying to get along with the irresponsible Congress that I've decided I believe the time has come to take on that Congress in an adversary relationship and take the case to the people and let the people of America make the decision.

There is one concern above all others that the people ask question about in the meetings that I've gone to. They want peace. The American people want detente when it works. But they're concerned about the national security. Well, so am I. And just recently, the x new Secretary of Defense described our strength as "roughly equivalent" to that of the Soviet Union. "Roughly equivalent" is in quotes. What does he mean by "roughly equivalent"? Are we second to none in our defense capability? Or, are we just second?

The Library of Congress has released an 86-page study compiled by the senior national defense specialist there. He has stated that the Soviet Union has more missiles, more submarines and more men under arms than we do, and the superior quality of some of our equipment has "never compensated completely" for this Russian advantage.

According to the report, "...the quantitative balance continues to shift to the Soviet Union". That's a polite way, or bureaucrats, of saying they're getting farther ahead of us every day. Now we learn that we've been badly misled about the Soviet Union's commitment to military power. We had been told that they are spending six to eight percent of the gross national product for the armed forces. That's roughly about what we've been spending. Now we learn they are spending twice that much.

The American people have a right to know to what degree our defensive posture and our foreign policy have been based on erroneous figures; where we stand with the Russians; and what we're doing about it. I believe that Secretary Schlessinger was fired because he was trying to tell the American people these facts and warn us that we could not continue down that road without being second to the Soviet Union.

Not just in Florida, but even way up in New Hampshire and over in Illinois in the midwest, one of the first questions asked in any question-and-answer session is about the Panama Canal. People are concerned about that -- and rightly so. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States. A 1904 Panamanian Government -- all three branches separately -- agreed that the sovereignty of the canal zone belonged with the United States. A 1907 U.S. Supreme Court reinforced this view. So did a 1972 U.S. federal court decision. Unfortunately, Dr. Kissinger ignored this in early 1974 when he signed a memorandum with his counterpart, the Foreign Minister, Juan Tack, which called into question our sovereignty over the canal. There has never been a full explanation of why our government wants to give away the Panama Canal Zone.

The State Department recently appealed to the American business interests who had holdings in Latin America to help them sell the idea of giving up the Canal Zone to the American people on the grounds that the Panamanian Dictator, Omar Torrijos, was threatening sabotage, not only of the Canal, but of the American holdings in private businesses. These threats were made by Fidel Castro's friend, the General Torrijos who overthrew the duly-elected government in 1968. He denies the Panama people civil liberties, he censors the press, and there hasn't been an election since 1968. How can the State Department suggest that the United States pay blackmail to this dictator -- because that's exactly what it is.

Panama's economy and standard of living is one of the highest in Latin America because of our continuous successful operation of the Canal. Our government has maintained a mouse-like silence as criticism of a giveaway has increased. Virtually unnoticed by the United States press is a February 18 article in Times of the Americas, reporting that Foreign Minister Tack has said, "The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal and the 1,400 square kilometers that surround it because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty." Tack then said that the President, in a message that has not yet been made public, has proposed a compromise formula in which Panama's sovereignty over the Canal and the Zone is accepted.

Tack reportedly also has supplied information exclusively to the Spanish News Service to the effect that sovereignty over the Canal will be transferred on December 31, 1995 under this agreement.

If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. They deserve a full explanation. Presumably the President has not been fully informed by

9--9--9

the State Department. If he were, I cannot imagine he would knowingly endorse such actions.

When it comes to the Canal, we bought it, we paid for it, it's ours, and we should tell General Torrijos it's going to remain ours.

And, I will tell you one additional thing. If I am elected President of the United States, I will name a new Secretary of State.

As I said before, I believe these things have had to be states because there have been issues brought up which did not properly describe my position -- they continue to be brought up -- and because of this belief that we are waging some kind of a contest within our party in which there is really no importance as to what the decision might be. I've tried to state to you what I believe about government. I believe that government should be taken to the people. I believe that the bureaucracy in Washington must be dismantled to the extent of bringing it down to where it is no longer the master, that it becomes again the servant of the people. I believe that the authority and autonomy should be returned to state and local governments and that individual freedom should be enhanced. I believe that the budget should be balanced. I believe that the budget can be balanced. They say, "Well, it's uncontrollable; three-fourths of the budget is frozen into the budget by acts and statutes of Congress." Well, statutes of Congress can be repealed by Congress. And, since this Congress hasn't done it, it's high time we elect a Republican Congress that will.

We have heard talk for the last two years in Washington about doing something about the excessive paperwork that adds \$50 billion a year to the cost of the things we buy. And, last year the amount of paperwork required by government increased by 20%. We have been told about deregulating -- turning this economy loose so that it can expand to meet our needs and provide the jobs for our people. Well, the kind of regulations that are harrassing the business and industry are illustrated by some that you can laugh at them, and yet at the same time they are tragic. One business concern reports that last year -- one year alone -- in filling or meeting government regulatory requirements it spending \$30 million. In that particular industry, \$30 million would provide 3400 factory jobs. Another industry was told by a government agency that all of the protective guardrails in their industry that were 41" high and 43" high had to be torn down and replaced because the regulation of OSHA says they have to be 42" high. I don't know how high the workers are -- whether they should fit them -- or maybe there will be a regulation about that someday. We have the conflicting regulations that are besetting education, that are besetting industry, that are besetting our professionals in every area to the place that no longer are we free. I believe all of this has to be turned around. I

10--10--10

believe it can be turned around. I believe it can be turned around bettern by someone who is not part of the establishment. I don't have any magic solutions; I don't have any plans in my pocket that I can offer you that this will instantly cure this problem or that. But I do have a great faith in the ability of the people and in the knowledge that the people of this country have more talent and managerial skill and expertise than government could ever possibly afford and I believe the people of this country are dying to make it available.

I am not a part of the Washington Establishment and I don't consider that a disadvantage. I guess maybe that's the principal difference between us as candidates and the fact that I do not believe that we should have a continuity of what's been going on for these last too many years.

In New Hampshire, in one of the last question-and-answer sessions, a little girl asked a question. She stood up when I said "questions" and she was only about six years old and she asked, "Why do you want to be President?" And she kind of had me. And I finally gave an answer -- it wasn't a very good answer -- but I gave some kind of an answer to her. It wasn't until we were up in the airplane -- up there in the dark on our way to the next stop that I said to Nancy, "You know, I know the answer. I didn't give it; but I know, really, what the answer to her question was. I just really, down in my heart would like to feel that someday very soon, that little girl, and children younger, and children a little older, will be able to grow up in an America that will be as free for them as it was for me when I was that age growing up."

Ladies and gentlemen, I'll tell you now, and I frankly solicit your support. It wasn't easy for me to make the decision to do this. It still isn't easy for me to talk about it and propose myself for this. But, I'll tell you now, I want very much to go to Washington, D.C. and to take on that

more--more

11-11-11

bureaucracy and to see if we can't make work at a national level what we made work at a state level in California; and I'm convinced in my heart that it can with the help of the people of the United States. And, I want the opportunity to do that -- to give government back to the people of this country, where it belongs.

Thank you.

# # #

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Young Republicans State Convention,  
Jacksonville, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

It's a great pleasure to be here and I am appreciative to you for giving me the opportunity to come and speak to you and perhaps say a few things that maybe I haven't had a chance to say along the campaign trail so far. I've been telling some people that, you know, the campaign trail and what you say or don't say, or the way you say it, can have great repercussions; and pretty

Crossfiled Under:

Republicans 1-2

Balance of Power ?

Panama 8-9

Federal Regulations - Impact 9

~~Copy 3-5~~



Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Young Republicans State Convention,  
Jacksonville, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

It's a great pleasure to be here and I am appreciative to you for giving me the opportunity to come and speak to you and perhaps say a few things that maybe I haven't had a chance to say along the campaign trail so far. I've been telling some people that, you know, the campaign trail and what you say or don't say, or the way you say it, can have great repercussions; and pretty soon you find yourself not knowing what to answer when they ask you do you want coffee or tea for fear it might be misinterpreted. I've illustrated that by telling about the young lady that left home for a few days and put her house and her cat in charge of the village handyman (Story). .....

You know, I'm sure that many of you, over the year 1975, and at least up until November 20, thought that perhaps I was playing some kind of a game with regard to a decision that I felt I had to make, but that I didn't know what it was going to be. It was no political game. I don't think anyone has ever prayed harder and hoped more that there would be no necessity, or need at all, for any other candidate to enter the Republican race. In making my decision, part of the decision was based on, first of all, a consideration -- the most important consideration of all -- that our party must be victorious. This country cannot continue down the road we have been going for the last four decades.

Barry Goldwater walked his lonely road 12 years ago, trying to warn the people; but the people weren't quite ready. He was a sort of John the Baptist. Today, I think the people are aware and ready to accept that we cannot continue -- that we have come to the moment of decision -- a real time for choosing. And, so, this was a part of my trying to make up my mind. What I might do for, or against, that possibility of victory. Next, of course, was the fact that, the concern that I might be divisive if I made the decision. There are so many of you; and as I went around the country speaking, writing my columns and doing the radio program, it seemed to me there was a sizeable element within our party that believed there should be a choice, that the decision had not been made by them, or for them, and therefore they believed we should continue with the open primary. Now, finally, I made the decision. Electability, of course, had to be part of the consideration. Now that has

more--more

become a part -- an issue -- in this campaign. Not by me. I have tried my best to not be divisive and I don't intend to be divisive. I will abide by our 11th Commandment. But the first Republican President, Abraham Lincoln, said it is possible to be loyal to your government and still disagree with the policies of those in power. And I feel that there are some disagreements.

With regard to electability, the two candidates that you will choose between March 9 here in the primary, one has been elected and reelected many times from his Congressional District and has served his Congressional District well. The other one has been elected twice as Governor of a state -- the State of California. Now, as to electability, because this has been made an issue suggesting that perhaps I have a narrow base of a segment of our party, part of my decision was based on the knowledge that the Republicans are now only 20% of the registered voters of this country and no one is going to get elected on the Republican ticket, even if he has 100% turn-out of Republicans -- that we're only going to win in November if we can raise a banner that will attract a surrounding of Democrats and Independents -- Americans all of whom are concerned about the state of this country and the fact that it has been brought to the brink of economic ruin.

In California, in 1966, the Republican Party was as shattered as a party can possibly be. The very bitter primary -- the most bitter, I think, in the entire nation -- had taken place there. Barry Goldwater had run and had won, but the Republican Party was a shambles. Two years later -- or less than two years later -- confronted with the Gubernatorial race -- when I entered that race -- we put the Republican Party together. But more than that, California is Democratic better than three-to-two in registration. California has a bloc of independent voters and had even then outnumbered Republicans. We won by a million votes and won reelection four years later by what was called a landslide margin -- not quite as big as the million, but better than a half-million votes. Electability, therefore, of course in New Hampshire I was kind of excited when -- not only by the fact that we got better than 49.5% of the votes, but also by the fact that more than 1500 Democrats at latest count had written my name in on their side of the ballot.

Now, there has also been the suggestion that there are no differences in the campaign. Some have said to me that by observing the 11th Commandment I have helped bring this about -- that there are no issues -- that the two candidates are so much alike -- and then some, of course, naturally on the other side suggested if that is so, then why don't we stay with the incumbent. I would like to discuss that a little bit and I'll start with

something that maybe some of you have heard me talk about before.

The state of California is a microcosm (9sp) of this nation. It's the largest, most populous state in the Union; 22 million citizens; 1100 miles of coastline; and from the north with the great lumbering industry, we go to the south with the fishing industry. Down in our central valley, we have the largest agricultural state in the nation -- 40% of the vegetables and fruits on the dining tables of America come from California. We have great manufacturing; and we have great cities with all the urban problems that confront the nation. California, if it were a nation, would be the seventh ~~XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ ranking economic power in the world. That state, and its state government when I became Governor, was virtually in the same condition as New York City is today. The previous Administration had been a little brother to Big Brother in Washington for the preceding eight years. Every time Washington sneezed, the gazundtheit (sp) was heard in California. The state was spending a million-and-a-half dollars a day more than it was taking in. They had covered with the bookkeeping tricks the fact that they had been spending on a deficit basis for several years before. They had used up a reserve which the Attorney General, when it was discovered, told us that we were now in charge -- that it had to be put back in the remaining few months of the fiscal year because of the Constitution, or we would be in violation of the Constitution. A tax increase was necessary at that particular time. The Teachers Retirement Fund was an unfunded \$4 billion liability hanging over every property owner in the state. The water project was underfunded and unfinished. When we raised the taxes because of the absolute necessity in the first few months of my term, I said to the people that as soon as it was possible -- I considered it temporary -- we would return that money to the people. We turned to the people of California -- and perhaps this is one of the differences between the candidates in this primary. I happen to believe that government belongs to the people -- and faced with the great problem -- the disaster hanging over us -- and it's a disaster, as I said, like New York -- but, you know, New York's disaster is not too different from that of Washington. The only difference between the two is Washington has a printing press. But, we gathered in a room the people of California that represented probably the most expert, talented people in their various lines -- a number of activities -- gathered them and told them what our proposal was -- that we needed them -- we needed their services and we needed them at no cost to the taxpayers. Hundreds of Californians volunteered. Literally the leadership of the state. They organized themselves into task forces -- the leading hotel men in the state went into our prisons and hospitals to see how the housekeeping chores were being done. They went into 64 agencies and departments

of state government and came back to us with 1800 recommendations as to how modern business practices could be employed to put the state back on a sound footing and to make the state government more efficient -- more economic. We implemented more than 1600 of those recommendations. And, then, eight years went by and we turned over to the new Administration just a little over a year ago, a balanced a budget. They were the first new Administration in a quarter of a century to be handed such a thing in California. We handed them a \$500 million surplus. The government had been increasing its payroll by 5,000 to 7,000 new employees each year -- we turned over to them virtually same number of employees we had inherited eight years before, although the workload was increased due to our increase in population was such that many departments had absorbed the 66% workload increase with the same number of employees. One department not only had done that, but was turning out the work in one-fourth the time it had previously taken.

The Teachers Retirement Fund is on a sound actuarial basis -- fully funded. We gave the \$500 million surplus, as I said. But, in addition, we completed the water project without going to the taxpayers for more money; and we returned to the taxpayers, as we promised we would, in rebates and tax cuts, \$5,761,000,000. In addition to the temporary times, these people gave up 117 days -- this is what they averaged full-time -- at no cost to the taxpayers -- away from their own businesses and their own professions. We went farther with regard to the people that we would choose for appointment to government -- who would hold the appointed positions and the Cabinet positions in our government. We appointed a committee that we said was not a screening committee -- it was a recruiting committee. I gave them two directives -- the one ahead of this, the obvious directive, of course, was that they be the best qualified for the job -- but then I told them that I wanted people that met two requirements: Number one, that they did not seek a job or career in government. Now, this may sound like just window-trimming; it isn't. One of the great problems of government is the professional person in government who empire-builds and makes government bigger because it enhances his own position and his importance if he can add to his own department or agency or whatever it is and make it larger and larger and employ more and more employees; so the first requirement: they didn't want a career in government. The second requirement: they'd be the first to come and tell me if their job was unnecessary. And, I had one do it -- within four months, walked in and threw the key to his office on my desk; told me he'd wound down the agency completely; it no longer existed; he was going back to his regular job; and to this day I've never found out where the agency was. We've never missed it.

The welfare program was runaway. It was increasing in California at a rate of about 40,000 new recipients a month. We turned again to the people for a task force. For seven months they gave of their time and then came to us with the most comprehensive program of welfare reform that has ever been attempted. We implemented that program of welfare reform. Not as easily as I make it sound because we had a hostile Democratic Legislature. I've been answering questions of audiences all around in this campaign so far, and many times they say, "How would a Republican President fare with a Democratic Congress?" Well, I think they should go beyond that: How would it fare with what I believe is the most irresponsible Democratic Congress that we've had in my lifetime? But, I had a Legislature for seven of the eight years that was just as irresponsible; just as liberal; and just as Democratic as the Congress of the United States. And I learned something else. Again we went to the people -- on the matter of welfare reform, on other great issues, reforms that we needed, the tax reform, even the giving the money back to the people. When I proposed that, I have described that as like getting between the hog and the bucket. One Democratic Senator said to me that giving the money back to the people was an unnecessary expenditure of public funds. But, we did it. We went to the people on these issues and I've described what happened as the people not making the Legislature see the light, but making them feel the heat. I believe it is long since time that a President of the United States, confronted with what the Republican Presidents have been in the last few sessions, should take his case over the heads of the Congress to the people of this country and tell the people of the problems ~~confronting~~ confronting us, tell the people what the solutions are that are proposed and what the result would be if those are put into practice and I believe the people of this country would make the Congress of the United States respond.

Now, I realize that a number of things have been said in this campaign about positions of the two and whether, as I said before, there are any differences ~~between~~ between us. I believe there are. I believe there are differences between us with regard to the domestic situation. And one of the reasons I made my decision was because as of yesterday morning, I received a call from Washington that the United States government had gone \$95 billion into debt than it was just one year ago yesterday morning. We cannot continue down that path; we cannot continue on a path on which a budget is submitted that tells us that we're going to have a deficit next year of \$43.5 billion and then we find out that bookkeeping tricks have been used and that a half-dozen government programs are not included in the budget -- including the post office. They, too, will have a deficit, but that doesn't show up in



advance. We'll only know it when the books are balanced at the end of the year. We can't continue this way. We can't continue a government of deficit spending that is added to the inflation -- or created the inflation -- and that, in turn, has brought about the recurrent recessions and the unemployment. Someone said to me today, "Yes, but things are looking better now -- they're looking up." That's right. And in the so-called Nixon recession of 1970, when we took such ~~xxxmp~~ a drubbing in the campaign of that year, in 1971 they started looking up with the '72 election ahead because we resorted to all sorts of expedients and temporary recession emergency measures, and so forth, and unemployment began to climb again and inflation went down. We had an unemployment rate then of six or seven percent. We had an ~~ixt~~ inflation rate of six percent that went down to 2.4% and the '72 election was a triumph for Republicans. And, then, in 1973, if you will remember, the inflation became 12% and the unemployment rate became nine or ten percent, and on through '74. Now we're seeing the result of the same kind of pallatives (sp) that we saw before, and I'm quite sure that the rest of the year will look fair. But what's going to happen in '77 and '78? No, disaster lies down that road. What is needed? I heard a voice from Washington the other night saying that what we need is a continuity of government. That one of the reasons that one of the candidates should be chosen is ~~thatxxxxixixx~~ because we will continue. Well, if we'd have had a continuity of government in California, the state would have been bankrupt. I do not believe that we can afford a continuity of government if it means simply continuing at perhaps a slower pace, but down the same path of adding to the power and strength of the bureaucracy, deficit spending, tinkering with the economy now and then to give first aid, and then going into worse recessions and worse unemployment and higher inflation all of the time. I believe we've come to a moment where, just as nine years ago in California we needed it, what we need is a turn-around, a change of direction and course at the national level.

I do not believe it is divisive, but I believe that there's going to be a choice -- that you have a right to hear what I think are some of the differences between the candidates. I have told you what my view is with regard to the kind of people you seek for government. I would seek my Cabinet and I would seek appointees from the ranks of the citizenry, from people who do not consider themselves career government employees, but people who were willing to give some of their time to serve their country ~~ixp~~ in public office with the thought of correcting the problems that are wrong -- not continuing in office indefinitely. I happen to disagree ~~ixixix~~ with the idea that you can continue to fill the appointee ~~ix~~ positions in government with former members

7--1--1  
of Congress and members of the bureaucracy, and people who have been part of the establishment for the last four decades have been bringing on the problems confronting us today. I do not believe that we can continue with the kind of energy legislation we have had and solve the problem of energy shortages that is going to confront us in the very near future. I believe the energy legislation now, in effect, is a disaster. We were only importing 14 to 16 percent of our oil from the Arab nations a few years ago when we lined up in those long lines at the oil stations when the embargo was put on. We're rapidly approaching an import level of 40% now and very shortly it will be more than half and what do we do then if there is an embargo? I do not believe that we can continue down this same road of trying to get along with the irresponsible Congress that I've decided I believe the time has come to take on that Congress in an adversary relationship and take the case to the people and let the people of America make the decision.

There is one concern above all others that the people ask question about in the meetings that I've gone to. They want peace. The American people want detente when it works. But they're concerned about the national security. Well, so am I. And just recently, the new Secretary of Defense described our strength as "roughly equivalent" to that of the Soviet Union. "Roughly equivalent" is in quotes. What does he mean by "roughly equivalent"? Are we second to none in our defense capability? Or, are we just second?

The Library of Congress has released an 86-page study compiled by the senior national defense specialist there. He has stated that the Soviet Union has more missiles, more submarines and more men under arms than we do, and the superior quality of some of our equipment has "never compensated completely" for this Russian advantage.

According to the report, "...the quantitative balance continues to shift to the Soviet Union". That's a polite way, or bureaucrats, of saying they're getting farther ahead of us every day. Now we learn that we've been badly misled about the Soviet Union's commitment to military power. We had been told that they are spending six to eight percent of the gross national product for the armed forces. That's roughly about what we've been spending. Now we learn they are spending twice that much.

The American people have a right to know to what degree our defensive posture and our foreign policy have been based on erroneous figures; where we stand with the Russians; and what we're doing about it. I believe that Secretary Schlessinger was fired because he was trying to tell the American people these facts and warn us that we could not continue down that road without being second to the Soviet Union.

.more--more

Not just in Florida, but even way up in New Hampshire and over in Illinois in the midwest, one of the first questions asked in any question-and-answer session is about the Panama Canal. People are concerned about that -- and rightly so. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States. A 1904 Panamanian Government -- all three branches separately -- agreed that the sovereignty of the canal zone belonged with the United States. A 1907 U.S. Supreme Court reinforced this view. So did a 1972 U.S. federal court decision. Unfortunately, Dr. Kissinger ignored this in early 1974 when he signed a memorandum with his counterpart, the Foreign Minister, Juan Tack, which called into question our sovereignty over the canal. There has never been a full explanation of why our government wants to give away the Panama Canal Zone.

The State Department recently appealed to the American business interests who had holdings in Latin America to help them sell the idea of giving up the Canal Zone to the American people on the grounds that the Panamanian Dictator, Omar Torrijos, was threatening sabotage, not only of the Canal, but of the American holdings in private businesses. These threats were made by Fidel Castro's friend, the General Torrijos who overthrew the duly-elected government in 1968. He denies the Panama people civil liberties, he censors the press, and there hasn't been an election since 1968. How can the State Department suggest that the United States pay blackmail to this dictator -- because that's exactly what it is.

Panama's economy and standard of living is one of the highest in Latin America because of our continuous successful operation of the Canal. Our government has maintained a mouse-like silence as criticism of a giveaway has increased. Virtually unnoticed by the United States press is a February 18 article in Times of the Americas, reporting that Foreign Minister Tack has said, "The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal and the 1,400 square kilometers that surround it because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty." Tack then said that the President, in a message that has not yet been made public, has proposed a compromise formula in which Panama's sovereignty over the Canal and the Zone is accepted.

Tack reportedly also has supplied information exclusively to the Spanish News Service to the effect that sovereignty over the Canal will be transferred on December 31, 1995 under this agreement.

If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. They deserve a full explanation. Presumably the President has not been fully informed by  
more--more



the State Department. If he were, I cannot imagine he would knowingly endorse such actions.

When it comes to the Canal, we bought it, we paid for it, it's ours, and we should tell General Torrijos it's going to remain ours.

And, I will tell you one additional thing. If I am elected President of the United States, I will name a new Secretary of State.

As I said before, I believe these things have had to be states because there have been issues brought up which did not properly describe my position -- they continue to be brought up -- and because of this belief that we are waging some kind of a contest within our party in which there is really no importance as to what the decision might be. I've tried to state to you what I believe about government. I believe that government should be taken to the people. I believe that the bureaucracy in Washington must be dismantled to the extent of bringing it down to where it is no longer the master, that it becomes again the servant of the people. I believe that the authority and autonomy should be returned to state and local governments and that individual freedom should be enhanced. I believe that the budget should be balanced. I believe that the budget can be balanced. They say, "Well, it's uncontrollable; three-fourths of the budget is frozen into the budget by acts and statutes of Congress." Well, statutes of Congress can be repealed by Congress. And, since this Congress hasn't done it, it's high time we elect a Republican Congress that will.

We have heard talk for the last two years in Washington about doing something about the excessive paperwork that adds \$50 billion a year to the cost of the things we buy. And, last year the amount of paperwork required by government increased by 20%. We have been told about deregulating -- turning this economy loose so that it can expand to meet our needs and provide the jobs for our people. Well, the kind of regulations that are harrasing the business and industry are illustrated by some that you can laugh at them, and yet at the same time they are tragic. One business concern reports that last year -- one year alone -- in filling or meeting government regulatory requirements it spending \$30 million. In that particular industry, \$30 million would provide 3400 factory jobs. Another industry was told by a government agency that all of the protective guardrails in their industry that were 41" high and 43" high had to be torn down and replaced because the regulation of OSHA says they have to be 42" high. I don't know how high the workers are -- whether they should fit them -- or maybe there will be a regulation about that someday. We have the conflicting regulations that are besetting education, that are besetting industry, that are besetting our professionals in every area to the place that no longer are we free. I believe all of this has to be turned around. I

believe it can be turned around. I believe it can be turned around bettern by someone who is not part of the establishment. I don't have any magic solutions; I don't have any plans in my pocket that I can offer you that this will instantly cure this problem or that. But I do have a great faith in the ability of the people and in the knowledge that the people of this country have more talent and managerial skill and expertise than government could ever possibly afford and I believe the people of this country are dying to make it available.

I am not a part of the Washington Establishment and I don't consider that a disadvantage. I guess maybe that's the principal difference between us as candidates and the fact that I do not believe that we should have a continuity of what's been going on for these last too many years.

In New Hampshire, in one of the last question-and-answer sessions, a little girl asked a question. She stood up when I said "questions" and she was only about six years old and she asked, "Why do you want to be President?" And she kind of had me. And I finally gave an answer -- it wasn't a very good answer -- but I gave some kind of an answer to her. It wasn't until we were up in the airplane -- up there in the dark on our way to the next stop that I said to Nancy, "You know, I know the answer. I didn't give it; but I know, really, what the answer to her question was. I just really, down in my heart would like to feel that someday very soon, that little girl, and children younger, and children a little older, will be able to grow up in an America that will be as free for them as it was for me when I was that age growing up."

Ladies and gentlemen, I'll tell you now, and I frankly solicit your support. It wasn't easy for me to make the decision to do this. It still isn't easy for me to talk about it and propose myself for this. But, I'll tell you now, I want very much to go to Washington, D.C. and to take on that

11-11-11

bureaucracy and to see if we can't make work at a national level what we made work at a state level in California; and I'm convinced in my heart that it can with the help of the people of the United States. And, I want the opportunity to do that -- to give government back to the people of this country, where it belongs.

Thank you.

# # #

Excerpts of Remarks by the Hon. Ronald Reagan  
at the Young Republicans State Convention,  
Jacksonville, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

It's a great pleasure to be here and I am appreciative to you for giving me the opportunity to come and speak to you and perhaps say a few things that maybe I haven't had a chance to say along the campaign trail so far. I've been telling some people that, you know, the campaign trail and what you say or don't say, or the way you say it, can have great repercussions; and pretty

Crossfiled Under:

Republicans 1-2

Balance of Power ?

Panama 8-9

Federal Regulations - Impact 9

~~Copy 2-25~~

For information:  
T. Lynn Nafziger, Press Secretary  
(traveling with Governor Reagan)

FOR RELEASE UPON DELIVERY

February 28, 1976

Excerpts of Remarks by The Hon. Ronald Reagan,  
at the Winter Haven Baseball Park,  
Winter Haven, Florida,  
February 28, 1976

"People are concerned about the Panama Canal. The Hay-Bunau-Varilla Treaty of 1903 gave sovereignty over the Canal Zone to the United States. A 1904 Panamanian court memorandum, and a 1907 U.S. Supreme Court decision reinforced it. So did a 1972 U.S. federal court decision. Unfortunately, Dr. Kissinger appeared to ignore this in early 1974 when he signed a memorandum with his Panamanian counterpart, Juan Tack, calling into question our sovereignty over the Canal.

"Why our government wants to give away the Panama Canal I cannot understand. There has never been a full explanation. State Department actions for several years have suggested that they are intimidated by the propaganda of Panama's military dictator, Fidel Castro's good friend, General Omar Torrijos. Torrijos and a military junta overthrew an elected government in 1968. They suspended civil rights, censored the press and haven't permitted an election since.

"Although Panama's economy and standard of living -- one of the highest in Latin America -- depend upon continuous successful operation of the Canal -- our State Department apparently believes the hints regularly dispensed by the leftist Torrijos regime that the Canal will be sabotaged if we don't hand it over.

"Our government has maintained a mouse-like silence as criticism of a giveaway has increased. Virtually unnoticed by the U.S. press is a February 18 article in Times of the Americas, reporting a telecast in Bogota, Colombia, by Juan Tack, appearing on a program called "Five Reporters and the Personality of the Week". According to Tack, "The United States will recognize Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal and the 1,400 square kilometers that surround it because both governments have already reached preliminary agreement on a new treaty".

MORE--MORE--MORE

"According to the Times of the Americas, "Tack said that President Ford, in a message that has not been made public, proposed a compromise formula in which Panama's sovereignty over the Canal and the Zone is accepted. He said in the new round of talks which begin this month in Panama, 'Agreement could be attained in the search for a new treaty draft which recognizes Panamanian sovereignty over the Canal'."

"If these reports are true, it means that the American people have been deceived by a State Department preoccupied with secrecy. They are due a full explanation. Presumably, Mr. Ford has not been fully informed by the State Department, for if he were, I cannot imagine he would knowingly endorse such actions."

# # #