

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

**SERIES:** I: HANNAFORD / CALIFORNIA  
HEADQUARTERS

**Subseries:** A: Ronald Reagan Files

**Folder Title:** Radio Commentaries / Broadcasts:  
Disc 76-14 through 76-16 (1977)

**Box:** 14

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Inventories, visit:

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

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

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

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

RONALD REAGAN  
Disc 76-14

Taped. 5/25/77

76-14A

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Korea	3:12
2. F.B.I.	3:06
3. Voting	3:04
— 4. Public Servants	3:15
5. Cuba-Trouble In Paradise	3:14
6. National Review	3:03
* 7. Cambodia #1	3:07

76-14B

<u>TITLES</u>	<u>TIME</u>
* 1. Cambodia #2	3:04
* 2. Cambodia #3	3:09
3. Soviet Workers	3:02
— 4. Why Government Costs Money	3:02
5. Marijuana	3:09
6. Government Spending	3:10
7. Inflation	3:04
8. Russians	2:45

\*To be aired in sequence.

Please retain your program reprints.  
You may reproduce them to meet your  
listeners requests for copies of  
program scripts. Please do not for-  
ward these requests to our office.

## RONALD REAGAN

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

A two-star general who came into the Army in World War II, and who served with distinction in that conflict as well as in the two wars since, deserves better from his commander-in-chief than public humiliation and the destruction of his career.

Major General John K. Singlaub, 55 years of age, chief of staff of American forces in Korea, is highly respected by his colleagues in the military and is deserving of that respect. No longer chief of staff in Korea, he awaits re-assignment. The consensus among his fellow officers is that he will probably be re-assigned to a job that will make it plain he is being punished.

In announcing his recall and re-assignment, Secretary of Defense Harold Brown said, -- QUOTE -- "Public statements by General Singlaub, inconsistent with announced national security policy, have made it very difficult for him to carry out the duties of his present assignment in Korea." -- UNQUOTE. The Secretary then went on to say he had directed the Secretary of the Army to take action to that effect.

But, calling the General home was not Secretary Brown's doing. The order came from the President. It was public, it was angry and apparently born of vindictive temper. The General's associates, from buck private to fellow officers, knew he was being called to the "House" for a spanking. In my opinion, there is no excuse for this humiliation of a man who has served his country in peace and war with valor, indeed, with heroism.

And what was the General's crime? According to Secretary Brown, -- QUOTE -- "Public statements inconsistent with announced national security policy." -- UNQUOTE. The General has asked no quarter. He simply said that his remarks expressing his opinion were made in what he thought was background information for a Washington POST correspondent and not for attribution. The POST disputes this, and I'm not challenging that assertion but anyone who has been in public life knows how easy it is for a misunderstanding to take place. All of us have spoken frankly at times in what we thought was an "off-the-record" session, and found ourselves quoted by a journalist who had not considered the interview "off-the-record".

General Singlaub expressed the opinion that withdrawal of American forces in Korea could lead to war. President Carter has announced his intention of removing those troops. I think the General is right. The South Korean government thinks he's right. The government of Japan thinks he's right. And, most of our top military brass think he's right. The war we've already had in Korea was caused at least in part by the careless words of an American Secretary of State who intimated that we didn't consider South Korea in our perimeter of defense. The North Koreans apparently took that as an invitation and the war was on.

Admittedly, the disciplining of the General is because his statement was critical of the President's declared policy. But, the President has smilingly apologized for a succession of verbal boo-boos by his Ambassador to the United Nations; outrageous statements that angered and insulted several of our allies. Each time, like a patient parent, the President has explained that Ambassador Young was not correctly stating national policy. Then, murmuring a few words about misunderstanding or incomplete communication, the President has reiterated his confidence in his Ambassador.

There is anger and bitterness among our military officials who believe General Singlaub expressed what they all feel. Certainly, he deserves better from the country he has served so well.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Some weeks ago, on this program, I told of the retired F.B.I. agent who is being prosecuted by the Justice Department for having used wiretaps, mail openings, and so forth in order to get a line on the revolutionary Weatherman organization.

All of this took place several years ago before the agent, John Kearney, had retired. It seems that Mr. Kearney had done nothing that wasn't standard operating procedure at this time. And certainly, the best interests of our people and the nation called for knowing, in advance, what activities were being planned by the Weatherman activists.

It is hard to understand how the Justice Department thinks the interest of the nation will be served by proceeding with this after-the-fact prosecution of a man who served his country and his fellow citizens honorably and well. The Attorney General, himself, has expressed sorrow about the case, which makes one wonder why he doesn't drop the whole thing. He has even declared that John Kearney will face ruin even if he's found innocent, because his entire life savings will be used up in his defense against the charges.

This charging of an F.B.I. agent with a crime for carrying out orders has reduced -- to zero -- the morale of every agent. The Bureau, a proud service with a unique record, is being treated as if it were some kind of "secret police", guilty of harassing and persecuting the law-abiding. Personally, I don't know of any governmental agency more entitled to the respect and gratitude of the American people.

It has guarded against sabotage in times of war, carried on a tireless crusade against organized crime and aided local law enforcement in every way possible. Now, in a climate of fear, mistrust and hysteria, not only the Bureau, but police intelligence of every kind, has been attacked as somehow threatening us with a police state. It is in this climate that former agent John Kearney is being prosecuted.

When I spoke of this before, I closed the broadcast expressing the hope that a committee to come to the aid of John Kearney would be formed so I could contribute to his defense fund. Well, that hope has been realized and there is such a committee.

Former United States Senator James Buckley, former United States Ambassador Clare Booth Luce and former Secretary of the Treasury William Simon are writing letters asking for help to finance the "Citizen's Legal Defense Fund for the F.B.I.". Contributions should be sent to the Committee, Suite 608, 95 Madison Avenue, New York City 10016. I'll repeat that address in a few seconds, so be ready. The monies received will be turned over to the Special Agents' legal fund of the Society of Former Agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which will assist Kearney in the forthcoming trial.

Now I said I'd repeat that address. It is, "Citizen's Legal Defense Fund for the F.B.I.", Suite 608, 95 Madison Avenue, New York City 10016.

I know this is something I haven't done before, but in a time when dozens of government agencies are snooping into every facet of our lives without restraint of any kind, it seems to me there is a great injustice in hounding an agency whose so-called snooping is aimed at our protection.

RONALD REAGAN

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

It's funny how sometimes a bill of major importance will take on an invisible cloak and slip through the halls of Congress with very few people aware of its passage. The Carter administration is promoting an election bill which I commented on a while back. Without repeating myself, I'd like to tell you about one part of that so-called reform which could make a mockery of our entire democratic process.

The proposal is to allow any adult to walk into a voting place on election day, show a driver's license, a social security card, or some other identification, and be instantly eligible to vote. Proponents of the proposal say this will not increase the possibility of voter fraud.

Proponents of the proposal are either living in a dream world or are cynically dishonest. Voter fraud exists now despite the registration laws, provisions to check eligibility and the presence at the polls of pollwatchers on guard against cheaters. In one southern state, 25 election officials have been indicted on charges of fraud in the last election. In a challenged congressional election in another state, the winner received the votes of oil stations, warehouses, at least two city parks, and some vacant lots. And, the idea that a social security card is proof of identity doesn't work -- a woman in Chicago has just been convicted of welfare fraud who had 50 social security cards. Social security officials have long admitted that duplicate cards are probably held by millions of people.

But, about that cloak of invisibility, the Senate Rules committee has been given testimony from the career lawyer who heads the Election unit of the Justice Department Criminal division charging that the election reform bill has a "tremendous potential for fraud". And, Senator Strom Thurmond presented a wire to the committee by the Chief of the Public Integrity Section of the Justice Department's Criminal division saying the proposed instant registration would "increase the opportunity for election fraud".

With the issue somewhat in doubt of passage in the Senate committee, shenanigans took place. A request to have the Attorney General and others come before the committee was blocked. And, on May 12th the committee sent the bill to the full Senate by a five-to-four vote. This was done after a committee member, who might have been the fifth "no" vote was called from the room by Vice President Mondale.

Over in the house, the Administration committee was hearing testimony by election experts all over the land who are frightened of the bill. The head of Chicago's election board (where they know a lot about cheating) said, -- QUOTE -- "It will erode the integrity of our elections, since it is totally lacking in any safeguards on the front end at the time of registration and voting." -- UNQUOTE. He predicted congestion and long lines delaying the voting on election day. Similar testimony was given by the Democratic chairwoman of Philadelphia's City Commission. When other witnesses -- all Democrats -- appeared before the commission to oppose the bill, the Democratic members of the commission were all absent. One staffer, when asked why they weren't there, laughed and said -- QUOTE -- "They don't want to hear this". UNQUOTE.

They certainly didn't want to hear Richard Barnett of Chicago, a black political organizer, tell them the bill would make blacks vulnerable to exploitation by big city machines.

The House Committee sent the measure to the floor by a 17 to eight vote. Now it's time to write your Congressman.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Franklin Delano Roosevelt said, -- QUOTE -- "A strike of public employees manifests nothing less than an intent on their part to prevent or obstruct the operations of government until their demands are satisfied. Such action, looking toward the paralysis of government by those who have sworn to support it, is unthinkable and intolerable." -- UNQUOTE.

F.D.R. summed it up pretty well. His words mean that those who choose government employment become a part of the government establishment and are sworn to uphold it. Their employers are not their immediate superiors, or even the elected representatives of the people. Their true employers are the people. No amount of rhetoric or reciting of cliches, such as "second-class citizen", can change the fact that there is a fundamental difference between private and public employment.

In the fiscal year that ended in October, 1975, some 316,000 government workers, at all levels, engaged in unauthorized and illegal work stoppages a total of 490 times. They struck for a total of almost two and one-half million work days in that one year, generally over wages and hours. Tragically, the worst offenders were professional educators, those we trust to implant standards of conduct, concepts of trust and responsibility in tomorrow's citizens.

There are almost 10 million full-time state and local employees and more than half now belong to employee organizations. Some, refusing to join such organizations, have been forced to contribute dues to the organization they refuse to join.

In my own state, the citizens of California have an opportunity to do something about this situation. Teachers, disturbed by a change in the law which gave teacher unions the right to bargain for non-members, have formed a "Committee for Individual Rights." This committee is circulating petitions to put a proposed constitutional amendment on the ballot in 1978.

So far, they have attracted an impressive array of endorsements from office holders, chambers of commerce and other organizations such as the Professional Educator's Group, National Association of Professional Educators and the Secondary Elementary Teacher's Organization.

Their proposed amendment would make it, -- QUOTE -- "Unlawful for any public employee or any employee organization, directly or indirectly, to induce, instigate, encourage, authorize, ratify or participate in a strike against any public employer." -- UNQUOTE.

The measure continues spelling out what enforcement of this prohibition would entail, -- QUOTE -- "Any violation by a public employee shall result in mandatory dismissal and in the loss of tenure or seniority, and in the event that such employee has both tenure and seniority, the loss of both." -- UNQUOTE. Anyone dismissed for striking could not be reinstated, but would have to take his, or her, chances of being rehired as a new employee.

The amendment frees each employee from obligation to be represented by an organization as a prerequisite to employment. It also states that dues or fees cannot be imposed as a condition for hiring, nor can there be an assessment of such fees for political purposes. I'll assure you the National Education Association will come out against this proposal.

But, I hope my fellow Californians will rally-round and help provide the half-million signatures needed to put this on the ballot. It is time for the citizenry of all the 50 states to declare that public employees cannot strike.

## RONALD REAGAN

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

Remember that song some years ago that had the line, "I'll see you in C-U-B-A"? Well, a boatload of American tourists did see a big welcoming party of friendly Cubans when their cruise ship docked in Havana recently -- the first one since the United States severed relations with the Castro regime 16 years ago. But, while the Cubans were welcoming their visitors with smiles, hugs and cheers, the sugar cane -- on which Cuba's economy depends -- wasn't being harvested nearly fast enough to suit the regime. That, at least, is what the Cuban Communist Party newspaper Granma was telling its readers. Despite its name, Granma doesn't dispense warm, homey advice. It exhorts and berates its readers in a deadly serious manner.

Professor Roger Fontaine of Georgetown University's Center for Strategic and International Studies specializes in Caribbean affairs and he sent me Granma's report, with some comments. "Ordinarily", he said, "I do not quote from the Communist press. Its sheer turgidness can put to sleep even the most hardened insomniac. But, occasionally an article worth inspection does appear, because occasionally (and unwittingly) it reveals more about the Marxist system than perhaps was intended." -- UNQUOTE.

Granma, in its editorial on the sugar harvest, began with a routine quote from comrade Castro, blaming all of Cuba's economic woes on capitalism. Then it got to the real story. Bad weather, it seems, was playing hob with the sugar crop.

But people were to blame, too, said Granma. Now, in Cuba, there are not individual people (except, of course, Fidel), but only collective people. Granma's editor put it this way -- QUOTE -- "What is most essential (is that) the masses must understand and lend enthusiasm to this concrete, everyday struggle to optimize the sugar harvest." -- UNQUOTE.

Professor Fontaine notes that the Cuban workers don't seem to be getting Granma's message. In fact, they haven't been showing up for work. He says that, "despite Granma's pious pronouncement that '80 percent attendance in the field' (that's 24 days per month) is a 'socialist obligation', most provinces have not met their quota. In fact, the booby prize goes to Oriente - the cradle of the revolution." -- UNQUOTE.

Granma goes on to wring its editorial hands because last year two-thirds of the cutters harvested less than one-third of the crop. It singles out for special criticism the voluntarios (VO-LOON-TARR-I-OSE) because they are, after all, "experienced adults who are physically fit."

Of this, Professor Fontaine says, "I suggest that output is low because the 'volunteer' didn't volunteer in the first place. He has no incentive to work in the hot sun at a dirty job, except for the whip held over him. But slaves through history have learned to shirk their duty even in a thoroughly modern police state like Cuba. Well, perhaps that is stretching it a bit. It's not as if a Cuban cane cutter got nothing for his efforts. For that lucky 'vanguard group' which harvests the most sugar cane, the Council of Ministers will hand it the 'Jesus (HAY-SOOS) Menendez' Award." -- UNQUOTE.

Meanwhile, back in Havana, a young American who hijacked an airplane to Castro's paradise in 1971 was interviewed by a U.S. newsman and said he has a much different view of things today. He spent most of the last six years in prison, lost an eye there, and now is paid \$100 a month to sweep floors in a hotel. Of his experience, Garland Grant of Milwaukee, said, "I've been in this place six years and I'm out of my mind. Believe me, I'm all for the United States now. I'd even wear a Nixon button."

## RONALD REAGAN

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

It's too bad that more people aren't aware of some of the publications available in our land that bring us, on a regular basis, gems of information not usually found in the daily press. One such is Bill Buckley's NATIONAL REVIEW.

In a recent issue (the magazine comes out every-other week) there were a number of factual items illustrating some of the foibles of bureaucracy -- the things done with deadly seriousness by those who dwell in the marble puzzle palaces on the Potomac, but which contribute exasperation to working, earning Americans.

One example is news of a report I hadn't seen elsewhere about the artificial sweeteners the Federal Drug Administration is determined to take away from us. You'll recall their most recent decision, on saccharin, was based on a test made in Canada that found if you fed rats saccharin in tremendous quantities, a few developed cancer. Now, through NATIONAL REVIEW, we find those Canadians, the Japanese and the Europeans have conducted massive new tests and have given another artificial sweetener "sodium cyclamate" a clean bill of health. In the meantime, however, one wonders how much dislocation has taken place in that industry and at what cost as a result of the saccharin ban. Have there been lay-offs of workers and cancellation of plans and programs? One can wonder when the Federal Drug Administration will accept the new cyclamate finding. It certainly didn't lose any time accepting the first report.

On another front, the Consumer Product Safety Commission reaped headlines when it banned the sale of nearly 100 million dollars worth of children's "nighties and jammies" because they were treated with the flame-retardant chemical called "Tris". The chemical is now believed to threaten us with cancer, or so they say. But NATIONAL REVIEW asks, -- QUOTE -- "guess who ordered the manufacturers to treat the sleepwear with flame-retardant chemicals in the first place?" -- UNQUOTE. That same Consumer Product Safety Commission.

Other items, which do not add to the dignity of government's image, have to do with dog collars and a 12 year old boy's tree house. On the first item, the Food and Drug Administration is reported as suing the manufacturers of two dog training collars which, it alleges, hurt laboratory researcher's necks. NATIONAL REVIEW suggests the collars don't keep the researchers from howling. I don't think any of us would like a bit in our mouths either, but they are pretty useful if you are riding a horse.

The tree house incident has to do with a local building inspection department in Florence, Alabama. It seems that the 12 year old boy in Florence has an 8-by-10 tree house complete with shingled roof, windows, and a carpet on the floor. Such comfort, the inspectors have ruled, is out of keeping with a tree house. Therefore, Jamie's house is declared, -- QUOTE -- "Fit for human habitation." -- UNQUOTE. Having so ruled, the inspectors then carefully surveyed and discovered the tree house was less than 20 feet from a city street, therefore in violation of a city ordinance. Jamie's choice, according to the inspectors, is to tear down the tree house or move the tree. I wonder if anyone has looked into the possibility of a little house wrecking -- say breaking the windows, ripping off a few shingles and removing the carpet? If it wasn't so habitable it might be allowed closer to the street.

Well, I'm grateful to NATIONAL REVIEW, and those other publications, for reminding us of what a whale of an improvement just a little common sense could make.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cambodia #1" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

With our focus on Africa, the Middle East and other world trouble spots, few of us have thought to inquire about the fate of Cambodia which fell to the communists just two years ago. Now, thanks to a senior editor of READERS DIGEST, John Barron, and DIGEST Far Eastern editor, Anthony Paul, we have a view of what must be one of the most brutal violations in human history of all that is decent. What has happened, and is still happening in Cambodia, matches or exceeds -- in sheer horror -- what Hitler did at his very worst.

Our window is a book called, MURDER OF A GENTLE LAND, published by Readers Digest Press/Crowell Company, New York. Starting in the fall of 1975, Barron and Paul (with the help of two other DIGEST editors) interviewed hundreds of Cambodian refugees, mainly in the refugee camps along the border of Thailand. Those they talked to represented a cross section of Cambodian society, the educated, the illiterate, the poor, the affluent, students and professors.

Such an array made it possible to check story against story and thus verify the tales of horror. It is significant that most of those they talked to had actually welcomed the communist conquest, because they thought it would bring peace and end the long years of fighting. They were, for the most part, disinterested in political philosophy and were, therefore, neither for or against communism.

In addition to these personal interviews, the authors and their helpers, being experienced journalists and editors, monitored radio Phnom Penh as carried by the Foreign Broadcast Association. They checked their findings against intelligence reports, both foreign and American, and sought the counsel of scholars throughout the world who specialized in Cambodia. From all of this has emerged an accurate account of what took place beginning on April 17, 1975, when the first communist troops entered the capital city of Phnom Penh.

They were greeted warmly as heralds of peace. Within two hours, however, the "heralds of peace" -- using loud speakers and going door-to-door -- ordered every one of the three million men, women and children in Phnom Penh to leave the city. Those who resisted the order, or were too slow in obeying, were shot where they stood.

The same procedure was being followed at the hospitals. Patients -- bedridden, some just emerging from surgery, some who were dying -- were dumped into the streets. Friends and relatives of some who couldn't walk pushed their beds. Those without such help tried to pole their beds with a stick as you would pole a raft through shallow water.

The streets were so jammed that for days the pace was as slow as 100 yards an hour. Those who had cars only reached the outskirts of the city and there their cars were confiscated. The same scene was being enacted in other Cambodian cities.

Behind them, in the emptying cities, books, records, archives of every kind, medical libraries, priceless manuscripts, business and government records, were being burned. Hospital equipment, automobiles, home furnishings -- all were smashed, vandalized and destroyed in an effort to purge Cambodia of its entire history. This, of course, included the temples in the city.

At the same time, the killing of former military officers, civil servants and their families, down to infants and children, was going on. They were slaughtered in organized massacres by artillery fire, hand grenades, land mines, machine guns, bayonets and even clubs. I'll take this up again in the next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cambodia #2" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

There is no parallel in history for the forced march, in spring, 1975, of millions of Cambodians from their towns and city homes out into the jungles and fields. All along the line of march, communist soldiers goaded them onward and shot them when they couldn't keep up.

There were no provisions for feeding or even providing drinking water and the temperature was a hundred degrees. The authors of MURDER OF A GENTLE LAND tell us the very young and the very old were the first to die. They also quote a Cambodian doctor who was driven from his clinic with his patients and who spent a month on the highways until he was able to escape to Thailand. He said he passed by the body of a child at least every 200 yards. With the living suffering from dehydration and gastro-intestinal afflictions, he finally had to face the dread decision of saving his remaining medicines for those he thought had some chance of living.

The fields were littered with the cast-off belongings of the marchers and with the bodies of the marchers themselves. A few of the living were ordered to stay in certain villages and only had to endure the march for a matter of days. But most continued on for weeks to unknown destinations in the jungle or to death from cholera, starvation, thirst or sheer fatigue.

There was something of a plan to the horror. Eventually there would be a roadblock and a communist commander would send a group down a jungle trail. There they would find they were to create a new settlement in the wilderness -- very often with no tools but their hands. In these "settlements-to-be" there would be a meager daily ration of rice.

Out on the road the march would go on. More and more frequently there would be tragic scenes as families would find themselves too weak to carry the old or the children or the sick. Their heartbreaking choice was to abandon them or slow down to their pace and be shot with them.

Hear one story of such a choice. A slender young airline stewardess and her husband took turns carrying their four month old daughter. The infant was accustomed to canned milk because her mother had not breast-fed her, and now her body could produce no milk. The canned milk they had brought from Phnom Penh was gone. The young mother, whose name was Lon, suffering from dehydration and malnutrition, struggled on trying to keep the pace set by the soldiers. She hoped that someplace they would find food for their daughter.

Finally, she knew the end had come. In tears, she begged her husband to save the baby and himself. As he cradled their daughter in his arms, the baby smiled and laughed happily. Then, through his own tears, he said to his wife, -- QUOTE -- "We stay together". -- UNQUOTE.

The friends who witnessed this scene told it to John Barron and Tony Paul -- and who had to move on themselves -- said that, of course, he really was saying, -- QUOTE -- "We die together". -- UNQUOTE.

There were probably four million souls in this tragic march. More than half of the total population of Cambodia. By even conservative estimates, and after checking with every possible source, a safe guess is that possibly one-third of the Cambodian people died in this murder of a gentle land.

If you are wondering what the purpose might be behind this ghastly slaughter, the authors provide that also. I'll close this subject on the next broadcast with their explanation.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cambodia #3" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I've been reciting the story of what has happened to Cambodia since the communists marched into the capital city two years ago.

Today I'll give the reasoning (if one can apply that word to genocide) behind the destruction of Cambodia's social system and the murder of so many of its people. At first glance, it seems self-defeating for the communists themselves to empty cities and towns, wipe out millions of people possessed of useful skills and to totally destroy the fabric of a society.

In Phnom Penh, the University was turned into a banana farm and pigs rooted in the class rooms. Communist officials and, of course, soldiers, are the only life in the once flourishing capital city. In short, Cambodian cities have been abolished.

Interviewed in the paper HUMAN EVENTS, Mr. Barron was asked, -- QUOTE -- "What is the motivation and philosophy of the communist rulers?" -- UNQUOTE. He replied that everything that has been done in Cambodia has been by orders of "Angka Loeu". I'm not sure I pronounced that correctly, but it means the "organization on high", corresponding to the Politburo in the USSR.

It consists of about a dozen men and women who exercise all the power. They are from middle class families, educated as lawyers, teachers or economists. All are ardent communists, wedded to theory. None ever worked with his or her hands and they spent their adult lives outside of Cambodia.

They are ascetics who believe in the ultimate revolutionary dream of completely destroying the existing order, so that in the consequent vacuum, they can create a pure and perfect society. And this is what they have set out to do without regard to human life or material cost. What a reminder of Lenin's line -- that if three-fourths of the world population had to die, it would be worth it if the remaining one-fourth were communist.

These dozen purists moved more swiftly than any other revolutionaries, -- QUOTE -- "toward the total obliteration of all that existed because in a matter of two or three weeks, the past was eliminated". -- UNQUOTE. There was a classless society. All were equal in the jungle and before the soldier's guns. There was no printed material, no money, no religion and everyone was performing the same work.

Even courtship is licensed and to court without permission of the high 12 is punishable by death, as are extramarital affairs. Parents are forbidden to punish their children, nor can they order them to do anything. They can only ask. The children are encouraged to report their parents' wrongdoing. It's pretty heady for a child to know he, or she, has the power of life or death over mother and father.

They are taught their God is the "organization on high", that their whole life, their every thought, their being must be consecrated to the organization. If they falter, the "Wheel of History" will grind them down. There are no schools as such anymore, but they are indoctrinated with a hatred for anything foreign -- especially American.

In the villages, a gong awakens the people at five o'clock in the morning. They work in the fields with only a noon break until evening, and on moonlit nights they frequently put in three extra hours. There are no holidays. They work a seven day week and are only allowed two infractions of the rules. In the third, they disappear. Women have special privileges -- they aren't shot -- their throats are cut. THE MURDER OF A GENTLE LAND should be required reading.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Not too long ago a news item appeared in a few papers that you might have missed. There has been no follow up on it which is puzzling because it was an unusual story with a headline that read; "Discontented Soviet Workers Clamor for Right to Emigrate".

Now I know we are all aware that some of Russia's scientists and intellectuals have dared to criticize the Kremlin and some have been allowed to leave. No question but that they have shown great courage, and I don't mean to detract from their heroism when I point out that they have a certain following, world-wide public opinion on their side and, therefore, possibly some protection against retaliation. But when a working stiff known only to his family and a few neighbors stands up and says, "How do you transfer out of this chicken outfit", that's news.

According to the article, a growing number of Soviet wage earners are asking out. Letters have begun reaching people out here in the free world, and Soviet dissidents have passed the word that tens of thousands of workers in the USSR are more than a little discontented.

One remarkable letter which reached the West was from a shipyard worker. I'm a little surprised and concerned that the story gave his name and where he worked. I keep hoping that maybe he used an alias because his letter could put him in the Gulag for a long time.

Anyway, he asked for international support to help him emigrate to Canada, Australia or the United States. Married, with six children, he officially requested the right to leave the Soviet Union more than a year ago, but has received no answer.

His reasons for wanting to leave should strike a responsive chord in the heart of any one of us. He says it is impossible to live on his monthly income of 194 rubles and he explodes the Soviet fairy tale that they have no inflation. According to him, retail prices have risen substantially. Fruits and vegetables have doubled in price, increases for meat, eggs and lard have been about 40% and wages have not kept pace with prices.

He is explicit about working conditions, too. Frequent revision in production norms and pay scales make it hard to earn more than five or six rubles a day. Operating methods are obsolete and proper tools are in such short supply he bought his own. He writes, "That's the way they attempt to draw the maximum out of the worker while paying him the least possible".

Then his letter takes on the social services which are supposed to be those free goodies available to all in the "worker's paradise". Copies of his letter should go to some of our Congressmen who are trying to get us to go for socialized medicine. "Ambulances don't come when they are called", he writes. He goes on to say, "Doctors are indifferent to their patients, and in the hospitals the treatment is bad, the food is bad." Well, of course, that last one -- hospital food -- is a kind of universal complaint and no one has ever come up with an answer other than to stay well.

But seriously, there is a great significance to this letter and what it might be telling us. The Soviet Union is building the most massive military machine the world has ever seen and is denying its people all kinds of consumer products to do so. We could have an unexpected ally if citizen Ivan is becoming discontented enough to start talking back. Maybe we should drop a few million typical mail order catalogues on Minsk and Pinsk and Moscow to whet their appetite.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Why Government Costs Money" -  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

On these broadcasts I have frequently pointed out how much government has been (and continues to be) increasing in cost. And, I've called attention to the fact that government costs are not included in the factors used to compute the cost-of-living index. When government announces the inflation rate, it is the rate before taxes. That's why we could be told that between 1974 and 1975, for instance, real wages -- meaning purchasing power -- went up nine per cent. We were not told that after taxes real purchasing power had gone down three per cent in spite of the nine per cent raise in pay.

I've not hesitated to blame the federal bureaucracy for this increase in government costs. But, without retreating from the position, let's recognize that we, ourselves, and our local elected officials can also have a hand in the ever-rising tide of government spending.

Let me give you an example, which I'm sure is just one of hundreds of similar cases that have taken the cost of government up to almost 7500 dollars per year for every household in America.

A French statesman and economist more than a century ago said, QUOTE -- "Public funds seemingly belong to no one and the temptation to bestow them on someone is irresistible." -- UNQUOTE. At the federal level where there is the power to dole out grants to individuals and local or state governments, custom has it that success is measured by how efficiently that money is handed out. Emptying the bucket becomes the very reason for the existence of the bureau or agency.

Cap Weinberger, when he was Secretary of HEW, told me of coming to the end of one fiscal year with 17 million dollars left over in a student aid program. He was ordered by the Congress to use up that money. He had to send agents out to campuses to find students who would accept the grants. As you can imagine, it was hardly an insurmountable task.

Now comes a news item about a Florida city with a 475 thousand dollar federal grant to build a firehouse. The city had no need for another firehouse. It could return the money to Washington or it could go ahead and accept it and begin construction within 90 days. Those are the rules.

At least two commissioners, bless them, wanted to return the money, but in a three-to-two vote it was decided to accept 300 thousand dollars and build the unneeded firehouse. It was just too hard to let that seemingly free money get away.

To justify building the firehouse and keep it from standing idle for the period of as much as eight years before another fire company is needed -- that is, even if city growth should call for it then -- it was decided to put an emergency medical service vehicle and crew in the building.

One of the "no" vote commissioners pointed out that the city already had three medical stations and didn't need another. He also pointed something else out. The 300 thousand dollars in federal money, of course, came out of the same pockets the city has to get into for its revenues. And, the city will have to dig deeper into those pockets because it will cost 185 thousand dollars a year to keep that unneeded medical team in that unneeded firehouse. If they do need the firehouse in eight years, they will have spent one million, 480 thousand dollars to get that "free" 300 thousand dollar building. And that's why government costs go up.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A few days ago I was approached by several young men who wanted to know my stand on marijuana. They frankly told me they were users ranging from pretty regular by one to now-and-then by the others. Just as frankly I gave my opinion that it was definitely harmful to health and probably represented a dangerous threat to an entire generation.

It is estimated conservatively that more than half of all Americans between the ages of 18 and 25 have tried pot, grass, the weed, or whatever other names are given to marijuana. Another finding puts use by high school freshmen (now we're down to age 14 or 15) at almost half. Whatever the figure, use by youngsters is referred to by the National Institute on Drug Abuse as being of epidemic proportion.

In my discussion with the young men, their defense was chapter and verse from the cliches being uttered and repeated in what can only be called a public relations campaign in behalf of marijuana. It is less harmful than alcohol or even tobacco; it is a mild intoxicant at worst, but really just a pleasant relaxant.

They were not familiar with the facts refuting these easily sold cliches. For example, a sketchy experiment in Jamaica was quoted to the effect that 30 laborers were tested and it was found that their labor output was increased by smoking pot. But the experiment didn't show that at all. What it did prove was that productivity declined. The workers just thought they were doing better, because being "stoned", they weren't aware of the boredom of their jobs.

Peter Bourne used the easing of the marijuana laws in California (an easing I hasten to add, which took place after I left Sacramento) to persuade the Congressmen that such a course had proven beneficial. He did not, however, quote the present Chief of the Bureau of Investigation and Narcotics Enforcement of California who has testified that since the change in the law there has been a sharp increase in the use of marijuana -- an increase he puts at some 55%. Arrests of juveniles for driving under the influence of drugs has increased more than 70%.

But, Mr. Bourne and others who press for decriminalization and even legalization are signaling to young people that marijuana is harmless or in the parlance of the day, "real cool". They and our young people should read Keep Off The Grass, a report published by Readers Digest Press and authored by Dr. Gabriel Nahas of Columbia University. He confirms other research findings by reputable scientists that marijuana is far from harmless. It interferes with mental function, the grasp of reality and the reproduction of cells by the human body. Habitual smoking of pot weakens the body's ability to fight disease and can affect children yet to be born to those who indulge.

I asked my young questioners something we all ought to be asking ourselves. Obviously these scientists have no ulterior motives -- no ax to grind in declaring that marijuana is harmful. But, what is the motive behind the propaganda campaign to sell the idea that it isn't? In my own opinion, it's rather obvious; decriminalization leads to legalization and legalization leads to commercialization. Already a number of marijuana trade names have been registered in Washington looking toward the day. Can you see the billboards that will spring up in the land? -- "Smoke X Brand and Fly Higher". There's a whole new money making industry waiting to be born.

## RONALD REAGAN

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

A few months ago the new House majority leader observed that if unemployment was reduced to four-and-one-half percent, the budget would not only be balanced, we'd have a surplus. Just once I wish a member of Congress would turn that around and say, "If the budget was balanced, unemployment would be down to four and one-half percent, or maybe only three and one-half percent.

We've had deficits for 17 of the last 18 years. In the early '70's we had a 70 billion dollar total deficit over just three years, unemployment in those three years averaged less than five point three percent. In other words, full employment didn't prevent deficit spending.

We have more people working and paying taxes this year than at any time in our history, yet we are running an annual deficit of somewhere around 50 billion -- give or take a few billion. And that deficit is not caused by unemployment. Spending by government just rises faster than government revenues do.

During those years from '68 to '77, Federal revenues increased 128 percent, but expenditures went up 140 percent. And, we can't blame the cost of living because that only increased half as much. That period, '68 to '77, included good times and bad. In 1968 unemployment was only three point six percent (3.6).

The only term we can use is "runaway" to describe government expenditures over recent years. Federal spending on health care increased 261 percent; interest on the national debt, 206 percent, revenue sharing, 2,367 percent and education, 137 percent. All of these, plus many others, increased far more than the cost-of-living index. But, strange to say, the one expense targeted constantly for trimming, by so many of those who are responsible for the increases in spending, the defense budget, has only increased 27 percent in these last 10 years. Which means, in constant dollars, spending on our national security has actually decreased.

But the social spending programs, the re-distribution of your earnings to others, have almost all increased in cost faster -- some twice as fast.

It is time that Congress be denied the right to pass off this deficit spending as a natural phenomenon spawned by a recession for which they also take no blame. Economics may be an inexact science, but it isn't that inexact. The permanent debt ceiling -- I'll pause while you laugh -- is 400 billion dollars, but we passed that a long time ago and are on our way to 700 billion. In session after session the Congress meets and solemnly approves a -- QUOTE -- "temporary" -- UNQUOTE -- debt ceiling to cover whatever deficit they have in mind.

What makes this doubly frustrating is that the inflation, caused by deficits, is then counted on, by those same Congressmen, to bring in extra revenues. Thus they are encouraged to adopt new spending programs. A spokesman for the Congressional budget office predicted these inflation-generated revenues would give us a balanced budget by 1982. Don't you believe it. Those estimated revenues will be earmarked for spending long before they are collected. For every penny added to the cost-of-living index, the government will get a penny-and-a-half. Inflation is good business. . . . for government.

RONALD REAGAN

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

At the recent economic summit in London, one of our top-ranking staffers, in replying to press questions, said -- QUOTE -- "Inflation has so many causes it has to have many different answers -- there is no single one." -- UNQUOTE. If one of the advisers to our government on economic and fiscal matters actually believes that, you and I are in deep trouble.

We are undergoing the longest sustained period of inflation in our nation's history. Just since World War II it has cost Americans -- in the loss of purchasing power of their savings accounts and the value of their insurance policies -- more than one trillion dollars.

But let's come down to more understandable figures and see how this loss occurs. If you placed a dollar in a savings account 10 years ago, and if it drew six per cent interest compounded annually, today -- 10 years later -- your dollar would have grown to one dollar and seventy-nine cents. But it takes one dollar and seventy-eight cents today to buy what one dollar would have bought in 1967. Now if you are a cheerful soul, looking on the bright side, who always says the glass is half-full instead of half-empty, you'll say, "Well, at least we didn't lose anything -- in fact, we made a penny".

No, you didn't. That one dollar and seventy-nine cents is before taxes and the seventy-nine cents in interest is taxable income. To make it very simple, you are not a penny ahead. After taxes, you are a loser by a considerable amount.

What does this have to do with the cause -- or as our representative at the London Economic Conference would have it -- the many causes of inflation? It has everything to do with it. The cause of inflation is government. Nikolai Lenin, father of the Russian revolution, knew whereof he spoke when he said, -- QUOTE -- "The way to take over a country is to debauch the currency. Through a continued policy of inflation, a government can quietly and unobservedly confiscate the wealth of its citizens." -- UNQUOTE. And, don't let that word "wealth" fool you. It refers to the earnings and the savings of the workers in our land.

When politicians want to continue government spending on social programs they think will win votes, but know they can't raise taxes any higher than they are, they turn to inflation. Oh, they don't call it that. It's called deficit spending, borrowing against the future -- when they'll no longer need our votes. Inflation is caused by government spending more than government takes in. Inflation can be eliminated by reducing government spending to match government revenues.

Our progressive tax system is geared to the number of dollars we earn, not their value. We earn a greater number to even-up the lower value of each dollar, and end up paying a higher income tax. As purchasing power is reduced, we become more dependent on government which has more and more of our money.

I do not charge that inflation is a conspiracy in the sense that politicians knowingly set out to rob the people. To tell the truth, economic illiteracy is their greatest problem.

Senator Paul Laxalt has made a practical proposal to his colleagues in Washington; prohibit the Federal government from increasing the percentage of the gross national product it spends. Let government spending increase each year only as much, percentage-wise, as the G.N.P. increases.

A colleague in the House, representative Laurence Coughlin, proposes indexing of the tax system so it reflects changes in the cost of living. These two measures would end inflation by removing government's profit from inflation.



RONALD REAGAN

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

When I was a young boy our nation fought a war to, "make the world safe for democracy". And in less than two decades we had a Hitler, a Mussolini and a Joseph Stalin abroad in the world.

When I was a young adult we fought a war to end all wars. And, we've known hardly one day of peace in the world in the 32 years since that war ended.

The other day a young man, R. Emmett Tyrrell, Jr., editor of a fine paper called THE ALTERNATIVE: AN AMERICAN SPECTATOR, wrote, -- QUOTE -- "Throughout the last three decades I cannot think of one threat to world peace that would not have paled into, at worst, a regional altercation, were it not for the eager presence of the Soviet Union, or one of its clients. Nor would international terrorism, hi-jackings, kidnappings and other assorted barbarities, peculiar to our time, be such vexed questions were it not for the Soviet Union, the world's arsenal of anarchy". -- UNQUOTE.

That, in my opinion, is a blunt, but extremely accurate summation of the biggest single problem we face as a nation. Now, I expect those words will be dismissed as utter nonsense in our state department, and sneered at by those in the entertainment world who are writing fiction about the, -- QUOTE -- "McCarthy era" -- UNQUOTE -- and calling it history.

I think if Demosthenes were standing in our market place today he'd have a low opinion of diplomats, pundits and enthusiastic disarmament buffs who ignore the Soviet effort to build the most powerful military force the world has ever seen. He'd be surprised that we slumbered while our lead in technology was being wiped out. Apparently, the Russians have a laser beam capable of blasting our missiles from the sky if we should ever try to use them. And, apparently, we had no inkling such a weapon was being added to their arsenal.

He might even be surprised that the American Communist Party was on the ballot in our last election. And, he'd be dumbfounded to know that in California an effort was made to excuse that one party from obeying the election laws, with regard to identifying campaign contributors by name, because it might be embarrassing to them.

Editor Tyrrell lists all the areas of the world where blood is being shed and lives taken by weapons bearing a Soviet trademark. And then adds, -- QUOTE -- "They continue to arm anybody on the globe so long as he shows a glimmer of interest in the Marxist whim-wham. Further, they rush ahead with gigantic civil defense projects and with a military build-up that strongly suggests they are attempting to achieve nothing less than a war-fighting, war-winning posture in strategic weaponry." -- UNQUOTE.

Every Soviet leader up to and including Breshnev has sworn to carry out to the letter the words of Lenin who said, -- QUOTE -- "It would not matter if three-fourths of the human race perished; the important thing is that the remaining one-fourth be Communist." -- UNQUOTE. He also said, -- QUOTE -- "To tie ones hands in advance and to openly tell an enemy, who is presently armed, that we will fight him, and when, is stupidity." -- UNQUOTE. Well, there's a lot of that around.

TAPES 6/15/77

RONALD REAGAN  
Disc 76-15

76-15A

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Privacy Bureau	2:53
2. Vietnam	3:08
3. Oil I	3:13
4. Oil II	3:07
5. Cuba	3:17
6. Episcopal Controversy	3:03
7. Intelligence	2:56

76-15B

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. O.S.H.A.	3:15
2. DNA Research	3:12
3. Indexing	3:40
4. Force Account Work	2:50
5. Common Sense Bureaucrats	3:03
6. Economic Fairy Tales	3:05
7. Health Costs	3:20
8. Names	3:04

Please retain your program reprints.  
You may reproduce them to meet your  
listeners' requests for copies of  
program scripts. Please do not for-  
ward these requests to our office.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Privacy Bureau"-  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

Here's good news for any of you listening who are Big Government fans. It probably means bad news for the rest of us. But, if you like Big Government and you've been discouraged because that bill to create a hefty new Agency for Consumer Protection is in trouble, take heart. The Big Government lobby is waiting in the wings with plans for another new bureaucracy to spring on the taxpayers.

This one will carry a name such as the "Private Protection Agency" Specifically, it is among the recommendations of the Privacy Protection Study commission which will turn over its report to the President this month. Philosophically, it's a first cousin to the privacy movement promoted by those who are obsessed with the idea that government agents really are lurking behind every potted palm, spying on ordinary citizens.

Individual privacy is important to every one of us, but do we need Big Government and a huge new federal bureau watching over us in order to get it?

The Privacy commission's report includes some surprising recommendations. Here are some examples:

If you turn down a job applicant who has a conviction record, you could be hauled into court to prove that your decision was relevant to his conviction. So, presumably, you couldn't deny a convicted pickpocket a job as a salesman.

The federal agency proposed by the commission would have the authority to participate in any federal proceeding where it believed the action to be considered might have some effect on personal privacy. That should be a handy way to keep a battalion or two personal privacy lawyers busy.

The report will recommend new rules on business' record-keeping. More paperwork will result. If the recommendations are adopted, disappointed job applicants could appeal to the Privacy agency if they weren't satisfied with the employer's explanation of the job turn-down. The Privacy agency, in turn, could force a company to open its files to the applicant.

Underlying all this seems to be the assumption that most job decisions are made arbitrarily and irrationally and that government should force management to justify all of its decisions. In a country the size of ours, there are bound to be some employment decisions that are arbitrary, but I'll bet they are the exception rather than the rule, and do we need an expensive new federal bureau to find every one of them?

If it becomes a reality, the Privacy Protection agency will do a lot more for bureaucracy's growing control over your life than it will for your privacy. It will add to the cost of doing business. That means the cost of the things you buy will go up as a result. Businesses will find themselves being forced to hire -- out of self-defense -- "privacy specialists" to instruct them on how to deal with this new federal bureau. And, companies will have to hire more attorneys to defend them before the agency and in court. Some of the cases would have merit, undoubtedly. But, just as certainly, a great many would not. Almost as certain as the Law of Gravity is the Law of Bureaucracy: everytime you create new regulations and a bureau to right a wrong, you will find more wronged parties than you ever knew existed before. As usual, the taxpayer, will foot the bill.

## RONALD REAGAN

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

A former member of the South Vietnamese National Assembly, leader of the "Peace bloc" which opposed President Thieu and which rejected strongly our intervention in Vietnam, has escaped to Japan with two of his former colleagues. Interestingly, his anti-war activity had made him an honored figure among the North Vietnamese conquerors. He was a member of the National Legislature in Hanoi until he escaped.

He and his two companions have asked -- from the safety of Japan -- for American military assistance to those who want to overthrow the North Vietnamese Communists. The three ex-legislators frankly and sadly admit their complete turnaround. They say they wanted relief from the war and all its destruction, but now they realize how precious was the freedom their country had which has now been lost.

When an American journalist skeptically asked if the South Vietnamese people, after more than 30 years of war, would actually take up weapons and fight again, the answer was an emphatic "yes".

Meanwhile in Paris, where representatives of the Carter Administration are proceeding with talks leading to normalization of relations with the Vietnamese conquerors, an open letter to the United States was distributed by Vietnamese exiles. Calling themselves the Vietnamese Committee for Human Rights, they begged the United States not to establish relations with Hanoi until it ends its brutal repression of freedoms.

One sentence in their letter cannot be denied. It read, "Whether you accept it or not, the United States bears a great part of the responsibility before World History for the annexation of South Vietnam by the Communists and for the imprisonment of hundreds of thousands of their own allies". Unfortunately, "human rights" weren't being discussed by our team in Paris.

Other things concerning Vietnam are being discussed in a variety of places, all having to do with tax dollars taken from the American people.

The administration has granted licenses for \$5 million in private aid for Vietnam through charitable groups. Those, of course, aren't tax dollars but they're coming up. The U.N. Development Program has agreed to send Hanoi \$44 million. We put up 20% of the budget for that program.

The World Bank, to which we give a full one-fourth of its funds, is expected to approve major loans to Hanoi. Its affiliate I.D.A., -- the International Development Association -- makes 50 year loans at no interest to Third World nations and has about \$6 billion a year for development loans.

The Bank has sent a mission to Vietnam which has been described as, "a useful and constructive start to the Bank's relationship with a unified Vietnam". I suppose calling it a "unified Vietnam" is alright if you'd describe a lion that just has a lamb for lunch as unified.

Hanoi didn't just listen at that meeting. They presented a shopping list as long as your arm. It ranged from vast irrigation systems and expansion of electric power to factories for building rail road equipment. Maybe we could send them Amtrak.

In Paris, direct aid to Hanoi wasn't denied -- we just said it would have to wait till we'd established normal relations. Then, magnanimously, the Vietnamese handed us 20 more names of men missing in action. That only leaves about 1,150 or so to be accounted for.

We're writing a chapter for the history books we won't be proud to read.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Oil I"  
(Commentary by Ronald Reagan.)

I've been out around the country recently in a number of states filling some speaking engagements. When you do this, you usually meet members of the press who have a question or two. Of late, those questions have had to do with my remarks about the proposed energy legislation and why I don't buy the C.I.A. report quoted by the President --which has us running out of oil in about 30 years.

Well, it's true. I don't buy that report and if the President does, then isn't his plea for conservation to reduce consumption by 10% rather futile? If all the oil is going to be gone in 30 years, does it really make much difference if we make it last 33?

I don't believe it will be gone in 30 or 33 years. In 1914, the United States Bureau of Mines projected future production of crude oil at 5.7 billion barrels. Since then, we've produced 34 billion. Incidentally, about that same time we were told there was no hope of ever finding oil in Texas or Kansas.

In 1920, we were told we'd be out of oil in 15 years. Nineteen years later, in 1939, the Department of Interior told us we'd run out in 13 years. Since then, we have discovered more than the total known oil reserves we had at that time.

In 1948, the proven reserves in all of the free world amounted to 62.3 billion barrels. Within 24 years they were nine times as many.

In 1949, our Department of Interior said the end of the U.S. oil supply was in sight. We increased production in the next five years by a million barrels a day.

By 1970, known world reserves were six times as large as they were in 1950. To digress for a moment, this holds true for virtually all the minerals our advanced industrial economy depends on. To give just a few examples -- known reserves of iron between 1950 and 1970 increased 1,321%, chrome 675%, copper 279%, and phosphates 4,430%. To get back to oil reserves -- they had increased 507%.

Significantly and contrary to much of what is being said, the amount of proven reserves is increasing faster than the rate of consumption.

The National Academy of Engineering explains that U.S. oil reserves discovered to date total 430 billion barrels, but low cost conventional technology will only get 140 billion barrels out of the ground. This leaves more than twice that much -- 290 billion barrels, much of which can be recovered by more expensive techniques, if the government will allow the price of oil to respond to market demands.

Seven years ago we were producing 9.6 million barrels every day. Now we're only pumping 8.1. The decline is caused by restrictions imposed by government. Having reduced production, the government now proposes that we reduce consumption. For 25 years every 1% rise in price resulted in a 4% increase in the supply of gasoline. Why don't we try the free market again?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Oil II"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On my last broadcast I cited the ominous and repeated warnings we heard in 1914, 1920, 1939 and yes, here in 1977 about how soon we were going to run out of oil. I was also pretty critical of the present energy proposals with their emphasis on conservation and their lack of emphasis, or apparently no interest at all, in developing new energy sources.

But it's occurred to me that maybe I came off sounding as if I disapproved of conservation and that is hardly accurate. As a matter of fact, not only do I believe in it in general, but particularly with regard to petroleum. But I'm not talking about conservation as a temporary energy crises expedient. Oil is so important to something called the petrochemical industry, we shouldn't be burning it in furnaces at all.

It is true that petroleum originally was seen only as a fuel and lubricant. But, today, we have an even greater use for it as the basis for plastics, drugs, medicines and a host of other extremely useful products. Burning it to heat a boiler is as foolish as coming upon a cabin in the frozen wilderness and setting it on fire for temporary warmth, instead of using it for lasting shelter.

Granted we can't discontinue present uses of oil over night, but we can do more than we are doing to develop alternative sources of energy. Nuclear power and the breeder reactor are the most likely substitutes, and government is the greatest obstacle to their immediate use. A combine of regulations makes it take almost three times as long to build a nuclear power plant in America than it does elsewhere in the world. At the same time, government controls have reduced our production of petroleum and interfered with exploration leading to development of new producing oil fields.

On the previous broadcast I called attention to how many times our government in the past two-thirds of a century has told us we were running out of oil. And how many times new fields were discovered so that the predicted doomsdays never happened.

During those years of discovery, government had a policy of encouraging exploration including the much maligned oil depletion tax allowance. In these latter days, however, a punitive attitude toward the oil industry has prevailed. The incentives are gone and a network of regulations makes wildcatting so high risk, few are tempted. About 80 percent of the finding of new oil has been done, not by giant oil companies, but by independents and they have been the hardest hit by government's punitive policies.

The new energy proposals do little, or nothing, to reverse the recent course. Certainly they don't take into consideration the lag time in finding new oil. We are all aware that today's biggest source of oil is the OPEC combine of Arab states, but do we remember the search in the sands of Araby went on for eight years before a producing well was found? It took almost as long on Alaska's North Slope. Only recently was the North Sea discovered to be the source of new oil. Most of the world remains to be explored, and will be, if government will only remember how we did it a few years ago.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprising of a Radio Program entitled "Cuba"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A short time ago, I addressed the Foreign Policy Association in New York, giving my views on the international situation. Knowing I'd make reference to Cuba, I contacted some noted scholars and asked for the latest information on Castro's political prisoners. Word was returned to me that Amnesty International estimated their number at 80,000.

With confidence in the source, I used that figure in my remarks. It was challenged by a questioner who said his information had also come from Amnesty International and they had put the number of political prisoners in Cuba at four or five thousand. Now, that isn't exactly the kind of situation a luncheon speaker looks forward to. All I could do was to explain how I'd obtained my figure and say I'd re-check with my source -- which I did before the afternoon was over.

Let me reiterate the scholars I had consulted are connected with a most prestigious institution renowned for its studies on world affairs. They checked with their Amnesty International source and learned a typographical error had been made and the 80,000 should have been 60,000. Well, that's understandable and still left me in a better position than my questioner. But, then came other views all from within Amnesty International. The staff member who said 60,000 was disputed by others in the shop. Finally, they came up with something of a consensus that the figure was somewhere between two and twenty thousand. If whoever is in charge in Cuba can't do better than that, he must have trouble when it comes to providing meals for the inmates.

But maybe this is our problem when we try to cut through the curtains surrounding communism's closed societies. Not too long ago, a slender, soft-spoken, gray-haired lady addressed a large audience at Dartmouth College. I'm inclined to believe she speaks with greater authority than Amnesty International or those recent visitors to Cuba such as George McGovern who came home warmed by Castro's hospitality.

The lady, Anna Galbis, once held high positions in the Castro regime. She was studying in Paris (political science) when Castro came to power. Returning to Cuba, she supported the new government enthusiastically and served in the Cuban embassy in Washington; also in Peking. Later, she held a part in the Ministry of Armed Defense and was a translator and interpreter at international Marxist congresses held in Havana.

Yes, she is soft-spoken but her words aren't soft. Completely disillusioned, Anna Galbis likens all of Cuba to a prison except for the "showcases", foreign (make that American) visitors are taken to. Each Cuban is allowed three-quarters of a pound of meat every 10 days, 10 ounces of beans and three cans of condensed milk per month. Cuba's renowned seafood is processed for shipment to Russia. She makes it plain this diet does not apply to the Party leadership who drive Alfa Romeo cars.

Her disillusionment came in 1969. She applied for an exit visa and immediately lost her job and became an outcast for several years, eking out a living by tutoring in English and French. Finally, by way of relatives in Spain and the fact that she held American citizenship through her father, she was able to leave the workers' paradise. Anna Gilbis says there are 50,000 political prisoners languishing in 56 Cuban prisons, 26 concentration camps and 108 prison farms.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Episcopal Controversy"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

You may have read in the papers about serious disagreements within the Episcopal Church. If you're an Episcopalian, you may even be in the thick of it. The outcome of the controversy could have implications that reach well beyond the two-and-a-half million member denomination.

The controversy began to boil to the surface after the Church's convention in Minneapolis last September. At that meeting, the ordination of women was approved by a narrow margin, as was replacement of the Church's Book of Common Prayer. Since then efforts to remove any reference to gender from the Book of Psalms have added to the controversy.

Underlying these issues is a more basic tug-of-war between two large segments of the Church. Most of the Church's hierarchy and an undetermined number of its lay members favor a Church that is active in social change. On the other side is a grouping of priests and another group of laymen concerned about what they consider to be politically radical tugs at the Church's foundation. This group believes the Church should stick to its traditional role of ministering to the conscience of each member, so that well-motivated individuals will go out and work for a better world.

I think you'll agree that is a pretty fundamental disagreement. Since I'm not an Episcopalian, I won't step into the middle of their particular argument. Just the same, I can sympathize with the concerns some of them have.

Recently, I received a copy of a book that has fanned the flames of controversy among Episcopalians. Its title is "Struggling with the System Probing Alternatives", but it is usually referred to simply as "the green book", because of the color of its cover.

It's not an official Church publication, but was put out by a group called the Church & Society Network and The Witness, a magazine for Episcopalians. The guiding spirit behind "the green book" and its supporting organizations is the retired Bishop of Pennsylvania, Robert Dewitt.

One of my staff associates called the publisher's office. The young woman he talked with said that the book was designed to be a study guide for small groups of people who were "grappling with current issues". She cited the ordination of women and --QUOTE-- "fighting the grand jury system" --UNQUOTE-- as two examples. The idea was that these little groups, or networks, would then move to a larger discussion of the American economic and social system. The young woman said, "There is no set pattern or approach to the study guide. The healthy thing is that people are talking."

I'll bet they're talking! The book starts with the assumption that our system is a mess, and goes downhill from there. From beginning to end, it is an exercise in Marxist rhetoric, circa 1935. The Introduction to the Unit on "What's Wrong with Life in the U.S.?" says, "The truth of the matter is that one cannot expect to improve a system that is inherently irrational and unjust." --UNQUOTE. What can be done about it, as I'm sure you've guessed, is to toss the American System out and bring on socialism. Socialism is extolled on most every page. One writer even professes to see "Christ incognito at work in China today". Even the late Mao Tse-tung would be dismayed over that one.

Capitalism, on the other hand, is vilified. There is enough guilt and blame between the covers to last an army of masochists a lifetime.

As I said, I'm not an Episcopalian, but if I were I'd be concerned about this one-sided venture into political indoctrination.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprinting of a Radio Program entitled "Intelligence"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In both houses of the United States Congress the committees and subcommittees which used to concern themselves with threats to national security by alien and subversive groups have been closed down. There is, however, a Senate Committee to ride herd on our intelligence gathering agencies to see that they operate -- Number One -- lawfully and -- Number Two -- effectively.

In the committee's annual report, 38 of its 40 pages are devoted to what the committee has done to make sure our agencies operate lawfully.

Senator Daniel Moynihan wrote a dissent to the report, in which he said the committee made it sound as if the chief threat to our liberties was our own intelligence apparatus rather than the enemies that apparatus was supposed to protect us from. In the report there is mention of intelligence activities in our midst by South Korea, Chile, Iran, Taiwan and the Philippines. Has something happened we don't know about? Last I heard - all of these countries were friends and allies. Are we to believe the Russian K.G.B., Cuba and others among the Communist set aren't doing any snooping?

When I served on the Presidential commission looking into the C.I.A. we learned the Soviet Union had quadrupled its espionage efforts in the U.S. Can we hope that in the next annual report the Senate Committee will let us know how the enemy is doing now that they are so proud of having brought our own intelligence agencies under control - which means handcuffed?

This all seems part of an attitude in Washington that our liberties will be safe if we can just keep the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. from doing what they are supposed to do.

I've spoken on this program about the indictment of former F.B.I. agent John Kearney by our own Justice Department for using wiretaps, mail openings and break ins several years ago against the "Weathermen". When Agent Kearney did these things they had been presumed to be legal for 25 years. Since then a Supreme Court ruling has changed all that and J. Stanley Pottinger, head of the Civil Rights Division of the Justice Department, is plunging ahead not only to get Kearney, but apparently to get others in the Bureau, too. Mr. Pottinger is being cheered on by colommists of the New York Times and others -- who saw nothing wrong with forgiving draft evaders whose crimes were not presumed to be legal when they committed them. But as one columnist said, --QUOTE -- "In a free society the police cannot be above the law". -- UNQUOTE --

No one is suggesting they should be. But isn't it time for someone to ask if we aren't threatened more by the people the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. are watching than by the F.B.I. and the C.I.A.? In the spring of 1968 there were ten bombings on college campuses; that fall there were 41. By the next spring the total was 84 on campus and 10 off. In the 1969-70 school year there were almost 200 on our campuses and in 1970 - in the nation as a whole - some 3000 bombings. That is more than eight a day. Damage was in the millions of dollars and innocent people lost their lives.

Can anyone point to any comparable crimes against the citizens of this country committed by our law enforcement agencies?

RONALD REAGAN ·

(Reprising of a Radio Program entitled "O.S.H.A."  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Summing up government's purpose or responsibility in a single sentence risks over-simplification, but if I had to do it, I'd settle for this sentence: Government exists to protect us from each other. Brief as it is, it recognizes government's responsibility to provide police protection against law breakers; to maintain armed forces to keep our land from being invaded and our liberties lost.

The sentence also covers government's involvement in seeing we aren't sold poisoned or contaminated food or dangerous drugs falsely advertised as healthful medicines. In other words, government's function is to protect us from all those harmful things that could be done to us by someone else.

I have, however, criticized government for not stopping there, for deciding it knows what is best for us and trying to keep us from hurting ourselves. I'm sure many in the various agencies and bureaus of government are well intentioned when they do this, but what they do can lead to tyranny. An example is the continued effort by government to force motorcycle riders to wear helmets. I happen to believe it's foolish to ride a motorcycle without one, but doing so does not endanger others who are on the highway. The helmet protects only the rider and it's his right to risk not wearing one no matter how foolish we think he is.

Still, much of the costly growth of bureaucracy and the subsequent harassment and interference in our lives is the result of well intentioned public servants trying to eliminate all the hazards of living.

I've been most critical of the Occupational, Safety and Health Administration, commonly called O.S.H.A., now in existence for six years. It came into being to reduce or eliminate job hazards in every kind of business. And while it has inspected, filed charges against employers, and written tens of thousands of regulations there has been no reduction in work related injuries or deaths. There has, however, been costly reduction of productivity.

One of O.S.H.A.'s latest targets, which might explain why I've been critical, is the admittedly hazardous field of deep sea diving. According to the companies in this field there are about 600 commercial deep sea divers in the whole United States. The hazardous nature of the occupation is indicated by a diver's earnings which run from \$50,000 to \$100,000 a year.

O.S.H.A. is attempting to set standards for practices and equipment that would be required in deep sea diving. O.S.H.A. is meeting resistance. For one thing the cost of what O.S.H.A. is demanding is greater than the total gross revenue of all the companies in that business.

The companies and the divers do not minimize the hazards of their craft, but they present figures showing that injury and death is not commonplace. When it does occur it is unlikely that a regulation or safety precaution could prevent it; A man hit in the head by a tree carried down stream by the current, another entangled in wire who tore off his helmet in panic and tried to reach the surface.

They are brave men, a breed apart, and well aware of the precautions they must take. They have looked at O.S.H.A.'s proposed standards and, to a man, say "no thanks". It's easy to see why. The U.S. Navy in its Magazine FACEPLATE has said that to comply with the O.S.H.A. standards would mean sending the diver underwater weighing 1000 pounds!

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprising of A Radio Program entitled "DNA Research"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Though they probably can't even pronounce the word, some politicians are champing at the bit to control research into Deoxyribonucleic (DE-OXY-RIBO-NUCLEIC) Acid Molecules. Since that name is a tongue-twister, it's usually referred to simply as D-N-A. The research about it is called "Recombinant (RE-COM-BY-NANT) D-N-A research". In plainer English, these DNA molecules carry the genes which make up the hereditary characteristics of all living things.

Scientists have discovered that the DNA molecules can be split apart and rejoined in new combinations. The possibilities are almost endless. By combining molecules of different organisms, scientists can create new hybrids with new traits. This could lead to some dramatic breakthroughs in health care. Recently, for example there was good news about DNA's possibilities for diabetics.

There is hope that DNA research may lead us to a cure for cancer. It might slow the process of human aging. And, it might produce therapeutic proteins for victims of hemophilia.

In the environment, recombined DNA molecules might be used to breakup oil spills. Some might, in effect, draw nitrogen from the atmosphere to help fertilize crops.

Why are the politicians interested? Well, as I said, DNA research results in new organisms. So, some people are worried that new super-bacteria could be accidentally formed in the process; bacteria that would be impervious to all medicine and might escape from the lab and wreak havoc in the population.

Cries have gone up in some quarters for tight government controls on recombinant DNA research, as if the scientists were going to be careless with their vials and beakers.

Yet, Nobel Laureate, Dr. Arthur Kornberg of Stanford, says that the gene-splicing technique is not a health hazard and is nothing like the menace of overpopulation.

Last year, the National Institute of Health set up safety guidelines for the 91 institutions which house DNA projects funded by federal money. These are graded from P1, where normal lab precautions are taken, up to P4, requiring protective clothing, sealed rooms, airlocks and double doors. In addition, the labs themselves take steps to weaken the bacteria used in experiments. Cal Tech's Professor Robert Sinsheimer told the Pasadena city fathers that they use bacteria strains where ability to survive in the outside environment is reduced "by a millionfold" during lab procedures.

Nevertheless, Congress is toying with a bill that would use the NIH guidelines as the basis for a national law governing DNA research, in private labs as well as those supported by public funds. Senator Edward Kennedy even wants to add a provision for "local option", whereby city and town councils or local committees could have tougher regulations than the federal ones. Scientific inquiry could be stopped dead cold under such circumstances. Dr. Norton Zinder, a molecular geneticist at Rockefeller University, points out that widespread local bans on DNA Research would drive researchers underground, like bootleggers of the Prohibition Era.

The problems are already beginning. In California, where a certain amount of hysteria has been fanned over what might happen if DNA research is not done with care, the state legislature is considering a bill to license DNA genetic experiments by the state. As if the politicians and their bureaucrats knew more about the subject than the scientists.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Indexing"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In California the leader of the minority party in the legislature is pushing to have the graduated state income tax "indexed". He is being opposed by the big spending majority. Many of you who are listening live in states without an income tax; or, if there is one, it is a flat percentage of whatever your income happens to be. But all of us are subject to the steeply graduated federal income tax and here again a few brave souls in Congress -- like that California legislator -- are trying to get the federal tax indexed.

Very simply, indexing means adjusting the graduated surtax brackets to reflect the effect of inflation. As it is now, a wage earner who gets a cost of living increase usually moves up into a higher tax bracket. His pay raise hasn't made him one penny better off as to purchasing power. He's just kept even with the higher cost of living. That is he's kept even till he pays his taxes. Then, that higher surtax rate takes its bite and he's actually less well off than before the raise.

Here are some examples from California on just the effect of the state income tax without figuring in the added chunk Uncle Sam grabs. A family of four earning \$9,600.00 last year will have to get a \$595.00 raise to keep even with the 6.2% inflation rate. So this year their income is \$10,195.00. But that raise put them in a higher state tax bracket reducing their purchasing power by \$70.00. A family earning \$18,300.00 (about the median income) gets a cost of living raise to \$19,435.00, but their taxes go up far more than 6.2%. Add in the federal bite on both these examples and you can see why even with the pay raises it still doesn't get easier to pay for those braces on Junior's teeth.

In 1974, the federal government got an estimated \$30 billion of undeserved tax because no allowance is made in the tax rates for inflation. That averages out to \$130.00 for every man, woman, child and baby in America. But, don't let that fool you -- it's a lot more than \$130. for the average taxpayer.

Suppose the cost of living index was applied to the tax brackets--then the wage earner would continue paying the same rate of tax unless and until he got a raise that actually amounted to an increase in purchasing power.

Politicians for the most part don't favor indexing because that would interfere with their spending habits. You see, under the present system, inflation is an invisible tax. In California, in just the last three years, state income tax collections have increased twice as fast as personal income. That figure at the national level is probably even higher.

Now the politicians answer is that government is also caught by inflation and must pay higher salaries and prices for things it must buy, so indexing would keep it from growing with the economy. Of course government costs go up with inflation, but so would tax revenues even with indexing. That first California family I mentioned would be paying income tax on \$10,195.00 instead of \$9,600.00, but the rate would remain the same. Right now for every percentage point of increase in cost-of-living, the government gets one-and-a-half percentage points increase in revenue.

Indexing of the California tax would save Californians \$345 million the first year. Indexing the federal income tax could save as much as \$30 billion a year for all of us.

Indexing is an idea whose time has not only come -- it is overdue.

Several other countries have already done it. Leading economists endorse it. The American people should demand it in a way Congress can't ignore. Indexing isn't a tax cut, it is a halt to an illicit, hidden increase.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitle "Force Account Work"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Single family housing is in the middle of a boom right now, as you may have found out yourself if you've been shopping for a new home lately. The National Association of Home Builders forecasts that 1.4 million new single family houses will be built this year -- an all-time record, and nearly 21 per cent ahead of last year.

There is a combination of reasons -- more new family formations, plenty of mortgage money available, and a desire by man to invest in real estate as a hedge against further inflation. All this adds up to sunnier skies for the construction business -- which went through several hard years -- but there's a new problem looming which may hurt construction jobs in the future.

It's called "force account" or "day labor" work. That is, work done by government agencies using their own employees, instead of putting the jobs out to bid by private contractors.

In most cases, government agencies have limits within which jobs don't require public bidding. These limits usually range from \$2,500 to \$10,000. But, there is reason to believe that, as government at every level grows, the legal limits for non-bid construction work are often being ignored.

Most of the examples I've learned about are in California, but chances are the problem is about the same in your state, too.

One case that came to light recently involved a large school district in Sacramento County. It was building a 3,000 square foot building using its own employees as the construction crew, although the law required bidding on the \$45,000 job. It took a threat of court action by a group of contractors to get the school district to stop this "force account" work.

Government agencies argue that using their own work force is actually more economic than putting some jobs out to bid. They say that since they must hire people for seasonal and emergency work that this "force account" work keeps them busy during the slack times. They use the same argument about government owned equipment.

Contractor groups, on the other hand, argue that the law is the law and government agencies aren't above the law. And, a California coalition of construction trade associations formed to fight "force account" work estimates that some \$500 million in construction contracts is lost by private contractors and construction workers each year in California alone because of "force account" work performed by public employees of cities, counties, special districts, school districts and state agencies. They claim that there would be 17,000 more private construction jobs in their state if public agencies weren't engaging in this kind of work. If so, public agencies that skirt around the legal bidding limits on their construction jobs are also aggravating the unemployment problem. This, in turn costs the taxpayers additional money in the form of unemployment and welfare support for some of those construction workers who can't find jobs.

Maybe this practice isn't a problem in your community yet, but next time you read about a new public construction job in the newspaper, it wouldn't hurt to ask your elected representatives if their government unit is using "force account" work.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Common Sense Bureaucrats"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

If you're a regular listener to these broadcasts, you know I'm a skeptic when it comes to bureaucracy. More often than not, when I point out bureaucratic blunders, bobbles and boondoggles it is more to illustrate the folly of believing that government can make better decisions for you than you can for yourself than it is to attack bureaucrats as people.

Now it's true, some practitioners of the bureaucrat's art have given bureaucracy a bad name. Still, there are plenty of dedicated -- and efficient -- career government workers at every level.

Just the other day I learned about one bureaucrat at the local level who used the kind of common sense we wish there were more of in Washington.

In Pasadena, California the city fathers had decided to contract to have every house curbside numbered. It was a big order, some 30,000 residences. Bill Sato (SAH-TOE), a supervisor in the Department of Public Works, was given the assignment to find companies interested in doing the job and to make a recommendation.

He heard from potential bidders who wanted to paint the house numbers the old-fashioned way, with big crews going around with stencils, brushing the numbers on one-by-one. Then he heard about Harwood Hellen, a former aerospace tool-and-die maker. It seems Mr. Hellen had assembled a one-man house numbering factory on wheels -- go-cart wheels to be exact! Bill Sato checked with neighboring cities and found they had had good results with Mr. Hellen and his go-cart. He recommended him to the city fathers. They said okay, and Hellen got the contract.

How did the go-cart project work? Fine. Wearing a pith helmet, a sweatshirt with a big star on the front, gardening gloves and a big grin, Mr. Hellen zipped through the streets of Pasadena right on schedule. The whole city was done in 180 days! He painted up to 400 home's-worth on some days. Sitting low in his go-cart, Hellen had before him on the handlebars all the numbers he needed. Towed behind was a small generator. He would pull up to the curb (he was already sitting just above curb level), drop the right numbers into a frame; zip went his spray gun, then off he'd go to the next house. The moral of the story is that Mr. Hellen had built a better mousetrap and bureaucrat Bill Sato recognized it when he saw it.

There's even hope in Washington. At the Federal Trade Commission Robert B. Rich, assistant director for evaluation of the Consumer Protection bureau is in the midst of what seems like a revolutionary idea: he's evaluating F.T.C. regulations to see if some aren't working and should be scrapped.

Businessmen have long argued that some regulations aimed at helping consumers actually have the opposite effect. Regulators have rarely agreed, but now the F.T.C. is listening. Rich and his bureau are making "impact evaluations" on a range of Commission rulings. They have begun with the so-called "unavailability" rule adopted six years ago after a rash of consumer complaints about retailers who advertise bargains but don't stock the promoted good. The rule says stores must stock reasonable amounts of discount-advertised goods, but the F.T.C. now worries that its rule may discourage retailers from holding bargain sales at all. Who knows, the F.T.C. may even decide that the market place isn't so bad after all.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Economic Fairy Tales"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Many decades ago the Fabian movement was born. Its purpose was to impose socialism on the world through gradual and silent encroachment. The Fabians believed that by achieving certain programs not perceived by the citizenry as socialistic the world would one day awake to find it had accumulated so many of socialism's goals that it might just as well go the rest of the way.

So far, the Fabians have been pretty successful. And their success could be used as evidence that "gradualism" is the way to get things done.

I'm sure the Fabians, however, didn't have anything to do with the gradualism which keeps those of us who want less government and more freedom from doing something about it. The gradualism I'm talking about is our tendency to believe that if we were to suddenly wipe out unnecessary and unwanted government programs chaos would result.

Two years ago Leonard Reed, head of the Foundation for Economic Education, exposed the fallacy of this fear with three classic examples. Going back to the early 1930's -- the depression and New Deal days -- he reminded us of the National Industrial Recovery Act -- know then as NRA. Its symbol was a blue eagle, which was a pretty shabby way to treat an eagle. NRA was facism pure and simple -- government control of business and industry. Their courage destroyed by the traumatic experience of the 1929 crash and the depression that followed, business and industrial leaders embraced NRA. But after a year or two of government interference the honeymoon was over. Business wanted to rid itself of the political monster. But, gradually they were convinced that to end it suddenly would wreck the economy.

Then, in May, 1935, the Supreme Court declared the Blue Chicken (no one called it an eagle anymore) unconstitutional. As of that moment every provision of NRA was abolished. There was no chaos. The economic indicators started upward and, though the depression would continue until World War II, business was better not worse.

Reed's second example came with V.J. day and the end of World War II. President Truman greeted the news of victory by ordering cancellation of all war contracts. They amounted to \$45 billion. He was told that would ruin the economy. He replied, QUOTE: "Cancel them". UNQUOTE. Telegrams were sent, ordering all contractors to halt all production. There was no pandemonium, production of long-denied consumer items took over and again the economic indicators moved up. No one went bankrupt and there was full employment.

Third example was also postwar. The allied command in Germany had imposed Keynesian economics and all manner of controls on the German industrial complex. They chose Dr. Ludwig Erhard as their German economic adviser. Then, one Sunday evening, Dr. Erhard went on nationwide radio and announced, "Beginning tomorrow morning all wage, price and other controls are off". The allied planning commission told him he could be imprisoned for such an unauthorized action. They said, "You have modified our controls". He denied this. He said, "I haven't modified your controls; I have abolished them".

He was ordered to appear before the Allied Commander, our General Clay, who (bless him) told Erhard he was the economist and he would have the General's backing. We all know that chaos and disaster did not result from the Doctor's unprecedented action. An economic miracle did -- the recovery of West Germany that astounded the world. So much for gradualism.

## RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Health Costs"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The other day my friend, M. Stanton Evans, wrote a column in which he said; "From start to finish, the current mess in medical pricing is a creation of the government. There will be no hope of remedy until that simple fact is recognized and acted upon". He was commenting on the President's proposal for fixing hospital rates by government order to curtail -- QUOTE -- "the devastating inflationary trend" -- UNQUOTE -- of hospital costs.

Stan Evans has properly fixed the blame where it belongs, on the impact of billions and billions of taxpayer dollars pumped into the health care system through Medicare and Medicaid. Now a fair question is why and how does federal spending on health care raise the price? And the answer lies in the increased utilization that takes place when normal restraints are eliminated.

If you and I feel a touch miserable on a bleak winter day, chances are we take a couple of aspirin, go to bed early and call the doctor if we don't feel any better the next morning. Likewise, if something does hospitalize us, our first question is, "Doctor, how soon can I go home?" And that question is prompted at least in part by our knowledge of how much the hospital room is costing per day.

The increase in health insurance has had some effect on increased costs. With a third party paying the tab -- even though it's out of our insurance premiums -- we all relax a little and don't hurry to leave the hospital quite as soon as we did when we wrote out the check ourselves. But by far, the big impact is government.

Total figures can be confusing. The fact that government expenditures for Medicare and Medicaid went from \$7 billion to more than \$40 billion in 10 years can be laid to more people, inflation and other factors. However, one figure can't be talked away. That is, how much is the cost per person. The startling fact is that from 1965 to 1975 per capita health care spending by government went up 813.6%.

The Council on Wage & Price Stability says, "The rapid growth in private third payments is dwarfed by the growth in public expenditures resulting from Medicare and Medicaid". Right now roughly 40% of all health care spending is by government. Government is picking up the tab for 55% of all hospital bills. Thus a lot of those normal restraints I mentioned have been replaced by a "sky's the limit" attitude.

You see the government's method of spending is based on cost. To get more, a hospital administrator only has to spend more. So why fight a demand for higher pay by hospital employees? Order that new equipment that looked so good in the medical journal. Relax that close watch on extravagance in ordering supplies. Since three-fourths or more of hospital costs are for staff it is easy for hospital overhead to increase and, of course, it is prorated out on a per room basis.

A Frenchman named Bastiat more than a century ago said, "Public funds seemingly belong to no one and the temptation to bestow them on some one is irresistible".

This doesn't mean we should blame the hospital administrator. Would we do differently in his place? His task of trying to make each dollar go farther, saying "no" to a pay raise for hard-working nurses and trying to hold the price down for the patient can be frustrating. Then down the chimney comes Uncle Sugar saying, "Just send me the bill". Well, more Uncle Sugar is not the answer.



RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Names"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan

In a recent edition of the ALTERNATIVE magazine published by The Saturday Evening Club, a gentleman named Joseph McGrath wrote tellingly of something that could change our society more than switching to the metric system.

Mr. McGrath had seen an item in his local paper about an upcoming marriage. The thing that had caught his eye was the announcement that the young couple, in keeping with some of the ideas floating around these days, intended to keep both their surnames. They would, as a married couple, be known as the Schwamm-Bukowskis, not Mr. & Mrs. Bukowski.

Now if I'd seen that item, I must confess, I probably would have shrugged it off as a little silly, but certainly that's their right if that's what they wanted to put on their mailbox. But Mr. McGrath, while conceding that latter point, has a more inquiring mind. He looked into the future, not only of the Schwamm-Bukowskis but the future of society if such an idea catches on.

Envisioning parenthood for the happy couple, Mr. McGrath does some supposing. Suppose a daughter, Janet, is born -- Janet Schwamm-Bukowski who grows up and marries a young man who also has a dual name (the idea having caught on). Janet Schwamm-Bukowski and Jack Krenwinkel-Roget become the Schwamm-Bukowski-Krenwinkel-Rogets.

Time passes and they are blessed with a son they promptly name Frank. Reaching the age of 21 Mr. McGrath envisions Frank Schwamm-Bukowski-Krenwinkel-Roget falling in love with and marrying a lovely young lady, Juanita Halloran-Schwamm (no relation) - Morningside-Lucarelli. This nice young couple being sentimental and nostalgic over earlier times name their firstborn after a favorite great-Granduncle named John Smith. And there it is on the birth certificate -- John Smith Halloran-Schwamm-Morningside-Lucarelli-Schwamm-Bukowski-Krenwinkel-Roget.

Without getting into additional generations, Mr. McGrath then took up some of the associated problems started by the young couple, the Schwamm-Bukowskis, who set us off on this course. Roll calls, at the start of the school day, could conceivably take until lunchtime.

Of course, he points out, there would be rejoicing on the bureaucratic front. The computers would be humming like crazy and the Form 1040 would have to have a lot of additional lines. Telephone directory printing would be a great growth industry. And, how about all those monogrammed items. -- towels, bed linens, handkerchiefs and even shirts? Monogrammed jewelry, tie clips, cuff links, earrings, etcetera -- well, we'd probably just have to give up on those. But how about those conventions and business meetings where a sticker bearing your name is stuck to your lapel? It would become an 11 by 14 placard hung around your neck like a bib.

Mr. McGrath carried his vision of the future to other problem areas -- the engravers of tombstones, for example. He may have created a new parlor game. Try it at your next social gathering. I've thought of one already, probably because of an earlier occupation of mine. Can't you hear a sports announcer now, saying, excitedly - QUOTE - "John Smith-Halloran-Schwamm-Morningside-Lucarelli-Schwamm (no relation) - Bukowski-Krenwinkel-Roget is fading back to pass." I wonder if we could get Miss Schwamm and Mr. Bukowski to reconsider?

RONALD REAGAN

Disc 76-16

Taped 7/6/77

76-16A

TITLE

1. Private Property	3:02
2. The Hatch Act	3:11
3. South Africa	3:12
4. Food Stamps	3:04
5. Man's Castle	2:52
6. Jamaica	3:16
7. Endangered Species	3:16

76-16B

TITLE

1. Socialized Medicine	2:55
2. The Principal's Principles	2:55
3. Property Rights	3:11
4. Cambodia	3:06
5. Bulletins	3:12
6. Spending	3:00
7. Government Cost	3:14
8. Quiz	3:19

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Private Property"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A young couple in Fullerton, California with a collection of antique furniture and a yen (now fulfilled) to restore an old fashioned home are fighting City Hall. And, they may be winning. A lot of their neighbors hope they are, and the rest of us should hope so, too. Governments at every level have shown an increasing arrogance in recent years with regard to private property rights. It's time they were reminded that an individual's right to possess and control his own property is fundamental to freedom itself.

Carole and Matthew Slobin, like so many of us, had a dream. It wasn't an impossible dream but it did take eight years to fulfill. Now, for almost a year and a half, the Fullerton Park Commission and the City Council have been making the dream a nightmare.

The dream was to find an old fashioned home, restore it, furnish it with their collection of antiques and raise their children in it. Both the Slobins work. Carole teaches first grade and has always felt a responsibility to make her first graders aware of how wonderful their country is.

Well, a year ago March the Slobins found their old house. It had been built in 1916 on something more than a full acre. They put their life savings into restoring it and planned to landscape the entire acre plus.

But, in that same month, The Fullerton Park Commission had looked at the property with the idea of making it a mini-park. There are two regular parks within half a mile. When the city received a letter from the Slobins stating they had purchased the property and were in escrow, the park idea was dropped.

As work on the house was completed, the slobins made a slight alteration in their dream; they wouldn't landscape and garden the entire property. There was an energy crisis and California's worst drought in 100 years. They decided to build two rental houses on the back half of the lot, each having about a 90 by 100 foot lot.

The planning commission approved and so did the neighbors. But, when the Park Commission and the City Council learned of the new plan, back they came with the mini-park idea. The Slobins were threatened with condemnation proceedings in spite of all their restoring and the fact that the old house had become their family home, complete with mortgage.

Perhaps I've gone too fast. I failed to mention that last year when the Slobins first bought the place and then heard about the city's plan for a park, they got the signatures of 100 neighbors who evidently preferred to have the Slobin dream than the mini-park. It was then they were told to go ahead; that the city would drop its plan.

This June, with the park idea reborn, the city council called for a public hearing on the matter. The surprised council found 150 opponents of the park bearing signs that said, "Save the Slobin Home", "Listen to the People" and "No Mini-Park". There was, in addition, a petition bearing 2400 signatures of people in the area who don't want the park. The local paper has also editorialized against the park.

The meeting was adjourned with no action taken, but another public hearing was scheduled (under pressure) for August 23rd. Possibly the council thinks the people will cool down over the summer. I don't think so. The Slobins held an open house for their new friends; 700 came, many bearing gifts. It's nice, isn't it, to learn that you can fight city hall?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Hatch Act"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The House of Representatives has voted to eliminate the law known as the Hatch Act. And, because this program is pre-recorded prior to my going out on the mashed-potato circuit, it's possible that by the time you hear this the U.S. Senate may have done likewise. With all my heart I pray it has not.

Eliminating the Hatch Act is one of the major features of the Administration's so-called election reform proposals.

During the House debate, the Hatch Act has been portrayed as some kind of monstrous restriction on the rights of federal employees. They have been pitied as second-class citizens who are being denied the inalienable rights available to the rest of us. And, if you didn't look very carefully to see who was spouting this drivel, you probably never noticed that it wasn't coming from those so-called "second-class citizens" at all. Public employees remember better than the rest of us why the Hatch act was passed in 1939.

Well, it's time for a reminder; time to recall the massive scandals, the coercion of government workers that was standard operating procedure at election time. It was commonplace then for Federal employees to be ordered to attend partisan political rallies, to switch their party registration and to be shaken down for political contributions.

Congressman Joe Fisher of Virginia tried to tell his fellow House members what it was like to be a government employee pre-1939. They should have listened, because he spoke from experience. Representative Fisher was a civil servant in Washington in 1939. He said government workers hailed the Hatch Act as landmark legislation to protect them and to better their working conditions. It banned political coercion and restricted employee's own activities in campaigns, yet it did not prohibit them from supporting candidates of their choice or wearing campaign buttons or contributing if they so desired.

A poll taken while Congress was debating the repeal causes one to wonder who the Members of the House thought they were pleasing. Common Cause -- usually on the liberal side of any issue -- opposed eliminating the Hatch Act and provided some public opinion poll results. Of the total respondents to the poll by Decision Making Information, 74 per cent opposed changing the act, as did 71 per cent of union members. That's significant, because the union heirarchy was promoting the repeal. Among public employees, 81 per cent of the non-unionized government workers and 61 per cent of those in unions did not want the Hatch Act tampered with. But politicians and labor bosses did.

Government workers know better than anyone else the subtle pressures that can be applied, so they aren't very impressed with promises they've heard that they'll be protected. Those making the promises are the ones who voted to take away their protection.

Forms of compulsion are many if someone wants to invoke the multitudinous rules and regulations to make the civil servant's life miserable or to put a "dead end" sign in the path of his career. It's very easy to let a government employee know that if he or she wants to get along -- they'd better go along.

I saw enough examples of this when I was Governor and conscientious state employees cooperated in economies displeasing to the entrenched bureaucracy. It can be done so subtly that you are powerless to help the victim or even prove it's going on.

If when you hear this, the Senate has not yet acted, write your Senator.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "South Africa"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Let's start off by agreeing that apartheid -- the separation of the races as practiced in South Africa -- is not something Americans can be comfortable with. Let's also admit that our discomfort is heightened by our own memories of bigotry, discrimination and prejudice in our own land. We've come a long way toward solving our problem here, although no one claims the job is finished.

But, has our own experience made us intolerant and quick to criticize -- indeed to punish -- this other nation without trying to understand complexities we were never faced with? For example, is the problem in South Africa simply one of racial difference? Unfortunately, the answer is "no". It's not that simple.

The black majority in South Africa is made up of several different tribes with long histories of conflict and animosity between them. If majority rule should come to be -- in the sense that the black majority came into power tomorrow -- there could very easily be outright tribal war as each tribe refused to be ruled or dominated by one of the others.

In coping with this problem, South Africa has embarked on a plan of setting up separate Republics for each tribe -- with self-rule and autonomy for each. Those most critical of South African policies have charged this is a subterfuge; an extension of apartheid, and that the new Republics will be mere puppet states. But is this true?

One such state has come into existence already, the Republic of Transkei. It will celebrate its first birthday in October. Here are some vital statistics on the baby nation; population - two million; larger than Belgium, Israel, Lebanon and more than a score of other nations in good standing in the U.N. Indeed, its population is greater than some 30-odd U.N. members. It has a per capita income higher than 17 of its neighbors and a literacy rate higher than 19. Freedom House, a liberal group which monitors civil liberties throughout the world, finds Transkei providing more civil liberties for its people than a score of African nations including Angola, Mozambique, Zaire and, of course, Uganda.

The United Nations refuses to recognize or admit Transkei to membership, calling it a puppet state. But, it has happily accepted a number of puppets whose strings are tied to Moscow. If the U.N. can keep a straight face while calling East Germany an independent nation, it has truly reached the ultimate in hypocrisy.

Is it possible that Transkei is unacceptable because it came into being without bloodshed or the help of Cuban mercenaries? The new little Republic is pro-western and anti-Communist -- two characteristics the United Nations does not seem to possess these days. As a matter of fact, we may be on the trail of why Transkei is being ostracized by New York's Tower of Babel. Transkei's Prime Minister Matanzima has said that developing countries can't afford socialism -- nor can other nations for that matter. He has proclaimed that the free market, when it is allowed to function, is the way to provide the people with goods, services and food.

And if that isn't enough to keep him out of the U.N., he is staunchly anti-Communist and has an anti-communism clause in the Transkei constitution.

All of these may be reasons why Transkei can't get into the U.N., but they sound like good reasons why the U.S. should recognize Transkei and stop acting foolish.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Food Stamps"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

As the U.S. Congress began watching the clock on the last day before the Memorial Day recess the people took something of a beating. Rushing to adjourn, the Senate passed and sent to the House the "Food and Agriculture Act of 1977" Included in the act was a two-year extension of the Food Stamp program.

Now I, for one, have advocated a thorough overhaul of the food stamp caper for some time; even had a task force work on a plan for reform my last year as Governor. But, what I had in mind was somewhat different from the changes the Senators made.

The Welfare lobby, with the President's blessing, ended the requirement for purchasing food stamps. The stamps are now free. In the past there was some effort to recognize the extent of need. Some people received stamps free, others paid on a sliding scale based on their income and need. But, even at the top of the scale, the stamps were a bargain. Now they are more than a bargain. They are free for everyone but the taxpayer.

Senator McGovern has long advocated doing away with the purchase part of the program as a -- QUOTE -- "First step" -- UNQUOTE -- toward a guaranteed annual income.

The Senators didn't change that part of the program that made strikers and college students eligible for food stamps. I remember a student at one of our state universities who had quite a deal worked out. He was allowed to buy \$25.00 worth of food stamps for 50¢. Another convenience in the program was recognition that you couldn't always make your food stamp purchase come out to an even \$25.00 so the stores could give a small amount of cash for the unused stamps. In his case it amounted to 47 cents. The first week of each month he'd buy \$25.00 worth of stamps -- get \$24.53 worth of supplies and 47 cents change. The second week he'd put 3 cents with the 47 cents and repeat. By the end of the third week he'd have a total of \$73.59 worth of groceries plus another 47¢. Putting in his 3 cents again, he'd make his fourth week buy of food stamps which he then sold to friends for \$15.00. For a monthly investment of 59 cents, his "take" each month was \$15.00 in cash, plus \$73.59 worth of food. When I first learned about him, I didn't know whether to stop what he was doing or hire him as State Finance Director. Now, of course, he doesn't even need the 59 cents.

Free food stamps are intended for the poor. But, in establishing whether a recipient qualifies, they use net, not gross income. Therefore, the real cut-off point for a family of four is about \$10,600 and for larger families it is much higher.

If you aren't irritated yet -- try this for size. Senator Carl Curtis proposed an amendment to at least halt or reduce chances for fraud. He wanted the Department of Agriculture to issue I.D. cards containing the recipient's photo, set up an earnings clearance system to check reported income with employers and a cross-check to prevent recipients from picking up more than one set of food stamps.

On May 24th the Curtis amendment to prevent outright cheating was defeated in the Senate 57 to 37.

This must go down in the records as a sad day for those who toil and pay taxes -- indeed for America.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Man's Castle"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A unique feature of that document so unique in itself -- the United States Constitution -- is the 4th Amendment guarantying the sanctity of our homes. In all the social structures governing man's relationship to man, prior to the American revolution no one denied government's right to enter a citizen's dwelling place to search and to seize.

But here for 200 years we, the people, have declared that officials cannot invade our privacy unless they obtain a warrant. And that warrant must show "probable cause". Meaning the magistrate issuing the warrant must be given specific evidence which indicates a search is justified in the interest of the public good.

Now, suddenly we discover that as bureaus and agencies of government have increased in number, they have also increased in power. Spawning regulations to make their own jobs easier or just to carry out what they have decided is best for society, they increasingly invade, inspect and punish without the formality of a warrant.

Discovery of this was made by Idaho congressman George Hanse. O.S.H.A. the Occupational Safety and Health Administration -- sought entry to a small husband-and-wife-owned business. The wife, Mrs. Hertzler, told the inspectors, QUOTE -- "Not without a warrant." -- UNQUOTE. They returned with a warrant, but it did not show probable cause so again they were denied entry.

The Hertzlers have a small shop in their back yard. As a courtesy to their five employees they let them keep their lunches in the refrigerator which is in the Hertzler's own kitchen. The O.S.H.A. inspectors used this as an excuse to demand entry into the Hertzler's home. An aroused Mr. Hertzler ran them off with justified anger.

Learning of this, Congressman Hansen -- who has challenged O.S.H.A.'s high-handed tactics before -- inquired of O.S.H.A. if they did indeed claim the right to search private dwellings without a warrant. The answer was "Yes". O.S.H.A. did make such a claim.

His next stop was the solicitors office in the Department of Labor. There he was blatantly informed by one Mike Levine that the O.S.H.A. act gave the Labor Department the authority to conduct such inspections of private homes under Section 8 (a) of Public Law 91-596.

Looking at all the areas government now claims as within its jurisdiction and, therefore, subject to its regulations, the consequences of such a statement are staggering. Your home could be subject to search simply because you were hiring a gardener, having carpet installed, or re-doing the kitchen.

Congressman Hansen has called the seriousness of this violation of constitutional principle to the attention of his colleagues. Congress passed the law which gave O.S.H.A. its authority. It is probably that O.S.H.A. -- like so many other agencies -- has arrogantly gone beyond Congressional intent. But whatever, Congress can undo what has been done and should do so quickly and emphatically.

Daniel Webster said, -- QUOTE -- "Hold onto your Constitution, for if the American Constitution shall fall there will be anarchy throughout the world".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Jamaica"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The Prime Minister of Jamaica, Michael Manley, has been told by a spokesman for the White House and our State Department that the people of America admire his democratic achievements; that we want to help in his striving for social and economic justice and that what he is doing has great significance for all the developing world.

Before "we the people" endorse such statements, we should learn more about Prime Minister Manley's concept of social and economic justice. And, "we the people" might find ourselves more than a little upset with the spokesman who described us as filled with admiration.

Shortly after his election in 1973, Manley began his leftward tilt by flying to the conference of non-aligned nations in Algiers, along with Fidel Castro in Fidel's private plane. Returning from the trip, he dubbed Castro the greatest leader he'd ever met. After a follow-up visit to Cuba, he said, "I walk hand in hand with Fidel Castro to lead our people to a common destiny."

And, do you know, he's doing just that. Like Cuba, Jamaica is on the edge of economic disaster. Tourism, once the Number One business there, has fallen from \$400 million a year to one fourth of that. Inflation is high and unemployment runs about 30%. Many of the beach front homes and hotels that sheltered sun-seeking spenders are boarded up relics of a bygone way of life.

Manley has organized youth brigades which are sent to Cuba for training as are detachments of Jamaica police. Cuban "technicians" have come to Jamaica. The government admits to less than 1000, but Jamaicans put the figure at 5000 and more arriving every day.

Other happenings typical of countries going communist or, if you prefer, just plain totalitarian, have become the new way of life. But they are hardly the kind of thing one should say arouses the admiration of Americans. Organized terrorism by gangs of young goons sees beatings of innocent citizens and arson and murder are an everyday occurrence. Usually, this treatment is directed toward Manley's political opponents.

And, again typical of the totalitarian world, the Prime Minister used the violence as an excuse to declare a state of emergency (a year ago June). Under emergency regulations, arrests have been made, people are held without court order and hundreds -- mostly political opponents -- are put in detention camps.

Last December, with the state of emergency still in effect, the Prime Minister demonstrated his devotion to democracy by calling an election. No public meetings or motorcades were allowed, no candidate could travel with more than five people, and roving bands of thugs were a constant threat in the neighborhoods where political opposition was strong. At vote-counting time, they moved into a number of places where the counting was going on and took over.

Manley's government owns the only TV station, one of the two radio stations and threatens to take over the only independent newspaper left on the island. And, shades of Hitler and Allende of Chile, he has his own army. It is called the "Home Guard", 9000 armed, uniformed men which supposedly patrols with the army and the police but which is completely independent of both.

He has nationalized the utilities including the phone system and is turning his attention now to banking and essential industries. Rigid controls have been imposed on imports, exports and currency. Yes, he walks hand in hand with Fidel Castro but let no one say he has "roused the admiration of the people of our country."



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Endangered Species"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Since the beginning of life on this planet, thousands of species, plant and animal, have disappeared every century as part of the evolutionary process in an ever changing world.

We, as humans, share a feeling of guilt because, as our numbers have increased, we have contributed to the disappearance of some species by destroying their habitat or hunting them down for food, fur and feathers. And sometimes our guilt makes us forget those thousands of species that simply ceased to exist before man ever appeared in the primeval swamp.

Today, we are trying to halt as best we can our contribution to, or hastening of, the disappearance of existing plant and animal life. We have identified endangered species and passed laws preventing any act by man which might reduce their numbers. And I'm sure there is general agreement with this policy. But shouldn't we now and then remember nature's part in the elimination of some species and separate the serious from the silly in our own policy?

Up in Maine, a mammoth hydroelectric generating facility was scheduled to be constructed in a part of America -- the Northeast -- where power is in short supply. The Dickey-Lincoln dam site was key to this \$1.3 billion project on the St. John River. Many factors were taken into consideration and a great deal of study went into planning such an expensive project, as you can well imagine.

Then, about a year ago, someone discovered a clump of wild flowers -- about 200 in all -- in the area to be flooded by the building of the dam. They were a species of snapdragon, thought to be extinct, called the Furbish Lousewart. The \$1.3 billion Dickey-Lincoln generating facility is now halted -- stopped dead in its tracks -- by the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

I'm not a botanist, but isn't it possible those plants could be transplanted? I've transplanted wild flowers on the ranch with little or no trouble at all. I've even gathered seeds and helped the spread of some types to other parts of the ranch. And can anyone really say there aren't other clumps of Furbish Lousewart hidden in the woods of Maine as this clump was hidden until humans invaded the area to build a dam?

Down on the Little Tennessee River, the Tennessee Valley Authority has been building a dam to produce electricity for about 200,000 homes and I don't know-how-many industries providing jobs for people in those homes. This project has been going on for about 10 years so far, \$116 million have been spent and the huge Tellico Dam is 95% complete. Apparently, that's as far as it will get. A federal court has stopped construction because a three-inch fish called the Snail Darter has been found to spawn in the waters of the Little Tennessee River. This particular Snail Darter is an endangered species even though it differs only slightly from the 77 other kinds of Darters found in the rivers of Tennessee.

To date, more than 200 projects have been halted to protect, among other things, an inedible clam, some crayfish and fresh water snails. And the Fish & Wildlife Service announces it is now going to classify as "endangered" some 1700 species of plants.

It is time to ask if some environmentalists, and I do mean some, aren't using the Endangered Species Act of 1973 simply to halt construction of projects they don't like. Which is too bad because most of the billions of dollars I've mentioned would be in paychecks.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Socialized Medicine"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The campaign goes on to bring health care in America out of the free market system and into the protective custody of government. Those who brought us the postal service and Amtrak are anxious to provide medical service of the same high caliber.

What is hard to understand -- or, come to think of it, may not be so hard to understand -- is the American Medical Association's reluctance to fight back. After decades of all-out war against socialized medicine is it possible that combat fatigue has set in? Heaven knows, the energy and determination of those who want to put government in charge of our health has been untiring and persistent.

The Medical Association gave in to war weariness and endorsed a national health insurance bill which would force all employers to provide health insurance benefits for their employees. Probably, the association figured, government would have less chance to interfere in the doctor-patient relationship under such a program. Some place along the line, however, the troops rallied and the Association withdrew its support of the bill.

But the defense line -- once breached -- is hard to restore. The insurance business, which should be opposed to government medicine, is supporting a bill which -- just by coincidence I'm sure -- calls for a heavy government subsidy for the buying of private health insurance.

Much of the opposition to government medicine has been based on the better quality of medicine we have here in America -- where the providing of health care is still largely in the free market.

On these broadcasts I have tried to debunk the claims of the socialized medicine advocates by citing comparisons between medical quality, availability and cost here and in other countries. A typical example is an incident told by Congressman Bob Bauman. On a trip to England he asked an English woman (attractive, except for some facial scars) what she thought of their National Health service. She approved of it and said, -- QUOTE -- "We all get our medical care free you know". -- UNQUOTE. This isn't true of course. They are taxed far more heavily than we are, and their health service takes a big bite of those taxes.

Then she said, -- QUOTE -- "It is rather slow. I had to wait eight years for an appointment with a dermatologist about my face". -- UNQUOTE. She then had to wait another year before treatment could begin. She repeated, -- QUOTE "But it is free". -- UNQUOTE.

There is another argument against socialized medicine which hasn't been used as much as it should when you think of the sense of fair play that is characteristic of Americans. George Meany of the AFL-CIO is all-out for a national health plan. But how would he react if someone proposed that the skilled workers he represents would have to become government employees to practice their skill? Do any of us have the right to tell the members of any profession or trade they must become government employees in order to pursue their chosen work?

Of course, we all want to insure that no one is denied needed medical care because of poverty. And we've done better than most countries to provide that care. But wouldn't it violate everything we believe in to adopt a system based on the idea that the patients have a right to a doctor's services without regard for his right to say how and on what terms those services will be delivered.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "The Principal's Principles"  
Commentary by Ronald REagan)

Usually, a graduation address by a high school principal doesn't make news, but the one Dr. Howard Hurwitz gave at Long Island City High School, New York, in late June deserves plenty of attention.

His message brought 1500 students and parents to their feet with cheers and whistles. It was his farewell after 11 years as principal but it was more. It concerned the very future of our educational system.

Dr. Hurwitz, you see, believes in discipline and he spoke out about it. He believes that, in order for a student to learn, the classroom atmosphere must be conducive to study. That seems simple and direct enough, but for his beliefs, Dr. Hurwitz became the center of a controversy that extends far beyond the halls of Long Island City High.

The controversy erupted when Dr. Hurwitz refused to re-admit a 17-year-old he had suspended for consistent disruption of classes. For his action, Dr. Hurwitz was suspended by the New York City Board of Education. He was fined, to boot -- \$3,500.00 -- for disobedience! Parents and others who supported him offered him a check for \$3,500.00 to pay the fine, but he refused. Dr. Hurwitz turned down their offer because it seemed to him that the Board of Education is more concerned about the political atmosphere than the classroom atmosphere and he intends to fight his battle with the Board in court.

In case you're wondering if Dr. Hurwitz had a controversial record or a reputation as a troublemaker, put your mind at ease. During his 11 years at Long Island High, attendance has averaged better than 90 percent. Suspensions have averaged three a year. (In many New York city schools, they run to more than 100.) The school has a wide racial mix, but no racial incidents. Most of the students go on to college. And, there hasn't been a single assault on a teacher.

The reason for Long Island High's good record, Dr. Hurwitz believes, is that his policy of discipline in the school has the overwhelming support of the parents. One parent with three youngsters in the school said, -- QUOTE -- "This school is the best. We consider ourselves lucky that our children were when Dr. Hurwitz was principal." -- UNQUOTE.

In a letter to the community on his leaving the school, Dr. Hurwitz said, -- QUOTE -- "I can no longer remain with employers who are remorseless in their determination to interfere with the effective administration of this school." With that, he retired nine years ahead of schedule.

Now, he is preparing to challenge, in the courts, the school board's timidity toward discipline and he is forming a consulting firm to help schools in other areas face up to the problems of maintaining an atmosphere that makes learning possible.

Hearing about Dr. Hurwitz's experience makes me wonder, if parents are unwilling or unable to teach their kids standards of self-discipline and the school board, worried about some sort of "backlash" at the polls, won't permit principals and teachers to insist on discipline in the schools, is it any wonder a lot of youngsters are "turned off" by our present day society?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Property Rights"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Speaking on British Broadcasting in early May, President Carter pledged anew his commitment to human rights. This was reaffirmation of his call on March 17 to the United Nations General Assembly for creation of a Human Rights Division and the creation of a new post in the United Nations, "High Commissioner for Human Rights".

So far so good. But on that March day, he also announced he would ask Congress for approval of his signing the U.N. Covenant on Economic Cultural Rights.

One wonders if the President is aware of what his signing of those two covenants would do to one of our most precious rights, the right to ownership of property. Both covenants bar that traditional right.

In 1973, the U.N. published a review called "United Nations Action In the Field of Human Rights" It covered everything the U.N. has done in that field since 1948 when the General Assembly adopted a "Universal Declaration of Human Rights". That original declaration stated in article 17 that, "Everyone has the right to own property alone as well as in association with others. No one shall be arbitrarily deprived of his property."

But there have been some changes since 1948. There is now, in the U.N. a voting bloc of 114 nations, most ruled by Marxist or military dictatorships. This Third World bloc has successfully barred the original Declaration of property rights from being included in the two covenants. As those covenants are written now, it would be contrary to our own Constitution for Congress to ratify and the President to sign them. Our 5th Amendment says that "no person shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law, nor shall any private property be taken for public use without just compensation." Our 14th amendment prevents any state from making any law which abridges those guaranteed rights.

Both U.N. covenants specifically exclude compensation for private property seized for public use. This is in keeping with U.N. Declaration of Permanent Sovereignty adopted in 1962, to which the United States strongly objects. The covenants are of course anti-colonial measures. They are designed to permit expropriation or nationalization of foreign investment. In short, they sanction the right of theft.

Notwithstanding the fact that the covenants violate the 5th and 14th amendments to our Constitution, once our Congress and President accept them, they supercede our Constitution. We are unique in all the world in that treaties we enter into become the supreme law of the land.

There has been some quibbling about whether the covenants are recognized as treaties. That, however, is answered specifically in the U.N. passage on implementation where it is stated the covenants are indeed regarded as international treaties.

Let us hope that before anyone puts pen to paper, they will put in a few hours with a battery of brilliant and persuasive lawyers.

Yes, we support the ideal of human rights. And, in our concept of human rights, ownership of private property is included. Indeed, it is basic to our liberty and our pursuit of happiness.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cambodia"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

"Murder of a Gentle Land" is the well documented story of what has happened to Cambodia since the Communist take over. The authors, both experienced journalists, toured refugee camps in Thailand, monitored Cambodian radio and press reports, interviewed hundreds and hundreds of Cambodian refugees and then cross-checked the stories they heard to establish their veracity.

The crime is unquestionably premeditated, cold-blooded murder of possibly one-third of the entire population of Cambodia. And, the method of killing covered the entire spectrum of man's inhumanity to man back through the ages; starvation, thirst, beating, butchery by blade and, of course, shooting. The victims ranged from the tiniest of babes to the aged and infirm. The murderers are the Communist rulers of what remains of Cambodia.

Since that broadcast, the authors have submitted testimony to the human rights subcommittee of the House International Relations Committee. John Barron appended a letter from Anthony Paul to his testimony. Paul had just returned from another several hundred mile trip through the refugee camps. He wrote, "I had expected some evidence of slackening of terror in Cambodia. It is true that fewer refugees are escaping from that country into Thailand -- the present rate being about 100 per month -- but the stories they bring suggest the killings have not yet stopped".

The author's testimony didn't get much press attention, but one Washington journal, HUMAN EVENTS, reported the continuing story of barbarity and bloodshed including the account of a British correspondent who has toured the refugee camps. Ian Ward of the London DAILY TELEGRAPH says, -- QUOTE -- "Daily acts of unspeakable barbarism continue to be perpetuated in the name of this once gentle country's Communist revolution". -- UNQUOTE. He confirms the victims number more than two million so far.

Mr. Paul told of a 27-year-old philosophy student named Main Hom who told him the slightest form of irregular behavior was punished with often brutal and immediate execution. He related the case of a 20-year old girl seized and carried off, her arms tied behind her back. Her crime? Reading an English language textbook. Two days later, he came upon her about 15 feet off a jungle path. She had been buried up to her neck. She was still alive, her head and mouth moving but no words or sound came from her. He could only hurry by. Later he learned she had died.

Barron's testimony was that a tragedy of terrible proportions has befallen the people of Cambodia and will continue so long as the legislatures of the world remain silent.

Human Events reports that one Congressman on the committee -- a former anti-war liberal -- was appalled by what he heard. Calling it one of the most monstrous crimes of the century, he said -- QUOTE -- "The question is, what can we do about it? We have to bring this criminal regime to its senses". -UNQUOTE.

Am I wrong or wasn't this the type of thing the United Nations was established to eliminate? But whether the U.N. protests or not -- and the odds are against it -- wouldn't we feel better if our own Government expressed its repugnance and, in a voice heard round the world, proclaimed that Cambodia's present rulers are unfit to associate with the world family of nations?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Bulletins"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Every once in a while, little tidbits pop up in a variety of journals. They don't make headlines but they offer sidelights on the things that do. For example, the Soviet Union, with great fanfare, has handed its citizens a new constitution. Who says they don't believe in human rights? "Soviet citizens", the document said, "shall be guaranteed freedom of speech, press, assembly meetings, street processions and demonstrations, abilities, training, education" and just when you think they are free, then come the last eight words of that sentence; "with due account for the need of society". In other words, they'll have those meetings and assemblies and parades when they are told to.

Other constitutions may sound like ours but they don't work like ours for one simple reason. Our Constitution is a document in which we, the people, tell government what it can and can't do. Those others are documents written by government telling the people what government will let them do.

On another front, the Administration has named Mozambique as one of the countries to receive a chunk of money in our Foreign Aid program. A group of refugees escaping from that "liberated" African state have told reporters there are food shortages, collapse of the educational system and of medical services. There are political arrests and "re-education" (make that concentration) camps. They say the people of Mozambique look upon the Rhodesians who crossed the border to raid terrorist bases as liberators and hope they'll keep coming.

To change the subject, or at least bring it back to our shores -- a short time ago, our Federal Highway Administration told us that, beginning next year, it was converting all highway signs to the metric system and would not put equivalent miles on the speed and distance signs. The immediate response was a flood of letters, all strenuously objecting to the change. Congressman Charles Grassley of Iowa (bless him) offered an amendment to the Department of Transportation appropriation bill to torpedo the idea. The Department got the message and backed off. I don't know about you, but I like inches, yards and miles. I don't think I can get used to saying 28.349 grams of prevention is worth a .453 kilograms of cure.

Energy is a headline subject these days but have you seen anything about the experts who say there are 105,000 trillion cubic feet of gas in the Texas gulf area at depths of eight to 25,000 feet. If we doubled our use of gas, 10% of that would supply the whole nation's needs for 200 years. The hitch is it can't be produced for the restricted price the government has put on natural gas, but it can be for a price lower than what we're now paying for imported liquefied gas.

Time for a little comedy relief and you can count on bureaucracy for that every time. The Washington Star dug this example of gobbledygook up from the federal register. Now listen carefully and see if you gather the meaning --QUOTE -- "that the statement of Record and Property report for Briarcliff located in Travis County, Texas, contains untrue statements of material facts required to be stated therein or necessary to make the statements therein not necessary to make the statements therein not misleading." -- UNQUOTE.

One last item; in Rochester, New York, a private firm has been successfully delivering letters within the downtown business area for ten cents, delivery guaranteed the same day. The Post Office and the mail carriers union are trying to get an injunction to put the firm out of business.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Spending"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

To suggest that the tax collector is limited as to how much he can lift from our pockets because government just can't spend money fast enough to really hurt us is like saying we don't need a limit on ducks because there are more ducks than hunters.

Some time ago I told of the town that couldn't resist taking \$300,000 in federal funds to build a fire station it didn't need. The excuse the town fathers used to justify this was the possibility the fire house might be needed in eight years. In the meantime, an unnecessary emergency medical team will be put in the building just for appearances. Over the eight years, that will cost the taxpayers \$1,480,000 for their "free" \$300,000 building.

Well, that is not a rare and isolated case. Winter Park, Florida asked the Economic Development Administration for \$883,500 to build a new library. There is no evidence to suggest that was not a legitimate need. But apparently business hadn't been too brisk at E.D.A. And you know what can happen to a federal agency if it comes to the end of the fiscal year with money left over.

E.D.A. was heart and soul for the Winter Park library. It would not only spring for the \$883,000 -- it urged the city to accept \$2,650,000 which is more than half of the city's entire annual budget. For awhile a few of the city fathers wanted to turn down the money on principle -- but principle lost.

Of course, the town had to come up with some projects to keep E.D.A. legitimate, but that was easily handled. There were tennis courts, bike paths, a baseball grandstand. All told, about 20 projects were thought of to justify the enlarged federal grant.

I really think Budget Director Lance has underestimated the energy and the inventiveness of the Santa Claus helpers who dwell in the Potomac puzzle palaces. It's a plain case of survival with them. If they stop giving away goodies, they disappear.

Maybe it will brighten your day a little, however, to learn that the recently convicted "Welfare Queen of Chicago" served a useful purpose. Even government was shaken to find that an enterprising individual could collect welfare under 127 different names, hold 50 social security cards and get widow's benefits from a couple of non-existent husbands.

Her achievement triggered an investigation into a number of coincidental incidents where names listed on the public payrolls were also showing up on the welfare rolls. So far, there have been 3,183 such duplications including some who were on the payroll for salaries up to \$17,500 a year. All in all, 62 per cent of the cases show -- QUOTE -- "irregularities" -- UNQUOTE. Indictments have been brought against some, several hundred have been removed from the welfare rolls and the investigators have moved on to a list of another 4,500 names. Losses to city, state and federal government (which means to the taxpayers) stand at about \$10 million.

Last word is that Detroit is undergoing a similar experience and a U.S. Attorney is proposing that similar investigations should be launched in every major metropolitan area.

Rather than depending on Mr. Lance's optimistic hope that lack of time and energy will limit public spending, why don't we set a legal limit on what percentage of total earnings government can take in tax?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Government Cost"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Over in Tulsa, Oklahoma the Corps of Army Engineers is moving about one fifth of its operation out of its present quarters and into a new office building at roughly four times the rent now being paid. The engineers are leaving almost 21,000 square feet of office space, for which they pay \$2,89 a square foot, to move into only 16,000 square feet for which they'll pay (make that we'll pay) \$11.88 a square foot.

The operation that is moving represents about 22 per cent of the Corps' Tulsa headquarters. The other four-fifths of their offices are located in the old Federal Building which has 75,000 square feet of vacant space and which was remodeled 10 years ago at a cost of \$700,000 for use by the Engineers.

Apparently, none of this is the doing of the Engineers. The Business Service Center of the General Services Administration is in charge of this move. According to the chief of G.S.A. the new more costly office building is the only building in Tulsa which meets "Standard 101 of the National Fire Protection Code" called "Code for Life Safety from Fire in Buildings and Structures". He says the government is really getting tough about the fire regulations. Standard 101 is a book with 16 chapters.

The City Fire Marshall of Tulsa says he doubts that any building in Tulsa can meet all of the requirements of Standard 101. The Fire Marshall isn't saying downtown Tulsa is a fire trap -- he's indicating Standard 101 -- like so many government documents goes beyond the bounds of common sense and reason. To their credit the Corps of Engineers had asked for other locations but were turned down by G.S.A.

A lot of questions come to mind in this whole thing -- beginning with why the one-fifth of the Engineers Operation isn't over in the Federal Building with the other four-fifths where there is vacant space amounting to more than four-and-a-half times as much space as they are moving into. If the Federal Building doesn't meet the rigorous requirements for fire safety laid down in Standard 101, why haven't the rest of the engineers been moved out? A spokesman for the Corps can only say it will be up to G.S.A. to say when the building is no longer suitable for use by federal employees. That answers another question. Standard 101 isn't a code that can be enforced on buildings in general. It's just a code for the protection of federal government employees. Taxpayers can work and earn in less protected quarters. And, just between us, I'm sure with every bit as much safety as government employees are provided.

According to the Tulsa TRIBUNE the shortcomings of the building the Engineers are leaving consist of the following: One stairway is four inches too narrow and there was some concern expressed about the distance to the rest rooms.

Don't feel guilty if you can't make sense out of what they're doing. Let me read a paragraph from a memo on another subject, zero budgeting, by the "Office of Management and Budget". When you can understand this paragraph everything will be clear to you. -- QUOTE -- "Agencies may use whatever review and ranking technique appropriate to their needs. However, the minimum level for a decision unit is always ranked higher than any increment for the same unit, since it represents the level below which activities can no longer be conducted effectively. However, the minimum level package for a given decision unit may be ranked so low in comparison to incremental levels of the decision units that the funding level for the agency may exclude that minimum funding level package" UNQUOTE. See!



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Quiz"  
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

The READERS DIGEST recently printed a quiz by Ralph Kinney Bennett and, of course, provided the answers. Good thing, too, because there would have otherwise been a great many frustrated readers. I'm sure Mr. Bennett won't mind if I paraphrase his questions for brevity's sake and try them on you.

To start with, which of the following items is the fastest growing cost item in the family budget; food, fuel, housing or something else? The answer is "something else", and the "something else" is government. In 10 years, the cost of living has gone up 40 per cent; taxes have risen 65 per cent. Question Number Two. Total government spending (federal, state and local) per household is close to 3,000, 5,000, 7,500 dollars? It's that third figure - 7,838 dollars -- to be exact -- for each household in the land.

Question Three. The money government takes from one citizen to give to another -- redistribution of earnings? Is it one-fifth of the budget, one-third or one-half or impossible to determine? You are right if you settled for "half". It has increased 56 per cent in the last three years and now is 218 billion dollars -- a little more than half.

There is so much talk about this next one I'm sure most of you will get it. The National debt -- the amount government spends over and above what it takes in -- is it 50 billion dollars, going down from the 200 billion it reached in the Viet Nam war; no debt at all; or more than 500 billion dollars? The answer. It's on its way to 600 billion dollars at a rate of one billion dollars a week.

Listen carefully to this one. Mr. Bennett asks if the interest on the national debt has more than tripled in the last 10 years; or is equal to the combined budgets of California, New York, Michigan and Ohio, or is it more than double the total budget of the Department of Agriculture? Ready? The correct answer is yes to all three. It has gone from 12 billion dollars in 1966 to 38 billion dollars today. It is the third largest item in the national budget right after domestic assistance and defense, and, at the present rate of increase, will reach 50 billion dollars in two years.

The next one is a True or False. The Federal government has no significant outstanding financial commitments beyond those listed as part of the national debt? Quick, say false! I haven't time to list them all, but from TVA to social security almost a dozen other obligations of the Federal government amount to more than three trillion dollars, over and above the national debt.

Another true or false was a statement that government borrowing has no effect on borrowing by private citizens and, of course, the answer is that government takes about half the capital we need for mortgages, buying used cars, and so forth. Mr. Bennett also asked if federal spending has grown faster, slower, or at least at about the same rate as our Gross National Product which has increased 275 per cent in the last 20 years? The answer. Federal spending has increased 400 per cent and state and local governments, 520 per cent.

I haven't time for all the questions in the quiz, but one more had to do with the number of public employees, not counting military. Is it one out of 30 working Americans, one out of 17, one out of nine, or one out of six? The last is correct. Actually, the ratio is four and one-half private employees to one public employee. Have a nice day!