

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 76-17 through 76-19 (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
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 76-17

76-17A

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Food Stamps	3:04
*2. Neutron Bomb I	3:15
**3. Neutron Bomb II	3:09
4. Ukraine	3:14
—5. Tax Shift	3:13
6. Drunk Driving	3:02
+7. Korea I	3:06
++8. Korea II	3:15

76-17B

+++1. Korea III	3:03
2. Laxalt	3:11
3. Human Rights	3:22
4. Snail Darter	3:12
5. Busing	3:08
6. N.E.A.	3:20
7. Porpoises And Tuna	2:41
—8. Small Business	3:20

We suggest the programs marked (*) be aired in sequence and the programs marked (+) 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 forward these requests to our office.

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 "Neutron Bomb I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

A great many military experts believe the Soviet Union envisions a war it can win without the mutual nuclear destruction the world has come to fear. True, the nuclear capability of the Soviets to wipe out a hundred million Americans is the basis of their strategy, but victory would be won by conventional weapons, hence the massive buildup in tanks, artillery, tactical aircraft and helicopters.

If this sounds confusing, listen to how some experts see the script shaping up. Former Chief of U.S. Air Force Intelligence, General Keegan, looking at the growing imbalance along the NATO line says that one day, in the not too distant future, an American President could get an early morning call on the hot line. The caller would be Brezhnev to announce his troops were advancing into Western Europe and that he hoped the President wouldn't do anything foolish.

If the American President had not done anything to redress the growing imbalance in conventional forces prior to such a call, he would know our NATO line could not withstand the Russian assault. His choice would be, push the nuclear button or abandon Western Europe. Would an American President push the button knowing he was sentencing 100 million Americans to death?

How does another expert see it? John Taylor, editor of Janes All the World's Aircraft, a former designer of planes himself -- including those that saved Britain in World War II -- tells his version of what could happen in middle Europe. Mr. Taylor gets specific. He says the Russians now have something they haven't had before -- a helicopter such as we have that can -- QUOTE -- "dash in and shoot up everything in sight". UNQUOTE -- They have two versions; one carrying eight combat soldiers but also four anti-tank missiles and 128 rockets. The other is a specialized gunship with much the same weaponry plus see-in-the-dark sensors that give it day-or-night, all-weather capability.

These helicopters are stationed at the north and south ends of the NATO line. In a confrontation they'd scoot around our NATO forces, shoot up everything in sight and land their troops behind our lines. They also have a new fighter-bomber, similar to our F-111. Then there is the Russian Backfire bomber, which Taylor says is, in fact, a strategic bomber capable of hitting targets all over the U.S. Mr. Taylor also says our B-1 bomber, which we aren't going to make is far superior to the Backfire.

By coincidence there is another gentleman named Taylor, also British. But this one is General Sir Walter Taylor, who spent almost half his 40 years of soldiering in active operations from the tropics to Europe in World War II. He was Commander in Chief, Allied Forces, Northern Europe from 1969 to 72. He, too, sees us threatened by conventional forces.

He sees Russia's grand design as an outflanking of Europe by sea, taking control of the sources of oil and the sea routes in the Indian Ocean, South Atlantic and North Atlantic and, of course, dominating Western Europe. Need I add, the Soviets already have the world's largest Navy.

The General says World War III has already begun. At this time, the weapon is subversion. He quotes the Russians as saying, -- QUOTE -- "The role of the Red Army is to stand by, ready to shake the tree when the rotten fruit is ready to fall". -- UNQUOTE. They'd have a longer time to wait if we started producing B-1 bombers.

We have another weapon - not yet in production with much debate as to whether it ever should be.

Next broadcast, I'll talk about it.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Even if the Soviet Union and the United States could destroy each other in an exchange of nuclear missiles, war is still a possibility and the winner, if war came, would be the one with the most powerful conventional military establishment. So far the Soviets are on the way to having that most powerful establishment while we still argue about whether we should cut defense spending and build up the budget for social reforms.

One of the experts I quoted said the Soviets are already fighting World War III and their principal weapon is subversion -- at least for this stage. That isn't a new weapon or a new idea. The Chinese -- 2,476 years ago -- endorsed subversion as a weapon; -- QUOTE -- "The greatest art is to break the enemy's opposition without a fight on the battlefield. A true victory and a lasting one, can only be won by indirect and subversive methods and so corrupt all that is good in the enemy country. -- UNQUOTE.

Our problem would be more simple if all our disputes over weaponry were inspired by enemy subversion. Unfortunately, there are legitimate differences between us. Senator Hatfield of Oregon is opposed to a new development in tactical nuclear weapons -- the neutron warhead. There is no question about his sincerity or his devotion to the cause of peace and certainly his opposition to the neutron weapon is in no way connected to Soviet subversion. He is truly repelled by this proposed weapon system and unable to see that potentially it could be the very deterrent we need to prevent war.

Let's understand that tactical nuclear weapons are for battlefield use against military targets and have nowhere near the destructive power of strategic nuclear bombs or intercontinental ballistic missiles. So far our deterrent to an attack on the NATO line in Europe has been based on a tactical nuclear weapon with a 56-mile range -- the Lance missile. Its weakness as a deterrent however is the Russian knowledge that we might be reluctant to use it since it would be exploded on the towns and countryside of our West European allies. And, though smaller than the big Atomic bombs, it would still destroy villages and kill noncombatants.

Now our Defense Department is asking for an appropriation to produce a new warhead for the Lance missile as well as for other delivery systems. It is the "neutron" -- a small warhead capable of penetrating tanks and bunkers. It kills by radiation, without the blast and heat of atomic weapons. It is a battlefield weapon designed to kill enemy soldiers, and death is almost instantaneous. Furthermore, the terrain is not made dangerously radioactive.

Army field commanders have sought such a weapon for years. It is truly akin to the science fiction deathray. This technology would put us far ahead of the Soviets and be the deterrent we've sought against the nightmare situation of a Russian advance in which our only choice would be to surrender or loose a nuclear holocaust on the world.

Yes, it is horrible to think of soldiers helpless against a weapon that kills them instantly with silent invisible rays. But, what if it prevents anyone from being killed at all simply because it exists? As the Chinese said nearly 2500 years ago, "The greatest art is to break the enemy's opposition without a fight on the battlefield."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of Radio Program entitled "Ukraine"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Representatives of 35 countries, all signatories of the Helsinki agreement, met in Belgrade to decide whether they were living up to the term of that agreement. By way of a reminder, the Helsinki pact was something the Soviet Union had wanted for more than three decades. In effect it was an acceptance by all the other nations, including the U.S., that the Soviets could keep the several countries we call Iron Curtain satellites, which they took by force, in violation of more than 50 promises made during and after World War II.

We rationalized our signing away of freedoms (not ours to give) on the grounds of one clause in the document wherein all signatories agreed to provide basic human rights for their own citizens.

These are rights we take for granted. The everyday right to go where we want to go, say what we want to say, and be presumed innocent of wrong doing unless and until guilt can be proved beyond reasonable doubt.

If the Belgrade meeting didn't take up the names of Rudenko and Tykhy (among many others) then it only compounded the hypocrisy of signing the Helsinki agreement in the first place. I mention these two because they were being tried in a Soviet court at the time the Belgrade meeting was held.

Mykola Rudenko and Oleksiy Tykhy are Ukrainians. We tend to forget that U.S.S.R. stands for United Soviet Socialist Republics, and that some of those so-called republics are every bit as much captive states as are Poland, East Germany, Czechoslovakia and the others; none more so than the Ukraine. Solzhenitsyn has written that the great majority of prisoners in the Soviet Gulag are Ukrainians. It would seem that love of freedom still lives in the Ukraine.

Immediately after the Helsinki agreement was signed, a group was formed in Kiev to promote the implementation of the accords. Mykola Rudenko was chairman; Oleksiy Tykhy a member. They were arrested last February 5th and held without charges until their trial which only took a few days and ended with them being sentenced on July 1st. Rudenko was given seven years in a concentration camp, Tykhy 10 and both were given an additional five years of exile. Exile in the Soviet Union doesn't mean they send you out of the country. There wouldn't be any punishment in that. You are moved to another type of prison -- very little different from the one you have been in.

In the case of these two men, their sentences are in reality for life. One suffers from war wounds and the other, a school teacher, is in very poor health. Friends say it is doubtful they can survive their imprisonment.

They were tried several miles from Kiev in a factory building, used as a courtroom for the occasion. The charge was vague -- just that they were anti-soviet. The court appointed their lawyers. Rodenko chose to defend himself. Tykhy's lawyer agreed with the prosecution most of the time.

The trial was held behind closed doors with about 70 spectators handpicked by the K.G.B. Even news that the trial was being held was hushed up. Family and friends who journeyed there were arrested and held in jail for three days and then forcibly sent home.

Only government-selected witnesses were allowed to testify in the trial. The sentences were a forgone conclusion. Can any at the Belgrade meeting offer one reason why the civilized nations of the world shouldn't scrap the Helsinki agreement?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Organized labor -- or at least the ruling hierarchy of labor -- has been supporting candidates and office holders who proclaim the tax burden should be shifted to corporations. This particular bit of demagogery is echoed by labor leaders who profess concern for the workers they represent. They contend the tax burden on individuals would be lightened if business paid its "fair share".

Not too long ago the overlords of labor were shocked and angry that corporate taxes had fallen from 23 percent of the total tax to only 17 percent. They implied, of course, that business had somehow evaded its proper tax obligation. The truth is that business profits, as a share of national income, had dropped so far that by rights their taxes should only have been 8 percent of the total tax. In other words, tax law changes had increased their rate. And, of course, business taxes are paid by you the consumer.

The labor tycoons should reverse course if they really want to serve the workers of America. Through their pension funds, employees of American business today own at least 25 percent of its equity capital.

As these pension funds grow, it is possible that by 1985 (and possibly sooner) worker ownership will have passed the halfway mark and in another 10 years should top two-thirds of the equity capital. This means, of course, shares of common stock, plus a possible 40 percent of corporate bonds.

According to Peter Drucker, the economist, the pension funds own control of practically all the 1,000 biggest corporations in America. More significantly they hold what socialists call "command position" in the 50 largest non-industrial companies, banks, insurance, retail, communications and transportation. Whoever controls those, controls the rest.

Here really is the answer to Karl Marx' idiocy. American workers (in a kind of people's capitalism) now own, through their retirement funds, more industry than Castro has nationalized in Cuba.

And, before anyone starts to take bows for this little known phenomenon, the man responsible was the chief executive officer of General Motors. It was in April of 1950 that Charles Wilson proposed a pension fund for G.M. workers to the U.A.W., whose leaders were less than enthusiastic. They wanted a governmental social security.

Fortunately, the rank and file members had more sense than their leaders. The plan started operating in October of 1950. Within a year, 8000 such plans had come into being; all copying the unique feature Wilson had insisted on; namely, that the fund would be an investment trust, investing in stocks. He opposed, however, investment solely in the company employees worked for. He wisely said the workers shouldn't put all their eggs in one basket.

Now, about taxes. We have a double system. The corporation is taxed up to 48% -- almost half its profit. Then, when the stockholder gets his share he pays another tax -- the income tax on that already taxed profit. Pension funds are tax exempt. Organized labor -- if it truly represented its members -- would demand an end to this double tax. Don't tax the corporation. Tax the individual share owner when he gets his dividends. In the case of the pension funds, they would almost double their income and it would be tax free.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Last year, 46,000 Americans were killed in highway accidents. That's about equal to the population of Rock Island, Illinois or Longview, Texas. And, according to studies by the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, alcohol is involved in half of all the fatal crashes that occur.

That's a sobering set of statistics, but the studies also show that the drunk drivers don't stay sober for long. Nearly two-thirds of the alcohol-related highway deaths involve problem drinkers. As law enforcement agencies crack down more on drunk drivers, they find they are pulling in a large number of repeat offenders. Approximately 400,000 Americans are arrested for drunk driving every year, and an estimated 40 percent are repeat offenders. Most scientific evidence today points to the conclusion that alcoholism is a disease and, by its very nature, it almost insures a pattern of repeat drunk driving.

What's to be done about it? Lock up the drunk driver and throw away the key? Or, take away his driver's license? Many experts believe these actions only attack the symptoms and don't really solve the problem. In fact, a study by the California Department of Motor Vehicles a few years ago showed that among those whose licenses had been revoked, 68 percent continued to drive.

A growing number of specialists in the study of alcoholism are arguing -- persuasively -- for adoption of a relatively new technique in combating drunk driving. It's called the diversion program.

Much of the pioneering in diversion programs has taken place in Southern California, with its auto-oriented society. There, 37 programs have begun over the last two years. How do they work? Take one called High Gain, in Santa Monica. Its Executive Director, Gaylord Long, says that it and the other diversion programs start from the belief that -- QUOTE -- "Something on the order of half those arrested twice for drunk driving are alcoholics or near-alcoholics, but can't admit it to themselves. Alcoholism can't be cured, but it can be stopped in its tracks, if we can get to the person in time." -- UNQUOTE.

The judge, before sentencing the offender, assigns him to a screening interview with High Gain. If he's accepted and signs up voluntarily, he attends 10 weekly in-depth lectures on all aspects of alcohol and alcoholism. These are followed by a lecture every other week for nearly a year. Each session is followed by a group "rap" session in which members tell how alcohol has affected their lives and how their attitudes and behavior are changing as they understand their situation better. A basic rule of such diversion programs is that the "client" (as participants are called) stays sober -- that is, no drinking -- while in the program.

Diversion program results are encouraging so far. Of the nearly 8,000 offenders in or finished with programs such as High Gain, only 13 percent have been rearrested. That compares with a 35 to 50 percent rearrest rate predicted for drunk drivers who would not be sent to diversion programs in a Los Angeles Police department study two years ago.

Oh yes, the taxpayers get a break, too. The clients themselves pay for the diversion programs. And, the staff members, in addition to their professional training, have an intimate understanding of alcohol and what it can do. Every one of them is a recovered alcoholic.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Maybe I'm wrong but don't most of us have a preconceived idea about some of our overseas troops; that they are wearing the uniform to be seen but are, in truth, living a kind of sedentary life? It's easy to accept their possible withdrawal from foreign duty as pretty much just a transfer of lower echelon diplomats in olive drab.

Common sense should tell us that isn't so. The Army doesn't operate that way. In South Korea, the U.S. 2nd Infantry Division stands astride a pair of valleys leading from the North toward the capital city of Seoul -- just 16 miles from the demilitarized zone. Those valleys have been the gateway to conquest of Korea for 2000 years. The armies of China and Japan have used them and, more recently, the proxy communist forces of the Soviet Union.

Back through the years both China and Japan looked upon Korea as the highway of conquest between their two countries. And for well nigh to a century, Russia has thought of Korea as the key to its imagined security need in East Asia.

Kim Il-Sung, the communist dictator of North Korea has made it plain that he intends to unify North and South Korea on his terms. There is no question that he could get logistical support from both Red China and Russia if he attacked -- just as he did in 1950. Neither one can afford to let the other be the sole ally of communist Korea. But, right now, Red China would not like to have to make that choice. Whether they say it or not, they want us to stay in Korea. Military authorities sum up the fear the South Koreans live with as understandable. If a surprise attack by massed armored forces were launched by North Korea in the night, they could be in Seoul by sun up even against American air power. But the story is different as long as they would have to defeat the Second Division. Those who want to withdraw those American troops say that an attack on them means automatic American involvement. Those who say they should stay, say their presence is a deterrent, preserving the peace. I believe all the evidence supports the view that the U.S. 2nd Infantry Division is indeed keeping the peace.

If any should ask whether such a war between Asians is of importance to us, the answer is "yes". Korea is a dagger pointed at Japan, the third greatest industrial power in the world. A communist controlled Asia which included Japan would be a mortal threat to the U.S. Our danger would be as great as it would be if the Soviets breached the NATO line and conquered Western Europe.

Some have used the economy line as a reason for withdrawing our forces but that doesn't make sense. The 2nd Division will cost as much and maybe much more based anywhere else -- unless they have in mind dissolving the Division.

Last November, the Japanese Ambassador to the U.S., speaking in Minnesota, emphasized the importance of our forces in Korea. He makes this point in virtually every public utterance. He only says what his countrymen feel very deeply. They say the presence of the 2nd Division in Korea makes believable our pledge to defend Japan against nuclear attack.

There has been so much misinformation fed to us about Korea lately that I'm going to stay on this subject in the next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Korea II"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Last time, I talked about our ground forces in South Korea and why they are so important in maintaining the peace. But maybe we need to look at a few facts about Korea to counter the propaganda we're being subjected to.

Those who gave us defeat in Southeast Asia are at it again, painting a picture of South Korea as a totalitarian dictatorship long on repression and short on human rights. I agree there are some restrictions on freedom in Korea that we, as Americans, would find pretty irksome. But wouldn't we think there might be a few restraints acceptable here if a totalitarian power of equal size and strength had the bulk of its military forces mobilized on a line 16 miles from Washington, D.C.?

First, let's see how badly the South Koreans are faring under the authoritarian administration of President Park. Gross national product has, during his 14 years, nearly quadrupled. Unemployment has been cut from more than eight percent to less than 4 percent which, in our own country, is called full employment. At the same time, wages on an inflation-adjusted average have risen 8.1% a year. A World Bank study has concluded that distribution of income in South Korea is among the most equitable in the developing world.

The Korean government adheres to a proposition that a low paying job is better than no job at all so first priority is expanding the economy to produce more jobs. You know, that does seem to make more sense than some of the ideas proposed by our own welfarists. Their economy grew by 15% last year and is expected to grow better than 9% a year for the next five. As one economist put it, "the government gave people an opportunity to be creative". We did that once.

Now, about the widely heralded authoritarianism of President Park and his concern about the communist threat to his nation, let's have a little review of history. When the Soviets joined the war against Japan in the last five minutes of World War II, they took Manchuria and swept down on Korea, bringing Kim Il-Sung with them.

The U.S., having freed Korea from Japanese rule, hung on to Korea south of the 38th parallel. The U.N. asked for an election by the Korean people to set up their own government. The communists in North Korea refused, so an election was held in the southern half of the country and the Republic of Korea was born.

In 1949, in spite of the pleas of the new Republic of Korea, we started withdrawing our troops. In June of 1950, with no advance warning, the communists attacked and almost drove the remaining Americans into the sea. President Truman asked the U.N. security council for a resolution calling for the withdrawal of the Chinese from Korea. It was killed by a Soviet veto -- they and the Red Chinese were friends then.

Remember the cease fire agreement in 1953 which brought a meaningless end to the fighting? It was our first no-win war. General MacArthur said at the time that not winning that war would commit us to fighting another war one day, probably in Vietnam. North Korea claims it is the master of all Korea and refuses to recognize the Republic duly elected by the people. No one in North Korea had a chance to elect anyone. I'll continue in my next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Last broadcast, I indicated there was probably some justification for certain authoritarian measures in the Republic of Korea. That's, of course, what we commonly refer to as South Korea. There are no authoritarian measures in communist North Korea -- just pure slavery under complete totalitarian rule by a non-elected government.

But let me review the happenings of the last decade which I think will indicate some legitimacy for President Park's imposition of a few restraints. There is, of course, the memory of the unprovoked attack by North Korea which led to the long and bloody so-called police action, the Korean war.

On January 21, 1968, as we were heading into an election year, 31 North Korean commandoes slipped across the demilitarized zone and attacked the Presidential residence in Seoul. The U.S.S. Pueblo was kidnapped two days later, beginning a shameful chapter of American history. Then, in April of 1969, came another deliberate insult to our nation with the tragic murder of 31 of our airmen. A reconnaissance plane out over international waters was shot down by North Korean MIG fighter planes. Probably these two incidents were designed to convince us we should pull out of Korea and that was the reaction of our bleeding hearts.

On August 15, 1974, a North Korean agent attempted to kill President Park as he addressed a ceremony celebrating National Liberation Day. His bullet killed the President's wife instead. Three months later, United Nations forces found a tunnel beneath the demilitarized Zone near Panmunjom. Six months later, another tunnel was found on the Eastern front. It was more than a rabbit hole. It was capable of passing 30,000 armed soldiers an hour into South Korea.

A year ago, North Korean soldiers attacked an American officer inside the joint security area of Panmunjom where he had every right to be. He was seriously wounded and, I believe, permanently disabled. Two months later, two of our officers were butchered with axes by North Korean guards inside the demilitarized Zone. Though they can't all be listed, there have been thousands of violations of the truce; snipings, machine gun attacks on our patrols, and so forth.

The government of South Korea has asked repeatedly for a nonaggression pact with North Korea and has stated there would be no need for American forces to remain in South Korea if such a pact were signed. There has been no response, which would seem to be pretty good proof that Kim Il-Sung has aggression in mind.

Frankly, I thought President Park was extremely generous in making such an offer because no communist nation feels bound by any agreement it signs.

We've been treated to headlines quoting a disgruntled ex-Korean government employee about how terrible the present South Korean government is. Apparently, a South Korean business man crossed the palms of some of our congressmen with silver and we darn well should know who they were and what they did for that silver. But this shouldn't be the criterion used in making decisions affecting our national security. And, keeping the U.S. 2nd Infantry Division on guard in Korea is very much a part of our national security.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Laxalt"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Most of us are sadly aware that government -- like Topsy -- just keeps on growing. Even more sadly, a great many of us don't think we can do anything about it, which is probably why fewer and fewer Americans bother to vote. The percentage who do has been growing smaller for almost 50 years.

In the 1976 election, 47 percent of Americans eligible to vote didn't. If you are among that group, you really have no right to complain about taxes or how the country is being run. Our constitutional Republic, based on a democratic procedure of majority rule, has become rule by a minority clique. And it's safe to say this clique has a vested interest in government, using its police power to take your money away from you for things it thinks government should do.

The present administration and Congress were elected by 27 percent of the citizenry. About 26 percent voted for the losers, but the real losers were the nearly 47 percent who didn't vote at all. The winners favor a government that will do even more than government has done in the past -- so the empire building goes on.

Take one example: All the anti-poverty spending at the federal level amounts to three times as much as it would take to raise all who are below the poverty line about it, if you just handed them the money. Which means very simply that an army of government employed caretakers get \$2.00 for every \$1.00 that goes to the poor.

Multiply that by the hundreds of bureaus, agencies and programs and you begin to see the reason for a budget which next year will be in excess of \$460 billion, and a debt of more than \$600 billion. There is something else you should know. There are spending programs outside the budget referred to as "non-budget" items and there are obligations not included in the national debt. Those obligations actually total about 10 times the so-called national debt or better than \$6 trillion. That pro rates out to about \$130,000 for your family's share of the debt -- a mortgage you didn't know you had.

Now there is something you can do about it. Government still belongs to us and will reflect our views and desires if we'll use the power that is ours to elect and to make our wants known to those we elect and to help those who are trying to help us.

Senator Paul Laxalt of Nevada has proposed a program of good, sound common sense. We've talked tax limitation for quite a while, putting a limit on the percentage of our earnings that government can take. But, Senator Laxalt is coming at it from the other direction -- put a lid on how much government can increase spending each year. We've increased federal spending \$100 billion in two years. It amounts to more than one-third of the gross national product. At this rate, in about 20 years government will account for half the gross national product.

Senator Laxalt has introduced an ammendment prohibiting either house of Congress from approving (in peace time) a budget in which government spending increases by a greater percentage than the average annual rate of growth in the gross national product. This average to be taken over the preceding three years.

Taking the figures for the five years, 1972 through 1976, there was a 61 percent growth in the size of the federal budget. Had the Senator's proposal been in effect there would still have been growth to meet the demands of population increase and other priorities, but the taxpayers would have saved \$60 billion. That's about \$1,200.00 for the average family. Why don't you plan on voting in 1978?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Not too long ago a news item reported that the National Council of Churches and the Interfaith Center on Corporate Responsibility, an affiliate of the Council, are going to put pressure on I.B.M., through stockholders, to keep it from selling computers to Chile and South Africa. The reason, of course, is that one is ruled by a military junta which, incidentally, overthrew a government bent on a communist takeover. The other, South Africa, practices a racial separation which certainly does not meet our ideal of freedom.

Without faulting the sincerity of the Council, may I point out that Freedom House (a New York based organization which monitors freedom around the world) has listed 67 countries as "not free" and 48 as only "partly free". I won't ask why the National Council of Churches has selected Chile and South Africa for its attention -- that is pretty obvious. But we can ask, why it has ignored the other 113?

We might also ask why are we so aware of the shortcomings of some countries and not of others? South Africa and Chile have been long-time friends of the United States and certainly represent no threat to their neighbors. On the other hand, our country spends billions of dollars on defense each year because of the threat posed by one country alone -- the Soviet Union -- which I believe has been a customer of I.B.M., but with no complaint from the National Council of Churches.

Alexander Solzhenitsyn has told us in his book, The Gulag Archipelago, of the terror imposed on the people of the Soviet Union by their government. There are other books, Eugene Lyons', Workers Paradise Lost, The Great Terror, by Robert Conquest and Alexander Dolgun's story, An American in the Gulag. In addition, numerous defectors and escapees from behind the Iron Curtain have verified the stories of cruelty and inhumanity which characterize the Soviet Union.

The point is we can't claim ignorance of the truth about Russia. Why then are we so much aware of the others? Why have we not been touched emotionally by the brutality so prevalent in the Gulag? We stand by passively when South Africa is ruled unfit to participate in the Olympics, but let the Soviet Union host the games in Moscow.

Let me read a passage from one of the books I mentioned; the story of Alexander Dolgun, an American who was arrested while walking down the street in Moscow one afternoon. He spent eight years in Soviet prisons and camps, but the passage I'll read is his account not of his own torture but of what happened to his mother.

"They had arrested her in 1950", he writes. "For months she had pestered the M.G.B. (secret police) for news of me. At first they told her I had been shot as a spy. She had a breakdown. Shortly after she recovered she got my triangle letter from Kuibyshev in which I asked whether the American embassy had given her my personal belongings. She went to the embassy to demand help. At the gates, the M.G.B. arrested her. She was still emotionally very fragile. They beat her with rubber truncheons, trying to get her to incriminate me. They pushed needles under her fingernails. Now her nails would never be straight again. After a very short period of this, she went quite insane and without sentencing her they put her in a prison insane asylum." -- UNQUOTE.

She never regained her sanity and after Dolgun's release, believed he was a secret Russian agent sent to spy on her. His father was imprisoned after his release.

If organizations such as the National Council of Churches are going to involve themselves in matters such as our commerce with nations which violate human rights, it would seem to me they have a responsibility to be even handed and to inform their constituents of all violators -- not just a few.

RONALD REAGAN

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

For those of you who haven't heard of or who only dimly remember hearing something about the "Snail Darter", let me offer an explanation.

The "Snail Darter" is a minnow. Now that may not be biologically accurate, but to everyone but a biologist a tiny fish two or three inches long is a minnow. There are 77 or so varieties of Darters with 77 or so names and the differences between them are indistinguishable to everyone but a student of Ichthyology.

What makes the Snail Darter unique among its cousins is that it is one the endangered species list, lives only (so far as we know) in a 17 mile stretch of the Little Tennessee river and has held up a \$116 million dam for four years. It is interesting to note that in this hassle it is a bureaucratic civil war -- the Environmental Protection Agency versus the Tennessee Valley Authority. T.V.A. was building the dam.

The thing that brought the "Snail Darter" (I still say it's a minnow) back into the news was a recent action by the House Appropriations committee. With an eye toward settling the dispute and getting the Tellico dam completed, the Committee appropriated \$9 million to transplant the fish, which they estimate number 10,000.

It only takes a little arithmetic to figure out that comes to \$900 per fish. Think about that the next time you use minnows for bait.

Somehow this makes some other shenanigans of government easier to believe. For example, Secretary of Transportation Brock Adams has announced that the federal interstate highway system is ready to be completed -- at \$2,000 a foot. It will take about \$40 billion to finish the job, which is a little more than the whole system was supposed to cost in the first place. However, it does come out to a little less than the cost of a World War.

By the way, on the subject of finishing jobs; do you recall the Federal Paperwork Commission which came into being two years ago? With great fanfare we were told it was established to reduce the blizzard of paperwork which threatens to bury all of us. In these two years its staff has grown to 30 times its original number. Government-required paper work now takes 143 million manhours a year -- up 13 million from when the commission set out to reduce it.

Now, having told you that, I'm going to plug a particular piece of paper work. It's a document called "Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism". I know it doesn't sound very exciting, but it's a product of the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations and is a treasure trove of reliable data of government spending. I'm told it is free and can be obtained by merely writing to the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C. 20575. Don't write to me or this station. I'll repeat that address. Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations, Washington, D.C. 20575.

It'll help you win a lot of arguments. For example did you know that 20 years ago civilian employees of the federal government averaged earnings of \$4,802 a year. Those who paid the taxes to support them only averaged \$3,959. By 1974, the government workers had gone up to an average of \$14,111, but the pay average in the private sector was only \$9,840. The title of the publication again is, "Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism".

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Busing"

Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Courts continue to mandate busing, even though all but a few zealots have long conceded it is a social experiment that has failed. Just as compulsory segregation is wrong, so is compulsory integration. Somewhere along the line, social experimenters crossed over from desegregation to integration and, for a time, successfully blurred the difference. Also somewhere along the line, these same zealous experimenters became so wrapped up in their cause they forgot all about the children.

Never was this more evident than in a dramatic exchange which took place before the National Press Club in Washington, D.C. last fall. Former Secretary of H.E.W. and now Chairman of the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, Arthur S. Fleming, addressed the club on "What has Happened to School Busing". On the platform with him were several school officials and District of Columbia School Superintendent, Vincent E. Reed.

Fleming didn't need to warm to his subject; he was steaming hot to begin with. He demanded the breakup of segregated schools by any means possible saying, "We must create equal access and make sure minorities are not shunted aside." Now, this creates an interesting situation in Washington, D.C. where 95% of the 126,000 students are black and only 5% are white. Apparently, he was willing to bus thousands of black children out to the suburbs in Maryland and Virginia and bring white children into the District. Of course, he put it -- "bring them back in", because he assumes they are all children of families who moved to Maryland and Virginia to avoid the majority in the Washington schools.

Fleming dismissed the U.S. Supreme Court decision wherein it was ruled that Detroit could not carry out such a program of city to suburb busing. According to him, the case just hadn't been properly presented. He said, "I start with the premise that you can't have equal educational opportunities in a segregated school system".

His speech was followed by a kind of panel discussion. And what took place there had to rank as a news scoop for the media sophisticates of the National Press Club. The D.C. school Superintendent, 48-year-old Vincent E. Reed, a no-nonsense educator and former Missourian, bluntly responded to Chairman Fleming's proposal. He said busing is a waste of money that could be better used to improve the quality of education and he denied that forced integration is necessary for better education.

Superintendent Reed summed it up this way; "I don't think it's necessary for black children to be with white children in order to achieve quality education. I don't think many black parents believe that good education necessarily lies at the end of a bus ride." He then went on to challenge the idea that people moved to the suburbs because they were racist. He said, "So many people want to make this a racist thing, but it isn't. There are many blacks who can afford to move out of the city and are moving out."

It's hard not to agree with him. You see, Superintendent Reed is black. He worked his way up from the ranks in the D.C. school district, starting 20 years ago. He said "Busing does not mean quality education. We're more likely to get better education if we have better teachers. That's what will give us quality education, not busing."

I hope Dr. Fleming listened to Dr. Reed.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "N.E.A."
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

Last November in Houston, Texas more than 100 executives representing that many of the biggest corporations in America met with representatives of the National Education Association. The purpose of the meeting was to see if business and industry can help in the education of your America. Now, that shows a gratifying public-spirited attitude on the part of the business community, so much so that one wonders if the businessmen took time to learn what the N.E.A.'s attitude might be.

They might have discovered that improved education could begin with the National Education Association itself. Some would no doubt be surprised to learn that N.E.A. is a giant teachers' union, a powerful lobbying force in Washington, and its principal goal is the federalization of the public school system. N.E.A. not only doesn't believe education should be entrusted to local school boards, it doesn't think parents should have anything to say about their children's learning.

But over and beyond this one wonders if the industrialists know what N.E.A. thinks of them. They can find out very easily by reading a publication co-sponsored by N.E.A. It is called, "A Working Economy for Americans". The first thing this startling bit of fiction (posing as fact) tells us is that our economic system is a failure and guess who is to blame. You don't have to guess. "A Working Economy for Americans" tells you on virtually every page; that "malfunctions and shortcomings" in our economic system cause serious problems and that -- QUOTE -- "In large part these national crises stem from the increasing concentration of American business". -- UNQUOTE. The pursuit of profit is blamed for -- QUOTE -- "unemployment, inflation, inequality, urban decay, discrimination, unsafe products and work places, pollution and environmental decay and the increasing powerlessness of consumers. All of these stem from the nature of our economy". -- UNQUOTE.

And this N.E.A. - sponsored publication has the answer as to how to change the "nature of our economy". It calls for complete government control, redistribution of earnings, government-owned banks and dismemberment of large corporations -- among other things.

Here are some verbatim quotes: "For some very large corporations, recessions from time to time may actually be welcomed. This is because many firms enjoy substantial control over their markets, making them largely invulnerable to economic swings. Unemployment diminishes the aggressiveness of the labor unions in bargaining for improved wages and working conditions." Here is another: "Many items of doubtful utility or short life -- automobiles calculated to fall apart after two years, a glut of cosmetics and deodorants are produced that admittedly make a lot of money for manufacturers, but have little value for consumers." -- UNQUOTE -- They explain why we suckers buy them too. We are brainwashed by high-powered advertising.

Then we are told that the depression of the Thirties -- with all its human misery - would never have been ended if the government hadn't intervened with -- QUOTE -- "New Deal jobs, public works programs, unemployment compensation and Social Security" -- UNQUOTE. What they don't tell us is that after all those things were tried we still had the human misery of 25 percent unemployment and only World War II ended the depression -- a very high-priced cure.

The most blatant line, however, is that corporations influence government and threaten democracy itself. That -- from N.E.A., an organization which spent \$2 million of its members dues last year to elect its friends to office. Read "A Working Economy for Americans" or how Fascism can come to America.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Porpoises And Tuna"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

In an ocean-going version of "Mary's Little Lamb", wherever you find porpoises in the warm waters of the Eastern rim of the Pacific, the tuna are almost sure to follow.

Enter the tuna fishermen. Most of the U.S. fleet of tuna boats is based in San Diego, California and uses the purse seine method of fishing. This means they set nets over a wide area and, as the schools of tuna swim into them, they draw the nets closed to trap their catch.

In the process, many porpoises -- not fish at all, but air-breathing mammals -- get caught in the nets and drown. The tuna fishermen shifted to the purse seine method in 1959, for efficiency's sake. By 1972, though, environmentalists were so alarmed that the porpoise might become extinct that they succeeded in getting the Marine Mammal Protection Act passed to stop or slow down the killing.

Since then, as a result of the Act and of federal regulations, the allowable number of porpoises that could be trapped with the tuna catch has dropped sharply, reaching a "zero" quota after a court case early this year.

Faced with this restriction, the two-billion-dollar-a-year-tuna industry, employing 30,000 workers, came to a halt. The skippers tied up their boats in port to await a compromise solution. They have since gone back to sea, after assurances that Congress would come up with such a compromise. Whether the environmentalists will go along remains to be seen.

If they don't, the U.S. tuna fleet will almost certainly be forced to sell to new owners in other countries. Ironically, if this were to happen the environmentalists' cause would be worse off, for foreign governments impose no controls on porpoise kills on their vessels.

There's another irony, too. It seems the porpoise, long believed by scientists to be one of the smarter mammals, is getting the knack of beating the purse seine.

For several years the tuna fishermen have had occasional encounters with porpoises they've come to call "The Untouchables". These porpoises would let themselves be encircled by the three-quarter-mile long net and then swim out the bottom or a side opening just as the net was being closed. In the process of diving, "The Untouchables" would take the tuna right out with them. The loss of such a catch can amount up to \$60,000 worth of tuna. Such incidents are on the increase.

Porpoises are also detecting the boats at greater distances than before, fishermen say. They scatter when the boats get close -- and so do tuna.

A side benefit of the porpoises' growing familiarity with the fishermen's techniques is that they are calmer than before when trapped. Fishermen report that many, instead of thrashing about trying to escape, now wait quietly till the netters begin the process of dropping the net after making the catch. This allows the porpoises to swim free without losing the tuna.

At the rate things are going, the porpoises may solve the problem before Congress does.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The federal government has different definitions of what constitutes a small business, depending upon the field its in. One definition that seems to fit all is "an independently owned and operated business that is not dominant in its field" Some small business associations consider any business with fewer than 500 employees as "small". Now, if you run a gas station or dry cleaning shop and you have two or three employees, 500 may seem pretty big to you. But, compared with the industrial giants and their tens of thousands of employees, it's still "small".

The "smalls", as they are nicknamed in Washington, are getting an increasingly sympathetic ear in the capital these days. Congress, it seems, has discovered that, proportionately, small business investments create more jobs than investments by big business. This is because small business relies more on human labor than it does on automation.

So, the idea is growing on Capitol Hill that by improving the climate for small business, we may be finding at least a partial solution to the unemployment problem.

Several specific ideas are under discussion now. Various associations which represent the men and women who run small businesses are pushing members of Congress for action this year.

The National Venture Capital association, for example, makes the point that when a small business owner sells, chances are that he'll reinvest his money in another small business. So, this group reasons that high priority should be put on amending the federal tax code to allow the seller of a small business investment to defer his capital gains tax liability, to the extent that the proceeds from his sale are reinvested in another qualified small business within 24 months.

Economist Eliot Janeway underscored that point recently when he testified before a subcommittee of the Senate Finance Committee. He said -- QUOTE -- "Our experience of incentives to these (small business) people -- most notably in the form of tax deferrals on profits taken from homes sold and reinvested in new home building and buying -- leaves no doubt that the economy and the Treasury get generous value for consideration given. Why not extend this same incentive to capital gains cashed in and reinvested?" -- UNQUOTE.

Another proposal of the National Venture Capital association that is being considered now is to put the capital gains tax rates on a sliding scale in order to encourage long-term small business investments.

Whether these and several other proposals to give small business operators a boost will become law isn't yet certain, but one thing is: Washington has suddenly discovered the "smalls", and they're the talk of the town this year.

7(1977)

Taped - 8/16/77

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 76-18

76-18A

<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
1. Panama	3:10
2. Cover Up	3:19
3. Justice Department	3:27
4. Unemployment	3:24
5. Medical Care	3:04
6. World Research	3:10
7. Tris	3:20

76-18B

1. Montage	3:15
2. Dream World	3:18
3. Tom Hayden	3:20
4. Business	3:03
5. Inflation	3:20
6. Korea	3:20
7. Rhodesia	3:03
8. Foreign Aid	3:20

RONALD REAGAN

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

It would be improper for me to comment on the terms of the agreement reached by the U.S. and Panamanian negotiators until we've all been able to see the treaty and study the terms. It is appropriate however to counter some of the Washington propoganda designed to soften us up by creating a guilt complex over the canal as if it symbolized American imperialism and exploitation of a weaker neighbor. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

The American people have every right to be proud -- not only of the great accomplishment in building the Canal, but -- of our complete lack of selfishness in all the years of its operation.

This is not the picture created by our negotiators, Ambassadors Bunker and Ellsworth, on "Meet the Press". I'm sure they are honorable men who sincerely believe our national interest would be served by giving up the Canal. But, they left the T.V. audience with the false impression that we have no ownership rights in the Canal and that we have inadequately compensated Panama for our presence there.

Back at the turn of the century, when we dealt with the new government of Panama which had broken away from Colombia, we took over the French contract for building a canal. They had failed completely, largely because of Yellow Fever which killed the canal workers like flies. The United States paid Panama and Colombia because the original contract was with that country. Then (and this Mr. Linowitz apparently didn't know when he spoke on T.V.) we went into what is now the Canal Zone and bought each piece of privately-held land from the individual owners just as any individual would if he were buying a farm or house and lot. We not only have treaty rights -- we are the owners of the real estate.

Then we set out to conquer the dread Yellow Fever. Volunteers allowed themselves to be stung by disease carrying mosquitoes and some died, but we eliminated the killer fever not only for canal workers but for all of Panama.

I recently looked at a book of photographs of the construction work -- there were no bulldozers then, nor heavy earth-moving machinery and the obstacles were monumental. No other nation in the world could have built the Canal. It is truly one of the great wonders of the world.

There have been more than 50 governments of Panama in its 60-odd years of existence. The present dictator took power by a military overthrow of the elected government. During these turbulent years, we have never made a profit. In fact, the original cost of the Canal has never been recovered. It still stands as an unpaid debt owed the U.S. Treasury.

We pour about \$200 million a year into the economy of Panama, giving it a higher standard of living than most of its Latin American neighbors. We paved the streets of Panama City, built a water system to provide pure fresh water and have negotiated treaty changes over the years to benefit the Panamanians. But, until now we have never negotiated our rights of ownership and sovereignty. So, we make no profit, we've never recovered the initial investment, we do not exploit the people of Panama -- they are better off because of us.

There is an unreality about the whole thing. Wouldn't the logical and honorable course be for Panama to offer to buy the Canal. How do we reconcile yielding to a demand that we hand it over free of charge plus giving them \$70 million a year for taking it off our hands?

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Cover-Up"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

There seems to be a cooling of the zeal on the part of those who were once ready to cleanse government of covering things up. The fires have gone out and the cauterizing tools are covered with rust.

Some time back I called attention to the 500-page report of E.R.D.A. (the Energy, Research and Development Administration) which gives nuclear breeder reactors a clean bill of health. The report had been -- forgive me -- covered up by the Administration since last February, because the Administration had decided breeder reactors were a dangerous "no-no". Then an enterprising journalist threatened to invoke the "Freedom of Information Act" and the E.R.D.A. report was made public. The bulk of the press greeted it with thunderous silence. The Administration had said the reactors were dangerous and that's the way it had to be.

Now we learn E.R.D.A. has more secrets. We owe this discovery to a journalist with the Wall Street Journal. Last April the Journal did an editorial on 1001 years of natural gas. The Journal was immediately rushed by a variety of frantic officials-- public and private -- who were panicked by the thought that someone might scuttle their crisis -- energy crisis that is.

The Journal was curious and curiosity paid off. It seems that way back in January about 70 E.R.D.A. people were assigned to a task force to study potential supply and demand. Their task force was called "MOPPS" for "Market Oriented Program Planning Study", and for about five days in April they had solved the energy crisis.

To brief this down, MOPPS had learned that at various prices -- higher than the price fixed by government but not as high as artificial gas for example -- there would be no natural gas shortage. E.R.D.A.'s top officials sent the members of MOPPS off on other business, redid their charts and, lo-and-behold, we had the energy crisis back just the way the administration said it was.

So much for energy. On another subject we find the Joint Economic Committee of Congress -- chaired by Representative Bolling of Missouri -- sitting on a 59-page study that has to do with the minimum wage for four months.

The report was written by Professor Walter Williams of Temple University at the request of the committee. Just so you'll know all about him and in view of what he has to say on the subject of minimum pay, he is black.

Professor Williams' report contends the minimum wage law hurts the employment chances of teenagers, racial minorities, and the physically handicapped. The study also looks unkindly upon the social reformers solutions for these groups, manpower training programs and public service employment. He says the best way to help marginal workers is to abolish state and federal minimum wage laws and to reduce monopolistic union practices. His report cites survey after survey showing how the minimum wage hurts young people.

Naturally, his findings struck at the deeply-held beliefs of the majority party committee members and one minority member, Senator Javits of New York. The report remains bottled up and staffers have admitted openly it is because the report is contrary to the doctrinaire liberalism of the majority and it is counter to the Administration's economy program. Other members of the committee urge its publication, especially since it bears a notation that it does "not necessarily reflect the views of the Joint Economic Committee.

Isn't there something in the 1st Amendment about the right to publish?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Recently a news story announced that Britain had resolved its own legal questions about expelling an American ex patriate. Former C.I.A. agent Philip Agee has been ordered to leave England. If that name doesn't ring a bell, Agee is the agent who turned against the C.I.A. -- apparently became a follower of Marx and Lenin -- and wrote a book about the Agency, obviously aimed at destroying it.

He's been accused of spilling secrets and naming C.I.A. agents and informers all over the world. Britain charges he has been involved in activities that -- "could be harmful to the security of the United Kingdom." -- Whether his actions were responsible for the arrest of a large number of Western Intelligence Agents in Poland has not been established, but the C.I.A. has spent a lot of money moving and transferring agents it believes are endangered by his actions.

In protesting his ouster from England, Agee for months now has stated he feared arrest and prosecution under the Espionage Act if he returned to America. As a matter of fact, the Justice Department under the previous administration had told him he would be. C.I.A. agents take an oath that they will never reveal secrets or identify and thus endanger those still serving in our intelligence-gathering service. Mr. Agee has violated that oath and betrayed his country.

But, on March 21st the new head of the criminal division of the Justice Department, Ben Civiletti, -- it is reported -- has told AGEe he would not be prosecuted if he came home. Whether this influenced England's decision to oust him, I don't know -- but he's free to come home and continue trying to carry out his pledge to destroy the C.I.A.. One can almost be sure he'll get T.V. talk show invitations and may very well prosper on the college campus speaking circuit. And, of course, his every word will be a bullet aimed at the destruction of the C.I.A.

Now about that inconsistency I mentioned earlier -- Ben Civiletti, head of the Criminal Division of the Justice Department, who has informed Agee he will not be prosecuted for his turncoat activities, is, on the other hand, pressing charges against F.B.I. agents and officials who he alleges have violated civil rights of American citizens.

These are men who risked their lives courageously to infiltrate the Ku Klux Klan in search of murderers; who made surreptitious entry; and, yes, opened letters and bugged phones in the fight against terrorists and organized crime. Mr. Civiletti will, if he has his way, jail these men as common criminals even though they were trying to protect us and this nation.

Come to think of it, maybe Mr. Civiletti isn't being inconsistent. He'll let Agee return to American where he can carry out his oath to destroy the C.I.A. while he (Civiletti) is striking a blow against the F.B.I. for practices he says are illegal snooping.

We should all be reminded of that day in March, 1970 when Greenwich Village in New York City was rocked by a tremendous explosion. A townhouse had been made into a weatherman bomb factory. The accident killed three young members of the underground group, two escaped. One, Kathy Boudin, dropped completely from sight. Several weeks ago former counterintelligence chief James Angleton revealed to reporters in Washington that the C.I.A. had located Kathy. She is in Moscow with the K.G.B. -- the Soviet spy organization. And how did the C.I.A. learn this? By opening incoming mail from Russia -- Kathy's letters to her associates in this country.

RONALD REAGAN

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

There are people in America unemployed through no fault of their own, people who desperately want a job with a future. By far the largest group of unemployed are young people. Some want part-time work while they continue their education. Others want to help the family and some are looking for that first toehold in the job market. The smallest group of unemployed is, however, the one of greatest concern - the head of household, provider for the family.

I'm not going to get into the subject to what measures could best solve these problems; or the effect on teenage employment of the minimum wage; or the lack of investment capital to create jobs because of ridiculous tax policies. These are the result of actions motivated by politics, not statemanship. But I would like to point out that U.S. Labor Department statistics on unemployment seem to be designed with the preservation of government programs in mind rather than creating full employment. We can't provide answers until we understand who it is we should be trying to help.

Two years ago, when New York City's financial plight was getting so much attention, most of us were unaware that Massachusetts was in about the same shape and the word bankruptcy was heard frequently. Unemployment was at or near the top of all the 50 states (a little over 11 percent). And, of course, the cost of the tax-free benefits for the unemployed was part of the state's financial distress. So, even though Massachusetts as a state has subscribed to all the social reforms of recent years, necessity forced it to trim spending wherever and however it could be done.

Unemployment benefits had been hiked and extended in the 1974 recession. Total unemployed had risen in Massachusetts from some 168,000 in 1974 to almost 300,000 in 1975. So, unemployment benefits were attacked as one of the areas in which state spending could be cut. In one year unemployment fell from more than 11 percent to 7 percent, a full point below the national average. In numbers, roughly 140,000 people were taken off the unemployment rolls. Naturally, one has to ask how a state creates 140,000 jobs in less than a year. The answer is -- Massachusetts didn't. There were only 19,000 more jobs in 1976 than in 1975.

The explanation for 120,000 people disappearing from the rolls of the unemployment figure in America is distorted by the availability of unemployment benefits. Milton Friedman has said, "A large fraction of our unemployment figure does not constitute a human problem -- it constitutes people taking advantage of very good arrangements".

Not only do the tax free benefits lure people to quit jobs more frequently, they actually lure people into the job market. The effect is an artificial layer of unemployed who don't reflect the economic situation in the country at all. Right now the United States has the highest percentage of its population at work than at any time in its history. Forty-one percent, but we have a high recession type unemployment figure. Professor Feldstein of Harvard, a top expert on unemployment, says that a possible one-fourth of our unemployed represent people who have voluntarily quit their jobs or are simply moving into the job market because of the generous tax free benefits.

This explains the economic miracle in Massachusetts. A drive was put on to ensure that benefits went only to those who had legitimately lost their jobs or were seriously looking for work. The disqualification rate on employment compensation jumped 200 percent. Between 1974 and '75 Massachusetts had only lost 30,000 jobs, but the unemployment rate had gone up by 131,600. In other words, 100,000 people simply came out of the woodwork to get on the gravy train. If Washington would quit playing a numbers game, we could bring unemployment down toward 5 percent with hardship to no one. We could save billions of dollars and concentrate on the really hard-core unemployed who need our help.

RONALD REAGAN

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

For years now American has had a pluralistic health care system. There are government hospitals for veterans, government-paid care for the needy, public institutions for psychiatric patients and various rehabilitation programs and -- for the most of us -- private medical care paid by ourselves. Can anyone say this system of private medicine augmented by government programs has not worked?

Americans are living longer (72.5 years). Infant mortality in the last 15 or 16 years has dropped almost 40%. Our general death rate is down 14% and deaths for women in childbirth have fallen more than 70%. Low income people go to doctors twice as often as the more affluent and three times as often as they did in the '30's. We have one doctor for every 581 people and one employed registered nurse for every 230.

Those last items should quiet those who are now proclaiming high costs have put health care beyond the reach of the average citizen. They talk of catastrophic illnesses and \$50,000 medical bills as if those are routine. No one denies such things do take place, but only 8/10ths of one percent of Americans will have a medical bill of even \$5,000 in a single year and 80% of those are financed by existing government programs.

Something called private health insurance started in America 125 years ago. At that time it was coverage against steamboat and railroad accidents. We've come a long way since then. Today, more than 183 million of us are protected by hospital insurance, 170 million have surgical insurance and more than 160 million are covered for doctor's fees. As for catastrophic illness, 150 million Americans have policies with high benefits ranging from ceilings of \$50,000 to no ceiling at all.

More than two-thirds of the \$100 billion-plus which Americans spend on health each year is paid by insurance companies, charities, businesses and government. The remainder is out-of-pocket and that includes over-the-counter drug store purchases of even such items as rubbing alcohol.

I realize figures are hard to follow when you are hearing them on radio, but listen to these if you will and I think you'll agree there is no need for anyone to push the panic button. A 1970 survey of out-of-pocket medical expenses, including health insurance premiums, found six percent of the people had no expense at all, 11 percent spent less than \$100. The biggest grouping -- 40 percent had annual expenses between \$100 and \$500; 26 percent had bills of \$500 to \$1000; and 15% spent more than \$1,000. This hardly sounds like we need a compulsory catastrophic insurance program which will add \$370 to everyone's yearly tax burden.

Admittedly, health costs have gone up since 1970, but not as much as food or housing. As I've said, catastrophic insurance alone would raise taxes \$370 a year for each one of us. Can you imagine what comprehensive insurance would cost? Right now some savings are realized because we're allowed a tax deduction for medical costs above a certain amount. But, if you are in a 20 percent bracket, you are still paying 80 percent of the bill yourself. If there is an argument that most of us don't buy or can't afford as much health insurance as we should have, government can remedy that without adding any new bureaucrats or administrative overhead. Let the government give us a tax credit for any health insurance premiums we pay. A tax credit means we subtract the amount of the premium from the income tax we owe the government. Thus at no added expense to one's self a citizen can afford health insurance of his own choosing.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Quite some time ago on one of these programs, I quoted from a small book called The Incredible Bread Machine. It was published by the Campus Studies Division of World Research, Inc. in San Diego, California. The Incredible Bread Machine was about as good and concise a job as could possibly be done in summing up what our free market system is all about.

The Campus Studies Division of World Research is dedicated to providing educators and students with material to counter the economic fairy tales that abound in our schools and on our campuses today. And, bless them, the people at Campus Studies have shed some pretty bright light in some very dark educational corners. But no one is more aware than they are of how much more light is needed.

Recently, they released the results of a nationwide poll taken among college students and instructors from high school level to university professors. The poll makes it plain that education itself is helping to promote economic illiteracy. Less than 9% of students and faculty have a clear understanding of terms such as "free market", "mixed economic system" and "collectivism". Only one out of five really believes in the principles of a free market system and there is an unfavorable, if not hostile, attitude among instructors toward the free market.

Among the students, 67% do not believe in strictly limiting government's power and 37% see no danger to freedom in increasing government's power. More than three-fourths of them don't think government should outlaw actions which do not threaten the life, liberty or property of others which is reassuring until you discover that about two-thirds of them at the same time are willing to let government legislate what it thinks is for our own good.

To sum up, less than half think the free market can do as well as government in delivering gas and electric power, and more than half would nationalize the oil companies.

With such a survey in hand, the Campus Studies group is readying a follow-up to The Incredible Bread Machine. And, that's a hard act to follow. They have come up with a movie script (a large part of their success is in making the truth pleasant to absorb). The intention is, as they put it, to stimulate thought and provoke discussion with a film that is entertaining and informative -- suitable for both classroom and television. It will promote the idea that a free economy is neither unjust nor inhumane; that it is instead highly moral and fair when compared to a planned economy and bureaucratic controls in the market place. I'll buy that.

And, incidentally, that's what these bright, young people are hoping a lot of us -- particularly the business community will do -- help buy that. You see, World Research, Inc. is a non-profit organization maintained by tax deductible contributions. And that's how this film will have to be funded, just as the film version of The Incredible Bread Machine was produced.

The business and industrial community and, for that matter, all who believe in the free market should give a hand to this undertaking. On its record, the Campus Studies Division of World Research, Inc., San Diego, California deserves our support. They stand in contrast to the National Education Association which has promoted a publication which declares that profit-making should be replaced by government action.

RONALD REAGAN

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

A few years ago, the farmers of America were victims of a middle-of-the-game rule change by government that left them holding the bag. And the bag was filled with unsold wheat. They had been told by the Department of Agriculture to plant fence-row-to-fence-row; to raise all the wheat they could and sell it on the world market, which meant, in reality, sell it to the Russians. With the wheat harvest in, the government--under pressure from the hierarchy of organized labor--stopped the sale. The financial hardship was monumental.

There is another case -- this time no involving farmers -- that could mean bankruptcy for some members of the business community. This one involves the self-appointed protectors of the consumer who ride in like vigilantes to ban the sale of anything they even suspect might endanger consumer health and safety.

Some time ago, the Consumer Product Safety Commission decided the possibility of small children accidentally setting their sleepwear on fire was a risk so deadly that immediate action had to be taken.

The action involved a chemical flame retardant called "Tris". The Commission virtually compelled the makers of children's sleepwear to impregnate the fabric with tris. There is no way to estimate the cost as concerned parents replaced their children's clothing, or the even greater loss to merchants who shelves were filled with merchandise that had been made before the Tris order. But patient parents went along if it added to the safety of their children. So, pretty soon, all the tots were protected against accidental ignition.

The textile industry and the merchants accepted in good faith the government's assurance that Tris was the answer. But now, that same government has discovered Tris might cause cancer in the children wearing the sleepwear. The ban is immediate; no Tris-treated sleepwear or clothing can be made or sold.

What happens now to wholesalers with warehouses filled with unsaleable merchandise? Then there are the retail merchants with the same problem. Do they return the merchandise, putting all the burden on wholesaler or manufacturer? And, of course, Mama can only empty the dresser drawers and start buying again.

We are talking about a \$200 million loss which must be borne by someone. If business can weather this economic jolt, the \$200 million will eventually have to be recovered in the price paid by the consumer. Of course, if the threat is real, no price is too high to protect our children, but the cancer risk in tris is extremely small. This is another saccharin case. There is no record of anyone contracting cancer, no deaths to report and science says the supposed risk is estimated at a possible four in 10,000. Compared to tobacco or alcohol (both of which can be sold), the threat to health from Tris is minimal. And remember, Tris isn't something the industry dreamed up with profit in mind. It was a government idea and a panic decision of the kind we are getting altogether too familiar with these days.

The Consumer Protection Commission, so sure the fire risk was immediate, asked no questions about Tris except, was it a fire retardant? Now comes the cancer possibility and against emergency action is ordered -- clear the shelves, stop production! But what about the original emergency -- the fire hazard? They haven't found a substitute fire retardant. In other words, we're back where we were in the first place with the kind of sleepwear we've always had -- except that hundreds of millions of dollars have been lost for which government accepts no responsibility.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Usually on these broadcasts I spend the entire time on one subject and if it's too much to one program I carry on for one or two more. Now and then, however, I collect items, no one of which takes long enough in the telling to fill a program but which are too good to let go by.

For example Washington, D.C. has been working to reduce Congressional waste and it seemed to me you'd be interested in knowing how they're doing. Well, the Senate has reduced its standing committees from 31 to 25 and it has eliminated 47 of its 177 sub-committees. And, they only had to add 16 more employees and spend almost an additional \$4 million to achieve these savings.

It's not of earth-shaking importance -- but interesting -- that a federal employee in the post office injured his right arm to the extent that he couldn't continue sorting letters. During the three months he was off the job on full pay he won a bowling tournament by rolling a 267 game. Which makes this a good time to quote the Secretary of the Treasury who says the Administration intends to reduce taxes for those earning less than \$25,000 a year. An administration official adds that "We'll have to raise taxes for those earning more than \$25,000, but we're not talking about it right now".

With the return of former CIA agent (now pro-Marxist) Philip Agee, the campaign to destroy our intelligence agencies will be stepped up. Time to note that in the first four months of this year San Francisco had 500 terrorist bombings causing almost \$4 million damage. Last year there were 1500 and damage totaled \$10 million.

The NATIONAL REVIEW reported on preparations for the coronation of that dictator who has announced that henceforth he will be Emperor of the Central African Empire.

A jewel crown, sceptre and orb and golden throne have been ordered from France. Emperor Jean-Bedel Bokassa will be drawn through the street in a gilded coach by 130 horses, also to be imported from France. And our Congress is worried about an imperial presidency!

I guess emperor was all that was left for Bokassa. He was already Life President, Marshal of the Central African Empire, Defense Minister, Keeper of the Seal, Chief Executive of the Government, Minister for Ex-Servicemen and War Veterans, Minister of the Civil Service, Minister of Posts and Telecommunications and signer of all the imperial checks. Now with his new job though he'll have help -- he has appointed a Minsiter of the Car Pool.

Last month the Department of H.E.W. admitted that about one-fourth of all the families receiving aid to dependent children are ineligible or improperly paid. Almost half of the more than 11 million welfare recipients are ineligible and 13.3 percent are overpaid. Why are they telling us? Why don't they do something about it?

Detente; where is it when we need it? Our ambassador to the Soviet Union was prevented from delivering the traditional 4th of July speech on Soviet TV and given a two-hour dressing down by Papa Bear Brezhnev himself. The line in his undelivered speech that did him in was "Americans will continue to state publicly their belief in human rights and their hope that violation of these rights wherever they may occur will end." It kind of makes you wonder about the NBC coverage of the Olympics in 1980.

Last, but not least, a testimonial to what a few years back in the real world can do for a fellow. Commenting on his loss to S.I. Hayakawa, former Senator John Tunney said "I think I would have been far better off if I'd spent more time in California learning that one of the major things on people's minds was that they didn't want Washington to do things."

RONALD REAGAN

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

A friend sent me a clipping from the Washington STAR -- several weeks old now but so mind boggling I just have to pass it on. It was on page 10 (not the front page) which in itself makes one wonder if we've become so blase we are beyond being astounded by anything.

The lead paragraph tells of policemen in several jurisdictions across the nation who are familiar with an individual they call Al. They refer to him as affable, likeable, calm and intelligent but then with some surprise they add that Al has no remorse.

The affable Al they are speaking of is Allen Leroy Anderson, who has pleaded guilty or no contest to three murders, has been charged with three more and is the number one suspect in yet another two. Authorities in seven states think he may be responsible for more.

Seven of the victims were shot -- execution style -- in the back of the head. The other, in California, was bludgeoned to death with a hammer. Homicide officers quote "affable Al" as saying he got angry with the man over a business deal and just didn't have his gun handy. He was caught near Malibu, California when police stopped a van stolen from the man he'd killed; they also recovered his 22 calibre revolver.

But this isn't a California story. It began on June 1, 1976 when Anderson broke parole at a "half-way" house in the state of Washington, where he was being counseled. He stole credit cards and the director's car and lit out -- reportedly because his homosexual lover had turned on him during a group therapy session. His first victim, according to detectives, was a 76-year-old woman who ran an antique store. She objected to giving him her money even though he threatened her with a gun. Finally annoyed with her protests he said, "If you want to die, I'm the guy who can help you." He told detectives, "I blew her brains out. The others were easy".

The "others" he spoke of included a young man in Virginia whose body -- bound hand and feet - was found in an apartment. He had been shot in the head. Anderson has been indicted in that case, but is less willing to talk about it than the others.

He left quite a trail starting with that first stolen car. His receipts for purchases made with the stolen credit cards were like a 2800 mile paper chase. But, the mind-boggling part of the story starts with the neat arrangements he has made for his future.

Having confessed to the California hammer murder, he then pleaded guilty to a murder in Minnesota (where the case wasn't very strong) on the condition that he serve his time in Minnesota where he has friends and family. He has also arranged that his California sentence be served concurrently. In other words, by going to prison in Minnesota he will also be credited with having served his time in California.

But complicating his plans was the problems of a murder he'd committed in Florida. Like any good citizen with a problem, he wrote to Washington to Senator Humphrey and Vice President Mondale. He wanted their help in keeping him from being extradited to Florida. Under something called the interstate compact, he was sent to Florida for trial but with the understanding he'd be returned to Minnesota to serve his prison term. No reflection on the Florida climate. It just happens that Florida has capital punishment and "affable Al" sure is opposed to that. In fact, he claims he didn't kill anyone in Texas for that very reason. He just slipped up in Florida and wasn't aware they had an electric chair on active standby. Florida just voted 10 to 2 for the chair, but he'll be in Minnesota till 1994.

Al wants to write a book, a publisher suggested the title, "Eight Bullets: Eight Bodies". He prefers, "Therefore I Shall Do It Myself". He says that describes his disappointment with our society. If we had had capital punishment in California, the title would have been "One Bullet, Two Bodies; One of Them His".

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Government directing us in Washington was chosen by little more than one-fourth of the people. In the general election, 27 percent voted Democratic; 26 percent voted Republican and 47 percent sat on their hands. In other words, 73 percent of the voters did not vote for those who now hold office.

In California, there have been a couple of special elections (less than a year after the '76 general election) to fill vacant seats in the state legislature. In one election only 30 percent of the people voted and some 25 percent in the other. This means the winners were the choice of about 15 or 16 percent of the electorate in their districts. Will Rogers once said, "Public officials are no better and no worse than the people who elect them, but they are better than people who don't vote at all".

Let me use California as an example of what can happen to all of us if we don't change our ways and accept our responsibility to see that government truly represents the will of the majority. Suppose the rank and file -- average, conscientious citizens -- are fairly divided among the 30 percent or so who bother to vote? But, suppose there is a small, well-organized group determined to exert more power than its numbers justify? This group can become the deciding factor both in a primary contest to determine who the nominee will be and in the general election to put that nominee in office.

I said I'd use California as an example, but I assure you it has no monopoly on the kind of activity I'm about to describe. Early last spring, in Santa Barbara, California, a large, well-attended conference was held. It was called the "California Conference on Alternative Public Policy". Actually it was an outgrowth or follow-up to the '76 United States Senate campaign of Tom Hayden. It is fashionable to describe Hayden these days as a political activist. A few years ago he was one of the foremost revolutionaries when no one bragged about living only a stones throw from the campus. Now people cluck in astonishment that he got a surprising percentage of the Democratic vote when he challenged then-incumbent Senator John Tunney. Remember what I said about a small unified voting bloc when the turnout at the polls is light.

The Santa Barbara meeting was like a reunion of all the anti-war demonstrators of the '60's, the hard corps shock troops of the campus violence who marched, rioted and threw rocks for causes. They gathered to endorse a new cause which they would support in a new and different way; a kind of uptown, wear-a-necktie-to-fool-them way.

Out of the meeting, led by Hayden, has come the "Campaign for Economic Democracy" (C.E.D.). Hayden describes it as an umbrella organization of coalition groups to break up the alleged power of corporations. He estimates they can round up a million to a million-and-a-half followers, starting with the ex-campus rioters. Their purpose? To win elections local and statewide, to lobby, to support those who are allies and replace those who don't come through.

First priority is to win control of corporations. But in the process to build a network by electing their people to water districts, local air pollution control boards, planning commissions, boards of permit, equal rights commissions, and so forth. These are the offices so many voters don't pay any attention to and don't bother to vote for, but which can cause so much trouble if held by trouble-makers. And, they'll succeed famously as long as the rest of us don't bother to vote. You say you don't think they can do it? We didn't think they could burn down the schools either, did we?

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Joint Economic Committee of Congress commissioned a study which was made public early this summer. In the report two Wisconsin professors charged that in 1974 the top 17 supermarket chains "over-charged consumers \$662 million because of lack of competition".

Now, with inflation hiking the prices on us every week it's like shooting fish in a rain barrel to make such a charge. We're all angry enough to believe it. But doesn't the fact that they could use the term "the top 17 supermarket chains" (indicating there are others who aren't in the top 17) suggest there must be some kind of competition?

Why doesn't business itself answer a charge like this? Maybe it does, but not in an effective way. The chairman of the board releases a statement to the press, but who sees it or what guaranty is there that it will even be printed? And telling it to the Congressional committee is like spitting into the wind.

But they could say, possibly in some of their ads where they'd be sure to be seen, that the top 17 supermarket chains couldn't have cheated us out of \$662 million in 1974. You see, that's more than three times as much as their total net profit, which happened to be a little less than \$200 million.

In that particular recession year when unemployment was going up -- but not as fast as inflation -- those 17 market chains averaged a profit margin of less than one-half of a cent on each dollar of sales. As a matter of fact, the total profit of all the supermarket chains, including independents, in 1974 was less than \$800 million.

The federal government spends that much by about noon every day. But, that's a mere detail that didn't prevent one congresswoman from charging -- because of lack of competition, she says -- that the average consumer family is overcharged about \$300 for food every year.

Now, in 1974 the average family food bill was about \$2700, and of that amount only \$11 represented profit for the supermarket. That, of course, is the average for all supermarkets. If you did your shopping in the most successful of the chains, that profit jumped to a whole \$30. If on the other hand you spent your \$2700 in the supermarket chain at the bottom of the profit scale, it lost \$16 on you. So, if you are being "ripped off" (as the Congresswoman says you are) for \$300 a year, you'd better look under the bed, because the market isn't that burglar.

Of course, we could ask the lady if she is concerned because the per capita cost of government is increasing three-and-one-half times as fast as the cost of food. Or, how our government can, by its own mistakes, lose -- in Medicaid and welfare -- seven times as much each year as the profit made by the entire supermarket industry?

One of the Wisconsin professors in the congressional study was formerly a part of the bureaucracy, employed in the Federal Trade Commission. At that time he claimed supermarket profits were one-and-a-quarter billion dollars too high. That was double what they actually made. Now he's charging it is \$662 million more than it should be, but that's only for the top 17 market chains, and -- as I said -- that's more than three times as much as their actual profit.

What reason can there be for this assault on a business our best economists say is highly competitive? Can it be just a bias against the free market system or is it the old Washington game of looking for a scapegoat-- someone else to blame for the inflation Washington itself is causing?

One footnote in closing; this year's federal deficit alone would pay one-half of the food bill for the entire nation.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The French have a saying for it, "The more things change, the more they remain the same." Do you suppose the Frenchman who first said it had Washington in mind?

We are enduring the longest period of "inflation" in our nation's history and something else we've never known before -- world-wide inflation. Solemnly, high officials in every nation talk of the need to do something about it. But, what they end up doing -- in the name of stimulating the economy -- is to make the average citizen the patsy in an economic shell game he doesn't understand.

Very simply, government votes to go on spending as much -- but usually more -- than it has been spending. At the same time, using terms like such as "stimulating the economy", "increasing employment" or "providing more for the unemployed", it creates an illusion of effective action. It proudly proclaims it has pumped more money into the economy. And it has -- printing press money.

In the last 10 years our government has -- by simply running the printing presses at the Treasury Department -- increased the supply of money in circulation more than four times as much as the increase in goods and services available for purchase. We foolishly feel richer because we have more money. But then, we discover prices have gone up. We call it inflation and get angry with the store-keeper, the manufacturer or even labor. Here we just got rich and those greedy so-and-so's are going to make us poor again.

It's that word inflation that does us in. In these 10 years when the money supply has increased 112% and the goods and services for sale have only increased 24%, they have devalued our money by 44¢ on the dollar. Prices haven't gone up. Each newly printed dollar should read "66 cents". And that's only compared to the dollar of 10 years ago. Think what it's worth compared to those dollars we had in 1939 or even 1956 at the end of the war.

Rising prices don't cause inflation. Inflation is the cause of rising prices. It would be more honest and less confusing if they'd quit talking about the cost-of-living index and simply tell us by how many pennies and nickels and dimes they've reduced the value of our money every year. Of course, if they did that we'd probably quit going along with the shell game.

Why does government play this game to begin with? Well, it allows them to spend money they haven't had to raise taxes to get. They can get away with it because, unlike raising a tax, our money is whittled away a few cents at a time. And, when we do catch on we blame -- as I said before -- the wrong people.

And, of course, the politicians help us blame the wrong people. Along about vote buying time they come over the hill like the cavalry with all kinds of plans for protecting us from venal and greedy profiteers; consumer protection agencies, more regulations, and even price control. All of which makes them look like heroes saving us from the bad guys.

If we look back at even fairly recent history, we'll see that -- whether the politicians intended it or not -- when inflation reaches a certain point nations go totalitarian. Socialism or Fascism takes over and they are virtually the same thing.

At the recent London Economic Conference one of our officials declared inflation to be caused by many things and therefore requiring many cures. If he really believes that he had no business being there. Inflation is caused by one thing -- government spending more than government takes in. It will go away when government stops doing that.

RONALD REAGAN

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

In the weeks that have elapsed since North Korea shot down one of our helicopters, killing three young soldiers, the principal editorial reaction has been one of praise for our forbearance, gratitude to North Korea for accepting our apology and relief that nothing really nasty came of the incident. Of course, this mutual conciliation was predicated upon completely forgetting how tragically final the incident was for three families; how drastic was the punishment for a simple error in navigation.

Unlike the seizure of the U.S.S. Pueblo nine years ago in international waters or the shooting down a year later of one of our planes with loss of 31 American lives (again over international waters), our aircraft this time was at fault. It had strayed across the demilitarized zone into North Korean territory. This we had to acknowledge and did.

It was proper also that we should choose our words carefully until we had return of the lone survivor and the bodies of the murdered men. In 1965, the North Koreans shot down an off-course fighter plane and it took a week to get return of the one survivor and the body of the man who was killed. In the case of the Pueblo, they held the crew for almost a year and even though we were completely in the right, our government's conduct shamed us before the world.

In this latest incident, the North Koreans, after a single day's delay accepted our apology and we saw the return of our living and dead on the TV news. All across American, there was heard an editorial sign of relief and it went on for days. The Los Angeles TIMES referred to the three fatalities as "the service men who died". As for the "handling of the matter", the TIMES said, "The tone of the responses on both sides of the line appear to measure a more moderate relationship."

Well, in the first place, the three young men didn't die; they were killed. In the second place, why shouldn't the North Koreans be moderate? They had shot down the inadvertent intruders and we apologized. Again, let me say it was proper for our government since we were technically in the wrong, to be circumspect until our men living and dead were back in our hands. But, enough already of this continued self-congratulations as if we'd come through some terrible danger and were safe at last.

It's time to remind ourselves and others of the difference in culture, in morals and in the levels of civilization between the free world and the communist ant heap. In the years since World War II, the Russians have killed more than 100 American servicemen in accidents similar to this. During those years, they have violated our air space on occasion. We've kept them under surveillance until they departed, giving them the benefit of the doubt that they were accidentally off course. We never shot them down.

Since 1953, there have been more than 2000 shooting incidents across the zone in Korea. Eight American and almost 500 South Koreans have been killed. Last year, they attacked an American work detail in neutral territory and chopped two of our officers to death with axes. Now four young servicemen in an unarmed helicopter get off course and are shot down; three lose their lives and the fourth is saved. The TIMES says our apology and the North Korean's acceptance of our apology shows we are getting along better. It is time to weep for the men who were murdered. Time to offer our sympathy to their bereaved families but, most of all, express our outrage at a nation so paranoid it behaves like a homicidal maniac. Human rights include the right of young boys to make an inadvertent mistake without having to forfeit their lives.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The United States has joined with the Third World voting bloc in the U.N. by imposing sanctions on Rhodesia. Our rationale is that Rhodesia is a nation predominately black, but governed exclusively by a greatly out-numbered white minority. In a sense, this is true but it also ignores the effort being made in Rhodesia to achieve majority rule.

The United States and Great Britain in an effort to persuade Rhodesia's Prime Minister Ian Smith to hasten the transfer of government secured his promise to achieve majority rule within two years. He is keeping that promise. In the meantime, however, two black nationalists, both dyed-in-the-wool Marxists, have repudiated the plan which they too had signed. Their terrorist guerrillas have brought bloodshed and death to hundreds of Rhodesians -- mostly blacks. Aligned in what they call "The Patriotic Front" they say they want no orderly peaceful transfer. They want an immediate takeover and the establishment of a Communist government.

And for no reason anyone can understand our government appears to support these self-declared leaders who are nothing more than terrorists ambitious for power. One journeys to Moscow for advice, the other to Peking.

The cabinet minister whose letters I quoted is a black chief of one of the two principle tribes in Rhodesia. J.S. Chirau is President of the council of chiefs, leader of some 250 chiefs and several hundred headmen. He has resigned from the cabinet to lead the black majority opposition to the guerrillas and it is estimated he has the support of almost two-thirds of Rhodesia's blacks.

When I picked up a NEWSWEEK magazine in late July and saw an interview with Chief Chirau, I thought you might be interested in how much more sense he makes than does our Ambassador to the United Nations.

The chief had just returned from a visit to London where he had submitted a plan to the British government. NEWSWEEK asked what his plan was. He answered, "A system of black government that would guarantee law and order, preserve our private enterprise economy and keep Zimbabwe (the African name for Rhodesia) out of Marxists' hands." Then he outlined a plan for a President with executive powers, two houses of parliament and two provincial assemblies for the two principle tribes, the Mashona and Motabeli. All this would be brought about through free elections with universal suffrage for everyone over 18.

Asked about restrictions on candidates, he ruled out only those who refused to renounce terrorism. This, of course, would disqualify Nkomo and Mugabe, the self-annointed "Patriotic Front", who he said would get less votes than the Communists got in Spain. He added, "If the Marxist terrorists succeed, we will become the victims of the greatest tyranny in history. It would mean the victory of a small handful of people, whose only claim to support is that they possess the majority of rifles, machine guns, mines and mortars -- all made in Russia".

Significantly, on a continent where the answer offered to white racism is usually an equally unjust black racism, Mr. Chirau responded to a question about excluding white; saying "Rhodesia could not survive without them (the whites). Their property and rights will be totally guaranteed. But we must act quickly to reverse the white exodus now underway".

In the same edition of NEWSWEEK, Rhodesian Prime Minister Ian Smith was interviewed and declared, "The new government should be made up of the best people we have available -- black and white". When he was asked if a black majority government with white participation was seen to be working did he think he would have our support against the Soviet-backed guerrillas, he said, "I doubt it". He believes we will automatically be on the side of the "Organization of African Unity" which is manipulated by the Soviet Union. Wouldn't it be nice if we could tell him we'd be on the side of decency and common sense for a change?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Representative Bill Young, a Congressman from Florida, successfully amended the Foreign Aid appropriation bill and now finds himself up against the whole administration, which didn't care for his amendment even a little bit.

In spite of the fact that poll after poll shows the American people increasingly disenchanted with Foreign Aid, this year's appropriation was almost double last year's. And the Secretary of State says he wants it increased even more in the years ahead.

Congressman Young's amendment blocked aid from going to Uganda, Cambodia, Laos and Vietnam. The White House complained that this hampered efforts to promote American interests around the world. But, the part of the amendment that really touched a nerve was language prohibiting indirect aid through international financial institutions over which we have no control. It seems that the Administration wants to increase our commitments to these multi-lateral organizations.

Of the \$6.7 billion approved by the House, about one-third (\$2.1 billion) will be plowed into six international funds or banks. Young hasn't been able to get any answers to his questions about where this money goes after it leaves our hands. Executives of the banks refuse to testify before Congress and Robert McNamara refused to allow the Congressman to sit in on a board meeting of the World Bank. We, of course, are the largest contributor to all of these banks. And part of our money underwrites the payroll of all these banks -- whose employees, by the way, in many categories are paid as much as 57 percent more than comparable workers in U.S. civil service jobs; besides which they pay no income tax on these handsome salaries.

Congressman Bill Young is calling for a national debate on the whole subject of Foreign Aid. He points out that Americans are unaware of the extent to which foreign aid is being placed in the hands of international organizations.

If the purpose of foreign aid is to further our national interests, by what rhyme or reason do we entrust it to international banks answerable to no one but their international charters? And what did our Secretary of State mean when he told the Conference on International Economic Cooperation in Paris last May 30th that we must have a "new international economic system"?

In that same week in May, the under secretary of Economic Affairs told a gathering in the State Department that the international banks should be an "umbrella -- a catalyst" for all international finance. Congressman Young asks what kind of scheme is being proposed for America and shouldn't the American people be told about it?

One thing we do know -- or should know -- is that some of the "international" or perhaps we should call them "multi-national" banks we help finance make what are called "soft loans" to developing countries. Soft loans are 50 year loans at no interest -- only a slight service charge. But since we ourselves are operating on a deficit basis this means we are lending money at no interest, which we have to borrow first and upon which we pay the going rate of interest.

Calling for a national debate on the subject of foreign aid, how it is distributed and what we get in return for it can hardly be called a radical proposal. Who knows, the world might even learn how much some nations are in arrears on their dues and contributions to the United Nations and affiliated organizations.

Taped 9/6/77

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 76-19

76-19A

	<u>TITLE</u>	<u>TIME</u>
	1. L. A. Times	3:15
*	2. Panama Canal I	3:21
**	3. Panama Canal II	3:18
	4. The Bible	3:07
	5. Kettering	3:12
	6. Government Costs	3:10
#	7. Cuba I	3:10

76-19B

##	1. Cuba II	2:56
	2. Youth Employment	3:03
	3. The Olympics	2:41
+	4. Government Can Cost Less I	3:20
++	5. Government Can Cost Less II	3:16
	6. Pensions	3:17
	7. Blackout	3:01
	8. Furbish Lousewart	2:42

We suggest the programs marked (*) be aired in sequence, the programs marked (#) be aired in sequence and the programs marked (+) 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 forward these requests to our office.



RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "L.A. Times"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

One August 29, the Los Angeles TIMES in an editorial, wrote that I have "endeared myself to right wing Republicans" -- by saying I will "work for Senate rejection of the new Panama Canal treaties". That raises a question of arithmetic. We are told that only 18% of the electorate is registered Republican. What percentage of these are "right wing" the TIMES doesn't say, but news stories in the TIMES as in other papers must have referred to the national polls which indicate 80% of all Americans are opposed to giving up the Canal. As a matter of fact, that same issue of the TIMES announced that the American Legion and the Veterans of Foreign Wars are officially opposed to the new treaties.

But, in both the TIMES editorial and a column by Ernest Conine the same day, the principal argument given for ratifying the treaties was the possibility of riot and bloodshed in Panama and Latin America. Yet, the TIMES says we are not "running from the Canal with our tail between our legs." They then go on to say the treaty gives us the right to defend the Canal and keep it open even after it is no longer ours.

This raises an interesting question. If we are so fearful of trouble (including actual sabotage of the Canal while it is still owned by us) would we send armed forces to Panama after we have agreed to give it away if they decided to hasten the takeover?

There are other questions to be asked. Would the Panamanian people -- or even the present dictator of Panama -- want to sabotage the Canal when it represents 25% of their gross national product? For that matter, does the TIMES believe the people of Panama are necessarily in agreement with their present ruler who took office at the point of a gun? In a military overthrow, the clique, of which General Torrijos was a part, ousted the elected President 11 days after he had taken office following a landslide victory.

One American newspaper, the Chicago TRIBUNE, sent a reporter to Panama several months ago while the negotiations were still going on. He interviewed the people of Panama on the street and in their homes. Even though many admitted to danger in talking to him, they expressed their opposition to Torrijos and said giving him the Canal would reduce their chances of ever freeing themselves from his dictatorship.

One more point regarding the charge that the Canal cannot be defended against sabotage. Surely the Germans in World War I who were able to touch off the disastrous "Black Town" explosion in New Jersey could have profited by sabotaging the Canal. In World War II, when our Pacific Fleet had been virtually destroyed at Pearl Harbor, our enemies must have wished they could close the Canal. And, in the Korean and Vietnam wars, the Communists (who are the only recognized party in Panama) must have wanted to shut off the supplies we were pouring through the Canal.

The TIMES says businessmen are fearful that failure to ratify the treaty will set off a wave of violence in Latin America. Of course they are! The State Department has been propagandizing them for almost two years to support giving away the Canal on the grounds that their business investments in Latin American will be endangered if we don't.

In my next broadcast, I'll tell you what some of our greatest military experts think about the treaties.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Panama Canal I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

While we are told the Joint Chiefs of Staff support the giving up of the Panama Canal, not enough attention is paid to those men who have led our military in the past who take a contrary view.

The Chiefs are bound by the military code to support the policy of the Commander-in-Chief, the President. Those who have retired from the service are not so bound and we should hear their views on what giving up the Canal would mean to our national security.

Four great names in modern naval history, all former Chiefs of Navy Operations, Admirals Carney, Anderson, Burke and Moorer wrote the President expressing their opposition to the proposed treaty. They wrote, "As former chiefs of Naval Operations, fleet commanders and Naval advisers to previous presidents, we believe we have an obligation to you and the nation to offer our combined judgement on the strategic value of the Panama Canal to the United States.

"Contrary to what we've read about the declining strategic and economic value of the Canal, the truth is that this interoceanic waterway is as important, if not more so, to the U.S. than ever." Citing their own experiences through four wars and the part played by the Canal in those wars, they said, "As Commander in Chief, you will find the ownership and sovereign control of the Canal indispensable during periods of tension and conflict." They added a line every American should think about; "Loss of the Panama Canal which would be a serious setback in war, would contribute to the encirclement of the U.S. by hostile naval forces, and threaten our ability to survive."

In closing their letter, they reemphasized the importance of the Canal to our security and then said, "It is our considered individual and combined judgement that you should instruct our negotiators to retain full sovereign control for the U.S. over both the Panama Canal and its protective frame, the U.S. Canal Zone as provided in the existing treaty."

Of course, such instructions were not given and the negotiated settlement calls for giving up our rights of sovereignty.

This letter was written on June 6th. On July 22nd, Admiral Moorer testified before the subcommittee on the Separation of Powers of the U.S. Senate Judiciary committee. As testament to his qualification, he went from commander of the 7th fleet in the western Pacific during the Vietnam war to Commander-in-Chief of the Pacific, then to Commander-in-Chief of the Atlantic, Supreme Allied Commander of NATO, Chief of Naval Operations and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. It is easy to believe him, thinking back on the 12 years between 1962 and 1974 when he said, "I saw this strategic waterway from many vantage points and under stressful circumstances."

Admiral Moorer told the Senators that, as Commander of the Atlantic in 1965-67, when the war in Vietnam was still expanding, he looked to the Canal not only as a means of sending support to the Pacific command but in the perspective of the possible need to reverse the flow. There was a possibility of the Middle East situation deteriorating, as well as potential trouble closer to home in the Caribbean.

He said, "The Canal made it possible to pre-position certain types and tonnages, but always with the knowledge that the balance could be shifted to meet unforeseen situations". And, he credited the Canal with providing the flexibility to do that.

Believing you should have the benefit of testimony by the admiral and other military experts, I'm going to carry on with this in the next broadcast.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Admiral Thomas Moorer, former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff told a Senate Committee on July 22nd that it is vital to United States interests to retain complete ownership and control of the Panama Canal. He expressed the gravest concern about surrendering the Canal to a left-leaning government allied with Cuba, citing the danger of giving this advantage to a man who might permit Soviet power and influence to prevail by proxy over the Canal.

He said, "The economic lifelines of the entire Western Hemisphere would be jeopardized. I have yet to see any solid justification advanced as to why the United States should willingly sacrifice the strategic advantage afforded to us by our possession of the Panama Canal."

Calling attention to the 8000 miles of added travel in rounding the Horn (which takes an average of 31 days), he said, "If we were denied use of the Canal, we would have to build a much larger navy; much larger storage and harbor facilities on both east and west coasts and provide more merchant ships and escorts."

On July 29th, Admiral John S. McCain, Jr. (retired) appeared before the same Senate committee. His last active duty was Commander in Chief Pacific 1968-72 during the height of the Vietnam war. Previous experience included duty with submarines based at Coco Solo in the Canal Zone prior to World War II.

Admiral McCain has been a student of sea power in defense of the United States and says the Panama Canal is the strategic center for the defense of all the Americas. He called it a "crucial element of U.S. sea power in the current drive for world domination by the U.S.S.R.". He added, "to surrender one square inch of the Zone territory, as shown by experience, will only lead to future greater demands and eventual loss of the Canal itself to a small country that could not possibly stand up against the pressures of stronger powers. Soviet Russia and the communists are making every effort to gain control of the Canal."

He concluded his testimony saying, "The U.S. is facing the gravest threat in its history. It has suffered successive defeats all over the world." Predicting that loss of the Canal would result in the Caribbean and Gulf of Mexico becoming "Red Lakes", he said, "it is time for our country to stop cowering, cringing and to act the part of a great and powerful nation with a positive and constructive program. We have nothing to be ashamed of nor need we apologize for all the foreign aid and technical assistance we have given to other nations."

Admiral McCain reminded the Senators that a great student of strategy with Canal experience, General Thomas A. Lane, foresaw the present situation in 1974 when we were already negotiating without the knowledge of the American people. General Lane said, "The belief of some officials that U.S. operation and defense of the Canal under treaty provisions instead of sovereign authority would eliminate the friction of recent years is a calamitous misjudgement of the present scene. Marxist-Leninist subversion would be intensified by such a retreat. Friction would mount and the U.S. position would become intolerable. We would be compelled to use force against Panama or withdraw. That is a prospect which no President should impose on his successors."

RONALD REAGAN

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

Writing in the journal, THE ALTERNATIVE, Richard Hanser, author of "The Law and the Prophets" and "Jesus: What Manner of Man is This?" has called attention to something that is more than a little mind boggling.

It is my understanding that the Bible (both the old and new testaments) has been the best selling book in the entire history of printing.

Now another attempt has been made to improve it. I say another because there have been several fairly recent efforts to "make the Bible more readable and understandable". But, as Mr. Hanser so eloquently says, "For more than three and a half centuries, its language and its images have penetrated more deeply into the general culture of the English speaking world and been more dearly treasured than anything else ever put on paper." He then quotes the irreverent H. L. Mencken who spoke of it as purely a literary work and said it was "probably the most beautiful piece of writing in any language".

They were, of course, speaking of the authorized version, the one that came into being when the England of King James was scoured for translators and scholars. It was a time when the English language had reached its peak of richness and beauty.

Now we are to have "The Good News Bible" which will be in "the natural English of everyday adult conversation". I'm sure the scholars and clergymen supervised by the American Bible Society were sincerely imbued with the thought that they were taking religion to the people with their "Good News Bible", but I can't help feeling we should instead be taking the people to religion and lifting them with beauty of language that has outlived the centuries.

Mr. Hanser has quoted from both the St. James version and the "Good News Bible" some well-known passages for us to compare. A few thousand years ago, Job said, "How forcible are right words?" The new translators have him saying, "Honest words are convincing." That's only for openers. There is the passage, "For in much wisdom is much grief and he that increaseth knowledge increaseth sorrow." Is it really an improvement to say instead, "The wiser you are, the more worries you have; the more you know, the more it hurts?"

In the New Testament according to Matthew, we read, "The voice of the one crying in the wilderness. Prepare ye the way." The Good News version translates that into, "Someone is shouting in the desert. Get the road ready." It sounds like a straw boss announcing lunch hour is over.

The hauntingly beautiful 23rd Psalm is the same in both versions -- for a few words -- "The Lord is my shepherd". But, instead of continuing with "I shall not want", we are supposed to say, "I have everything I need."

The Christmas story has undergone some modernizing but one can hardly call it an improvement. The wondrous words, "Fear not; for, behold, I bring you good tidings of great joy" has become, "Don't be afraid! I am here with good news for you."

The sponsors of the "Good News" version boast that their Bible is as readable as the daily paper, and so it is. But do readers of the daily news find themselves moved to wonder "at the gracious words which proceeded out of his mouth"? Mr. Hanser suggests that, sadly, the "tinkering and general horsing around with the sacred texts will no doubt continue, as pious drudges try to get it right." "It will not dawn on them that it has already been gotten right."

RONALD REAGAN

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

Our sons and daughters will, in their lifetime, undoubtedly see things almost impossible for us to imagine. But, in my opinion, the generation to which I belong will have had an experience they will not know.

There have only been a few periods at most in man's history when a single generation presided over a great transition. Our generation was one of those. We went from the horse-and-buggy to travel in outer space; and to the miracles of communication by which you are hearing my voice. But I don't want to sound like that man back in the late 1800's who wanted to close down the U.S. Patent Office because everything had been invented. Nor do I want to sound boastful or smug about the miracles that became commonplace in our lifetime.

Each generation sees farther than the generation that preceded it because we stand on the shoulders of giants.

Back in 1943, when radio had opened a new world to us, General Motors had a great Sunday afternoon program of symphonic music. On October 3rd of that year, C. F. Kettering, a General Motors Vice President and director of research, made a short address on radio. He called attention to how much we all owe the generations that preceded us.

Speaking of how radio could carry the music of the orchestra all over the world, he said the elements of radio had been developing over 100 years. Then, surprisingly, this remarkable engineering genius said that, in truth, the miracle of radio had started 600 years before Christ -- 2500 years ago.

He made it clear it was only a vague, weak thought at that time when a Greek philosopher, Thales of Miletus, found that by rubbing amber, he produced a force that would pick up straws. Two thousand, two hundred years later, Queen Elizabeth's physician in England, Sir William Gilbert, did a little playing around with the idea and called the phenomenon he produced "electricity". Sixty years later, a German, von Guericke, built a machine that generated static electricity. A century later, Benjamin Franklin identified positive and negative electricity and proved electricity and lightning were one and the same.

Kettering went on in his radio address and told how, in 1820, a Dane named Oersted proved that electricity would produce magnetism. The idea was moving faster. Farady discovered the principle of the electric motor. Morse and Bell came along and used the idea to communicate by way of the telegraph and the telephone. Edison lighted the world with it and Marconi and deForest laid the foundation for radio.

Pointing out how these men -- unknowing of each other for the most part, spread and separated over 2500 years -- brought that vague idea to a force that literally changed the face of the earth, Kettering spoke of how indestructible an idea is. He also said there have only been a few thousand such thought cultivators in all man's history and that, without them, we might still be living in caves.

Mr. Kettering had saved his surprise for the last. He closed his speech saying, "We might go back 2500 years to 600 B.C. and find out why the amber picked up the straws. We don't know that yet." And, he added, "If we did, I believe we could open up new fields that might be quite as important as the electric light, the telephone or the radio."

RONALD REAGAN

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

The Tax Foundation has just released its 19th biennial, "Facts and Figures on Government Finance". If we followed the ancient custom of beheading the bearer of bad tidings, the Tax Foundation wouldn't have use for a hat anymore. As it is, bless them for giving us the sad facts of government's cost.

For all levels of government -- federal, state and local -- in 1977, spending pro rates out to \$9,607 per family or almost half (45 percent) of average family income in America, which is now \$20,400. If we go back to 1950, we get the full jolt of how swiftly government costs are increasing. In that year, governments at all levels took only \$1,615 for each family.

Total spending for this year is more than \$715 billion. Almost \$450 billion of that is federal and something under \$270 billion is for state and local government.

Ralph Waldo Emerson, 100 years ago, said "In a free and just commonwealth, property rushes from the idle and imbecile to the industrious, brave and persevering." Either that isn't true or we're no longer a "free and just commonwealth". A young man in New York won the state lottery last spring which sets him up with \$1,000 a week for the rest of his life. Of course, he has the same tax problems we all have so his net is something more than \$600 a week. Still, he's no hardship case. Well, according to the report I just read he recently lost his supermarket managerial job for refusing to carry out orders. With 600 plus dollars a week outside income a fellow can be a little independent. The point is, he applied for his \$90 a week unemployment insurance and went camping.

But Congressman John Ashbrook has given us an example of why federal spending has skyrocketed the way it has. With as many buildings as they build in Washington, you'd think they'd be pretty good at it but practice has not made perfect.

Congressman Ashbrook has made public a report by the general accounting office on the National Visitor Center at the old Union Station railroad depot. Like the Kennedy Center, Rayburn Office Building and the RFK Stadium, to say nothing of Metro, Washington's rapid transit system, it's going to cost a lot more than the original estimate. Top figure for bringing it into operation was \$87.5 million. Now it's estimated at \$180 million.

Part of it opened on our birthday July 4, 1976, more than eight years after it was authorized. I say part of it because one wall is incomplete, major structural, mechanical and electrical problems will require repair and re-doing. Also, the parking facilities are still non-existent.

It's things like this which make you understand why no one cheers when the White House tells us by not deregulating the price of natural gas, consumers will save \$70 billion by 1985. It is estimated consumers will have to come up with \$100 billion to pay for imported liquified gas to make up for the natural gas we won't have because of the price limitation.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Since the administration announced (in the interest of human rights, no doubt) that we were going to normalize relations with Castro's Cuba, wondrous things have happened. They've beaten us in a basketball game, American businessmen tour Havana, dreaming of branch offices and new sales territories, and the wife of one of them tweaks Fidel's beard and finds him "cute".

Senator George McGovern and the Cuban dictator munch ice cream cones together and the Senator discovers Fidel is a personable, well-informed fellow. Apparently, he's better informed than the Senator, who shows no sign of knowing that the 15,000 Cuban mercenaries in Africa are only the tip of an iceberg. "West Watch", quarterly journal of the Council for Inter-American Security says Cuban agents have been active on the continent for more than 10 years and it lists 14 African states where they are operating. British journalist Robert Moss estimates there are more than 20,000 (not 15) in Angola and gives specifics on their Russian arms which include everything from heavy tanks to multiple rocket launches and MIG fighter planes.

If all of the testimony available on Cuba's long time support of so-called liberation movements is added up, there are 25 to 30,000 Cubans in Africa, and many hundreds more have operated in the past or still are operating in Jamaica, Panama, Portugal, Vietnam and North Korea. They have trained exiles who attempted to launch guerilla warfare in the Dominican Republic as well as the terrorists who plague Argentina. Bayard Rustin, writing in "New America", a socialist journal, describes Cuba as doing the Soviet's dirty work in Africa, the Caribbean and Latin America.

But what should be the most difficult thing for Americans to swallow is the testimony of our own former war prisoners in Vietnam. It is bad enough that we rewarded their years of suffering and their heroism by ducking out on our allies; surely they are entitled to be heard on the subject of Cuba. So far the national press has said nothing about their shocked disbelief that we could be negotiating with Castro.

Colonel George E. Day, former P.O.W. and holder of the Congressional Medal of Honor has written that Cuban embassy officials in Hanoi inflicted some of the worst tortures on our men. They sold the North Vietnamese the idea they were experts on brainwashing and could re-educate a dozen American servicemen so they would come home preaching the Communist line. When brainwashing failed, they turned to plain brutality.

Colonel Day tells of one of our Airmen who was raped, bullied and tortured for 24 hours until his mind was gone. Then he was subjected to electric shock treatments with an antiquated machine that not only left massive burns on his arms and head but also finished off what was left of his brain.

He was last seen by his fellow prisoners in October, 1970. Whether murdered or just left to die, he never returned. Colonel Day writes with regard to recognizing Cuba that he is, "appalled, amazed and frightened", that men such as Senator McGovern, Andrew Young and President Carter "would have the uncommon, bad judgement and poor sense of responsibility to Americans to aid the cause of these international outlaws."

To forgive is divine but not while Castro is arrogantly declaring (as he did a few weeks ago) that he has no intention of halting his efforts to bring terror and revolution to the world.

RONALD REAGAN

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

The tourist traffic to Cuba is increasing. Most recent visitor to the island, traveling in an air force jet was U.S. Senator Frank Church. He spent four days with Fidel Castro and departed for home saying, "I leave with the impression I have found a friend."

Lest we lose our perspective with so many carefully staged Cuban tours recently, let me read a letter written to President Carter by the exiled sister of the Cuban dictator.

"My name is Juanita Castro. I am the sister of the communist dictator of Cuba, Fidel Castro. However, I am also a Cuban woman in exile who loves her country and has put its liberation above personal gain and family ties. I have chosen liberty, Christianity and patriotism over slavery, atheism and treason. You, Mr. President, must now choose how your name will go down in history. I speak to your conscience and through it to the American people."

"I come to remind you of those killed by Communist Cuba's firing squads for trying to be free. I come to remind you of Communist Cuba's concentration camps and jails where torture and murder are everyday occurrences. I come to remind you of the enslaved people of Cuba, muted by terror and waiting, hoping, struggling for liberation."

"I come to tell you that those who state that the lifting of economic sanctions against Cuba and the establishment of relations with its communist government do not constitute condoning or accepting its actions, are wrong. This argument would not have stood up to the realities of an Auschwitz or a Dachau under Hitler's Germany and ring hollow and bankrupt before the realities of their counterpart in communist Cuba."

"I come to ask you why, after your pronouncements concerning human rights, you do not vigorously advocate that these be respected in Cuba before even trying to renew relations of any kind with the Communist government of Havana."

"I come to remind you of the Congressional resolution of October 3, 1962 and of the innumerable conventions, doctrines and treaties that oppose such action. I come to remind you, Mr. President, of that day in Florida when you shouted, 'Democracy, yes; Castro, no.'

"Last but not least, I come to warn you, Mr. President, that my brother, Fidel Castro, and the international communism he represents are not interested in this country's friendship, but only in the economic gain that would accrue to his regime from this move and in the increase of his political prestige that such action would bring."

"At the beginning of your War of Independence in 1775, Benjamin Franklin wrote to his old friend in England, William Strahan: 'Look upon your hands! They are stained with the blood of your relations!' Mr. President, I submit that your decision in this matter might well determine if you will ever again be able to look at yours."

Juanita Castro's letter was addressed to the President, but, in truth, it was written to all of us, and all of us must be a part of the answer. Has Senator Church or any of us, for that matter, "found a friend"?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Some have said the looting last July in New York was aggravated by not enough welfare. Others said it was the direct result of four decades of too much welfare. I myself have deplored a tendency in education to ignore teaching moral precepts. Columnist John Chamberlain recognized all these differing views in a recent column, but then came up with what might very well be the best explanation.

Idle hands can get into mischief. Juveniles who can't find summer jobs to keep them busy and to provide pocket money not only become bored, they can become resentful toward a society that seemingly doesn't need them.

John Chamberlain called attention to the fact that George Meany and President Carter met recently to discuss the minimum wage. Meany said it should be three dollars an hour; the President wanted to go to \$2.50. They finally settled on \$2.65. How many jobs that teenagers with no experience in the labor market can do have disappeared because possible employers don't think the jobs they can do are worth \$2.65 an hour.

I remember a meeting I had with a group of youngsters from one of our minority neighborhoods while I was Governor. These young people earnestly wanted an opportunity to work and earn. I expressed the view (backed by some available statistics) that jobs had been eliminated by the minimum wage and that we needed a waiver for young people such as themselves. I had thought they might possibly resent the suggestion that they should work below the prescribed pay level. I was wrong. They asked if I would help in trying to get the law changed. I've been trying ever since.

John Chamberlain's column reported the findings of University of Chicago economist Yale Brozen in two masterful studies that prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that every time the minimum wage goes up, teenage unemployment goes right up with it.

Four Congressmen, Senators McClure and Hatch and Representatives Clarence Brown and John Rousselot, were impressed enough by Brozen's figures to sponsor an independent study by Professor Williams of Temple University that is now before the Joint Economic committee of Congress.

Teenage unemployment averages five times that of the civilian labor force over age 25. And youths between 20 and 24 average 2½ times as much. Young people 16 to 24 are only one quarter of the work force, but they are one-half of all the unemployed. And young blacks have an unemployment rate almost double that of their white contemporaries.

Everyone must feel needed. I've never forgotten an episode a few years ago when one of our winter storms had churned up a high tide and rough surf which threatened to undermine and destroy dozens of beautiful beach homes. All day and into the night, volunteers filled sand bags and built barricades.

It was some time after midnight when a TV reporter stopped a young man in swimming trunks. It was so cold you could see his breath. Yes, he'd been at it all day. Yes, he was cold and tired. Did he live in one of those houses? No. Then why? He stopped for a second, then he said something so poignant -- this average teenager -- that it should be printed on a billboard. "I guess it's the first time we've ever felt needed."

RONALD REAGAN

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

Most Americans were angry, frustrated and a little ashamed last year when young athletes from the Republic of China on Taiwan were told they couldn't compete in the Montreal Olympics.

If I remember correctly, they had made the journey and were on hand when the door was slammed in their faces. The Chinese Communists -- claiming there is only one China -- had demanded the Taiwan ouster on the grounds that the Peking team was the official representative of that one China.

It wasn't the first time an Olympic committee has taken the easy way out under political pressure, and I'm afraid it won't be the last. The committee should have told the Chinese Communists their protest was denied. If they then chose not to compete, that would have been their decision. The Olympics are dedicated to sport and, by rule and tradition, are supposed to ignore politics.

Frankly, I would have been proud if our young athletes and those from other free world nations had told the weak-kneed committee that Taiwan would compete or the Chinese Communists would be running around the track by themselves. But that didn't happen and the Olympic flame seems a little less bright these days.

Now, it appears the athletes of another country are threatened with being ousted even though the games are three years away. The Soviet Union, as host of the 1980 games, is being a little more subtle but the goal is the same -- ouster of a nation because of politics.

In this case the target is Israel and someone had better start speaking up or Israel will be on the non-competitors list long before 1980 rolls around.

From all that can be learned, the Soviet Union is working through the Third World nations using an Olympic rule governing eligibility. It seems that a competing nation must belong to at least five of the 26 international sports federations to be eligible for the Olympics. If you'll remember, the Third World nations some time ago took advantage of their numbers to pass a resolution in the U.N. General Assembly equating Zionism with racism.

Now, as the various international sports federations meet, Third World nations invoke this resolution to oust Israel on the charge of racial discrimination. So far the maneuver has been successful in getting Israel thrown out of three federations. If, come 1980, Israel does not have membership in the required five, they just won't be invited to compete. Ineligible, don't you know -- sorry.

There seems to be a media blackout on this shenanigan and the Olympic committee makes pollyana noises about Soviet "guarantees". You can't help but wonder what would happen if the U.S. Olympic committee just once would say to the international committee, "We want to see the guest list now or we aren't coming to the party."

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Can Cost Less I"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

I've often said that when government tries to do things that are not proper functions of government, it cannot do them as well or as economically as private enterprise. Now, I'm beginning to wonder if we've gone as far as we could in determining just what are the proper functions of government.

I'll yield to no man in my respect for and appreciation of the men who fight our fires. So I intend no criticism of them when I bring up the question of whether they should or should not be employees of government.

The other day I discovered, by way of Robert Poole, Jr., President of the "Local Government Center" -- a non-profit research organization -- that more than a dozen towns and cities in our land have no fire departments and no more fire problems than cities that do.

One of the dozen is Scottsdale, Arizona. It contracts with Rural/Metro Fire Department, Inc., a private concern that has an employees' profit sharing plan, employs both men and women and pays time and a half for overtime. One additional difference also -- its trucks are painted yellow, not the traditional fire engine red. This is not some experiment. Scottsdale has used Rural/Metro, Inc. for 25 years and just recently signed on for another five.

How does Scottsdale compare to more traditional communities? Well, the latest figures available for comparison show that the per cost for fire protection in Scottsdale is less than one quarter the national average of cities in its population range. And, before you ask the next logical question, fire insurance rates in Scottsdale are in the Class Five rating, which is good and compares with all other well run cities its size (96,000 population).

There is another statistic used to determine fire protection quality -- what are per capita fire losses over a period of years? The national average is about \$12. In Scottsdale, it's only about \$4.50. Bolstering these figures is the fact that Scottsdale has been recognized by the National Commission on Productivity for eight significant innovations in fire fighting. It has also received commendations from the Institute for Local Self-government and the New York City Rand Institute.

One of the eight innovations is something called the snail; a remote control robot invented by the company and built at a cost of only \$3000. Operated by one man, it does the work of four and goes into action on treads with a two-and-a-half inch hose in areas too hot or dangerous for fire fighters (700 degrees). Other improvements include "attack" trucks with an on-board water tank, pump and hose. These are pick-up trucks with two-man crews for the 75% of cases which are minor, rubbish and grass fires, and so forth.

There is much more that can be told about Rural/Metro, but very simply, it comes down to this; because the company operates to make a profit, it has the strongest incentive to be efficient and cost effective. And, since 90% of fire fighting cost is personnel and much of that is for people who are paid to wait for something to happen, Rural/Metro has modernized the volunteer concept.

Scottsdale city employees form an auxiliary force of paid reservists. Those who serve must pass stringent selection procedures and undergo a rigorous training program, for which they receive a \$50 monthly retainer and \$6.38 an hour for training and duty. They are on call for one week out of four. During his "on" week, each reservist carries a portable paging unit. Adding in these reservists and the regular company employees, Scottsdale uses only two-thirds the manpower of the average city its size.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a Radio Program entitled "Can Cost Less II"
Commentary by Ronald Reagan)

On the last broadcast, I told of how Scottsdale, Arizona and a dozen other cities in our land were hiring a private, profit-making company to provide fire protection with no loss of quality and great savings to the taxpayers. Since fire departments are so universally thought of as one of those things only government can do, I got curious about other governmental functions and whether some of them might lend themselves to the Scottsdale pattern.

The answer is (and I'll admit I was surprised), "yes". Rochester, New York began increasing its contracting out of government chores in 1974 and has reduced the number of city employees by 12%. Private firms take care of some of the street and all the building maintenance and operate all but one of the city parking garages. Vehicle repair and gravedigging are contracted out. The city manager considers all of this as still experimental but is going ahead with a plan to have private garbage collection in one part of the city. He's interested in the competitive feature and what it might do to perk up the city run departments.

Other cities have been even more extensive in their contracting and at it longer. Twice as many cities use private firms for garbage collection rather than city refuse departments and a survey has found that, on the average, the cost for government garbage collection is 68% higher than when it's done by a private, profit-making concern. Among the better known cities who are moving to private contracting are New Orleans; Charleston, South Carolina; Dallas; Portland, Oregon and Omaha, Nebraska.

Just about every public service is being provided somewhere by private contractors at considerable savings to the taxpayers.

In Houston, Texas, instead of using highly trained policemen for routine protective duties, private security guards are employed to guard municipal court buildings and even the City Hall, freeing the police for crime fighting duties. San Francisco has contracted a number of parks and recreational facilities out to private operators and is now making a profit on these facilities instead of showing a loss to the taxpayers. Another California city is saving 20% through private management of a municipal golf course. More and more school cafeterias are being operated by private contractors -- even one by a hamburger chain and they have turned money losers into profitable operations.

At another level of government, Orange County in California is contracting out its data processing for seven years at a price of \$26 million. The county is getting better service and expects to save \$11 million.

One of the best incidents has to do with Minnesota's Hennepin County. County staff had proposed construction of a major food service plant as part of its new medical center. Then someone asked a simple question; "What does a county government know about preparing 3½ million meals a year?" I doubt anyone even tried to answer that question. There must have been an instant realization that food purchasing, storage, preparation and serving on such an institutional scale is a pretty complicated business for beginners. At the same time, there was recognition that a number of private firms have been in that line of business for quite a while. Hennepin County contracted with a private concern, set standards of performance, quality and cost and estimates it saves about \$1 million a year.

It's something worth looking at in everyone's hometown. And think what might happen if the idea reached Washington.

RONALD REAGAN

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

All of us should be more aware than we are of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974. This is particularly true if we're participants in a non-governmental pension fund. One man has tagged that set of initials -- E.R.I.S.A. -- as standing for "everyman's ridiculous idea since Adam".

The purpose underlying passage of the act was worthwhile and in the concept of government's responsibility to protect us from each other. Many workers have seen pension plans they were counting on in anticipation of their non-earning years wiped out in bankruptcies, company failures or just by faulty planning or management. When that happens, it is a tragedy of major proportions. Hence, the passage by Congress of the 1974 act to protect employees' pension rights.

But, as in so many things government attempts to do with good intent, the solution to the problem has become the problem. Commissioner of Internal Revenue Jerome Kurtz recently told a House Subcommittee that as many as 30% -- almost one-third of the nation's half-million private pension plans -- may have gone out of business since ERISA was born in 1974. A subcommittee aide said the total is about five times the number previously believed to have closed up shop. Let me hasten to say that this does not mean that 30% of the nation's workers have lost their pensions. Most of the plans that failed were in small companies and about 5 percent of the workers have lost their retirement security.

The reason for dropping the plans is the 1974 act. Small pension plans have been driven out of existence by the complex and cumbersome financial and reporting requirements. Small businesses are less able to handle the paperwork and meet the financial requirements and regulations than are large corporations with computerized operations, large legal staffs and auditing departments.

After hearing the testimony one congressman told Kurtz, "This is an alarming development. By passing the act, we may well have driven out 100,000 or 150,000 plans." An idea of the size problem they were trying to solve and the subsequent overkill is indicated by the Assistant Secretary of Labor for labor-management problems who said the Labor department disposed of 1370 pension fund investigations last year (remember, there were some 500,000 pension plans). They found only 642 violations -- all but four were settled out of court.

It's ironic that Washington should be in the business of trying to regulate private pension plans in view of its mishandling of social security. Significantly, federal employees managed to exempt themselves from social security and set up for themselves instead a generous pension program which hangs over future taxpayers as an unfunded liability of billions of dollars.

Recently, a columnist for the Boston Herald American, a specialist in economic affairs, revealed some startling facts about the Social Security Disability Program and the disability pensions for federal employees. This year, the government (meaning us) will shell out \$32 billion for disability pensions, and that does not include our disabled military veterans.

The federal government pays its disabled employees 75% of their full-time salary and it's tax free. In social security, disability pensioners have increased 45 times as fast as the increase in population and the cost has gone up almost 2000%.

Congress should give ERISA a quiet burial and social security immediate first aid.

RONALD REAGAN

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

Utility companies -- more than some other industries -- are vulnerable to charges of villainy, and so it was no surprise that Consolidated Edison in New York would be pilloried for the recent blackout in "Fun City". To hear some tell it, you would think the company planned the whole thing.

The attacks were made more bitter than usual by the looting that broke out in several neighborhoods. Of course, those with no charity whatsoever for Con Ed (as it is dubbed) played the sorrowing parent where the looters were concerned. Our Ambassador to the United Nations even seemed to have the attitude that stealing is something everyone does when the lights go out.

The Brooklyn District Attorney has released some figures which contradict those bleeding hearts who saw the looters as just hungry people who had a chance to eat for a change. It seems 48 percent were regularly employed (many by the City itself), 41 percent were in anti-poverty or educational programs funded by government, and fewer than 10 percent were on welfare.

The hunger excuse doesn't hold up either when you see a breakdown of the looters targets. There was that automobile dealer who lost more than 50 cars, 39 furniture stores, 20 drugstores, 17 jewelry stores, 10 clothing stores and only six grocery stores. The looters had an appetite --but not for food.

But, to get back to Con Ed, I kept wondering when, if ever, someone would look back down the last few years to see whether consumer minded politicians might have put thumbs down on requests by the company to expand or upgrade its facilities. After all, a utility isn't exactly a free agent. Yes, it is a privately owned, profit-making business, but it is also a government-regulated monopoly, controlled by politically appointed commissioners.

Victor Reisel, the noted columnist and expert on labor affairs did look back over the years and found that a "yes" several years ago instead of a "no" could have made the blackout impossible.

Con Ed made application to build a hydroelectric generating plant on the banks of the Hudson near West Point. The company explained the need and the possibility of power shortages unless the plant was built.

But environmentalists would have none of it. First it would mar the scenery. Con Ed replied to that with plans to put it completely underground. Opponents said the concrete tube bringing the water from the river to the turbines would still be visible. Then fishermen got into the act and said the warm water returning to the river would interfere with and reduce the striped bass in the Hudson. Con Ed volunteered to build and maintain a fish hatchery to keep the river stocked. This, too, was turned down, which adds to the suspicion that we have an element in this country that just doesn't want any additional power plants -- period, and all their environmental complaints are excuses to hide their real purpose.

Had that generating plant been built, there would probably have been no blackout, no looting, no small merchants wiped out in the Big Apple.

Con Ed still has the plans for the underground plant and the fish hatchery -- even though scientists now say the maximum loss of striped bass would be less than five percent.

Who really was the villain on that July night?

RONALD REAGAN

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

Some time ago on one of these broadcasts, I told about a giant electric power project; a multi-billion dollar construction job that had been stopped before it could start. It was the Dickey-Lincoln power program in northern Maine, intended to supply energy to a large section of the northeast.

The project was halted when it was discovered the huge hydroelectric dam essential to the program could not be built. Federal law prohibits use of federal funds in any construction that could harm plant or animal species included on the rare and endangered list of the United States Fish and Wildlife service.

And there on the banks of the St. John River in the area to be flooded by the building of the dam, someone found about 200 weeds. They were a particular kind of weed - a sort of wild snapdragon known as the Furbish Lousewart. The Furbish Lousewart is on the endangered species list. Furthermore, some supposedly knowledgeable people said those were the only 200 furbish lousewarts left in the world. So scratch one power project.

I found it a little hard to believe that all the rocks and rills and templed hills in Maine and elsewhere had been scoured for Furbish Lousewart and so stated on this program. If no one knew the 200 were there until they were getting ready to build a dam and accidentally stumbled on them, wasn't it possible they might stumble on some more?

I also remember suggesting that weeds aren't all that hard to grow; that possibly they could gather seeds from the 200 or even transplant some of them. After all, a few more winters like the last one without an adequate power supply and some New Englanders might get on that endangered species list.

Well, I'm happy to tell you I've learned, thanks to the New York TIMES, that the Army Corps of Engineers were having some of the same thoughts. They like to build dams and didn't take kindly to being shut out by a weed called the Furbish Lousewart. They enlisted the aid of George Stirett, a naturalist from New Brunswick and Dr. Charles Richard, a botanist from the University of Maine.

These gentlemen, along with some other scientists who were interested in the situation, discovered that, apparently, by doing a little hiking, the Furbish Lousewart reproduces by seed and can be transplanted outside its original habitat. I wonder if they'll grow in California? It would be quite a conversation piece to have a weed that stopped a \$700 million dam. I wonder, too, if one of these days I might be doing a broadcast about the emergency situation in Maine where a weed called the Furbish Lousewart had become so prolific that it threatened the state's agriculture?

What we really should wonder is -- will environmentalists find another reason why the dam shouldn't be built?

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

3/6/76

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

Crossfiled Under:

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