

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 79-4 through 79-6 (1979)

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/>

(AIRED 3/19 - 4/6/79)

RONALD REAGAN

RADIO COMMENTARY

Disc 79-4

79-4 A

1.	Nancy	2:50
2.	Lettuce Strike	2:44
3.	Taiwan's Future	2:25
4.	P.O.W.	3:14
5.	Cuba	3:00
6.	The 100 Club	2:56
7.	C.I.A.	3:01

79-4 B

1.	Miscellaneous	3:01
2.	Inflation	3:15
3.	Human Rights	3:09
4.	Comparisons	3:12
5.	Nuclear Power I	3:11
6.	Nuclear Power II	3:06
7.	Higher Standard of Living	3:00
8.	Student Economists	2:43

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from March 19 through April 6th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Nancy"

A few weeks ago while Nancy and I were in New York City, a friend invited Nancy to visit a school up in Harlem. I was going to tell you about that visit but figured you might like to hear it first-hand. So here she is, my wife Nancy.

Thank you Ronnie. I'll be forever grateful for this invitation. Over the years I've visited many schools and always enjoyed it but I just wasn't prepared for the rooms full of bright, happy children and proud teachers who obviously have great affection and love for those children. The boys were all wearing jackets and neckties. The girls dressed in plaid jumpers and blouses. They all looked so neat, polite and alert.

In every classroom I visited the students were told by "the sisters" that I would answer whatever questions they had. These were elementary grade students but the questions would have done credit to a high school. They asked intelligent questions which revealed a knowledge of national issues and what's going on in the world.

There in one room the Sister asked them if they'd like to tell me about their basketball team. Out of the forest of hands that went up, she picked a boy who jumped to his feet and proudly states, "we've won seven and lost two. We have two games to go and if we win those we're champions." I asked him if he thought they were going to do that and he said "of course". And do you know something -- I believe him.

Then they asked me if I'd like to see their cheerleaders and I said "yes". By that time I was ready to start cheering myself. A group of girls came forward and did a routine that looked as professional as anything the famed Rockettes might do. I learned they were responsible for everything, including laying out the choreography.

I learned there are 56 such schools throughout the inner-city, parochial schools once threatened with closing. His eminence Cardinal Cooke of the arch diocese of New York believed that these schools could be put to use to help the disadvantaged, the poor. His idea became "The Inner-City Scholarship Fund". It is supported by voluntary contributions and run by a board of trustees made up of New Yorkers of all faiths. This is also true of the students. In the school I visited almost all the students were black and 80 percent were Protestants.

A \$350 tuition fee is charged but no deserving student is kept out for lack of money. 92 percent of the parents are poor, but they've said they'll do anything to keep their children in these schools. Some volunteer to do custodial work. Some of the mothers serve as teachers aides.

One mother with an income of \$6,300 pays \$1,00 of that in tuition. She says she does without things, doesn't buy many clothes because education is the most important thing.

By reading the other tests these schools top the New York public schools in educational quality and the total cost per student averages less than \$500. By contract, the per-student cost in the public schools is over \$2,600.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Lettuce Strike"

California's lettuce strike has become a celery strike and no matter how it ends up, you'll be paying higher prices for produce.

At stake is a test of the federal government's wage-and-price guidelines, as well as a test of strength of the mystique of Cesar Chavez, founder of the United Farm Workers union.

When the union's contract expired in mid-January, growers in the Imperial Valley - which provides the nation with nearly 100 percent of its winter lettuce - offered a proposal in line with the maximum wage increase under the Carter guidelines -- seven percent. Chavez' union, on the other hand, demanded wage increases ranging from 25 to 85 percent. The growers asked that the Federal Mediation and Conciliation service step into the case, but the UFW refused and began striking on January 19.

Violence flared. According to one San Diego newspaper report, 1500 UFW members "staged commando-like raids" on the lettuce fields on February 21. There was a rock-throwing melee, vandalism, injuries -- even one death. As a result of the violence, a superior court judge issued a temporary restraining order limiting the union to no more than 100 picketers per farm. Judge Don Work said at the time that the UFW had shown "an apparent lack of desire to control the violence."

The judge's order came so late in the season that it may have been more symbolic than real, for the Chavez forces have now moved on to the celery fields along the coast north of Los Angeles, as that crop comes to harvest.

Chavez' efforts to halt the winter lettuce harvest were only partly successful. Volunteers from throughout the Imperial valley pitched in to harvest the crop, though growers estimate they still lost more than two million dollars worth of produce. That explains some empty supermarket shelves.

Chavez has charged that his workers get what he calls "just crumbs" from the growers, but the growers say that piecework employees can earn the equivalent of the U.S. annual average household income of \$7,019 in a few weeks at current pay rates. This would improve, of course, under the proposal the growers have made. Though pay scales in the fields vary, the current range is the equivalent of just under four dollars an hour to 13 dollars an hour. If the union's demands were to be met, according to the growers, labor costs per-carton-of-lettuce would soar by 187 percent!

Indications are that Chavez will keep moving north as more crops are harvested. Since California provides 40 percent of the nation's produce, overall, if Chavez' demands are met, be prepared for a shock at the supermarket. Oh, by the way, can you spare a bowl of potato salad?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Taiwan's Future"

Defense department officials, including Secretary Brown, have told the Senate Foreign Relations committee that the Taiwan could survive any concerted attack by the Peoples Republic of China, so that it's unlikely there would be such an attack for years and years to come, if ever. But, there has been other testimony which was unreported by such papers as the New York TIMES and the Washington POST -- testimony to that same Foreign Relations committee. Fortunately, the Washington weekly called HUMAN EVENTS has written about that testimony.

Vice Admiral Edwin K. Snyder, US Navy retired, told the Senate committee that Taiwan's defenses would have to undergo a vast modernization program to successfully withstand a sustained assault from the mainland, and it would seem that Admiral Snyder's opinion would carry some weight with the Senators. From August, 1974 to August, 1977 he was commander of the US Taiwan Defense command. He was responsible to the Joint Chiefs of Staff for contingency planning for the defense of the Republic of China including Taiwan and the Pescadores Islands.

Just giving Taiwan the weapons presently in the pipeline won't be enough. The Admiral says the ROC wouldn't have a chance if it didn't get such all-weather fighter planes such as the F-16, Harpoon missiles to stand-off the Communist Chinese navy, and special anti-submarine equipment. All of this is equipment our Seventh fleet would have provided under the mutual defense treaty we are now scrapping.

The admiral further says that without our carrier planes the Taiwan air force would be neutralized within two or three weeks. The Communist navy would pit patrol boats and modern destroyers (both armed with surface-to-surface missiles) against 20-odd World War II destroyers armed with five-inch guns. And the greatest threat is the Communist Chinese submarine force -- almost double the number we have in our whole Pacific fleet.

Admiral Snyder believes that the island republic's lines of supply and communications could be disrupted in fairly short order. His message is clear; if Congress fails to make certain that Taiwan receives advanced weaponry, the free Republic of China could fall to the Communists. But is the Senate listening?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "P.O.W."

A few weeks ago the UN was asked to deal with the matter of China's attack on Vietnam and Vietnam's attack on Cambodia. Specifically, a resolution called for each side to withdraw its forces to within its own borders. China's Teng Hsia-ping immediately proclaimed his support of such a plan.

If memory serves me correctly, President Lyndon Johnson asked the UN on more than one occasion to involve itself in the Vietnam situation when we were fighting there. The UN remained obstinately aloof and silent.

Regarding the present resolution I think an amendment would be appropriate. Yes the Chinese should return to their own border and, yes, the Vietnamese should return to theirs; the North Vietnamese, who broke their pledged word given in the Paris Peace Accords, conquered an independent neighbor, South Vietnam. The Vietnam war was not a civil war. They have been separate nations for centuries. Let the resolution be amended to read that North Vietnam will not only leave Cambodia, but will leave South Vietnam as well. And while they are at it they could also withdraw from Laos, which turned out to be one of the dominoes we were told would fall if North Vietnam had its way. You'll remember how some apologists ridiculed the "domino theory."

We've been treated to news photos of prisoners taken by the North Vietnamese in the present fighting. Someone had better be sure provision is made for their release in view of the Vietnamese record. Those photos bring back some unhappy memories.

A U.S. Navy fighter pilot, Jim Stockdale, parachuted from his crippled plane over North Vietnam on September 9, 1965. He was released almost eight years later on February 12, 1973, after 2,714 days in prison including three years in solitary confinement and over a year in total isolation.

He was tortured for days on end throughout those years and reduced, as he put it, to total submission on 15 occasions by his own count. In 1969 when his captors wanted to use him in a propaganda film he beat his own face to a pulp with a wooden stool and inflicted wounds on his head and face with a razor. He was not used in the film.

Months later, fearing that he might be so weakened he would eventually reveal secrets to the enemy, he stabbed both his wrists with broken glass to end an interrogation. He said he felt the only way he could stop the questioning was to make them believe he was willing to die rather than yield. For this he has received the Congressional Medal of Honor.

Today, Vice Admiral James Stockdale is an instructor in the Naval War college teaching mid-career officers philosophy. It is a philosophy designed to help the military "regain our bearings".

Admiral Stockdale says, "a lot of training in the military tells you how you should act but doesn't give you the why". And he adds, "No philosophical survival kits are issued when man goes to war."

What about us? Don't we have a moral obligation to continue reminding the world that the South Vietnamese are a conquered people?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Cuba"

Just recently our State department said violation of human rights has been erased as a block to normalization of relations with Cuba. Evidently the releasing of a few political prisoners was all it took to convince the diplomats in Foggy Bottom that Castro has been reborn as a nice fellow.

Well fortunately we have some elected representatives in Washington who like to see for themselves. One of these is Congressman Steve Symms of Idaho. Steve made a nine day trip, touching shore in Jamaica (our newest Marxist neighbor), the Dominican Republic of Cuba. His summation is blunt and to the point. He says the Carribbean is rapidly becoming a Communist lake in what should be an American pond and the United States resembles a giant, afraid to move.

Describing Cuba as a place where the clock seems to have stopped 20 years ago he says: "There are no new American cars, few new buildings have been erected since the Castro regime took over, and the buildings that existed before Castro are now in disrepair. The stores are virtually empty--with few consumer goods. Milk is available only for children under the age of seven. Meat and all other goods are strictly rationed. Commodities we take for granted are not to be found."

Congressman Symms attended Mass at one of the few churches still open. People approached him asking for help to leave the country. They told of waiting as long as 17 years for permission and of having their property and possessions confiscated and being denied employment for all these years because they were listed as wanting to emigrate. Quite simply, Cuban citizens have no rights and no freedom. They are constantly under the surveillance of a Soviet style force.

All of this suggests that human rights are not a major consideration in the policies of Fidel Castro. As for normalization of relations, Congressman Symms urges that we watch Cuba very carefully, and that we keep in mind how much both Castro and the Soviet Union would like the economic help to Cuba that our recognition would bring. Cuba is a heavy load for the Russians to bear. It prices out at about \$5 million a day. For one thing a new trade relationship with Cuba would have a dire effect on our own sugar industry.

The Congressman points out that Castro, who is a powerful, charismatic leader, has a vision that extends beyond the, "walls of his Palm prison in Cuba". His idea of peace is to spread Russian-style communism throughout the world and certainly throughout Latin America and the Caribbean. And Congressman Symms mentioned particularly Castro's influence in Jamaica and Panama.

I'm sure he would agree that the troubles in Nicaragua bear a Cuban label also. While there are people in that trouble land who probably have justified grievances against the Somoza regime, there is no question but that most of the rebels are Cuban-trained, Cuban-armed and dedicated to creating another Communist country in this hemisphere.

We should be grateful to Idaho's Congressman Steve Symms.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The 100 Club"

About 20 years ago four men in Boston, Massachusetts -- all successful in their field of endeavor--decided to create an organization simply because they cared. They were Catholic, Jewish and Protestant. They said, "We care for those who care for us." That is today the slogan of the unique organization they created, The 100 Club of Massachusetts, Incorporated.

Only one of those founders is alive today; Norman Knight, President of the 100 Club. The club, which started with four men, now has a membership of more than 2,000 business, professional and civic leaders from all over Massachusetts and a long waiting list of people who want to join them in providing a magnificent service.

You'll understand that slogan, "We care for those who care for us", if I read a line or two from one of the club's pamphlets. "A piercing bullet, a raging fire, a terrifying explosion or a sudden heart failure can quickly flick out the life of our heroic protectors against crime and holocausts. There's lonely grief, mounting bills, the world becomes bleak."

These words, of course, are about the men who serve in law enforcement and those who protect us from fire. And the families they leave when the hazards of their work cost them their lives.

The four founders of the 100 Club wanted to do something for these men who care for us. Twenty years ago they started helping the families who had met with tragedy. At first it was a \$1,000 check to a widow. Now it's \$2,500, plus paying \$10,000 worth of bills, summer camp for children, college assistance and a host of other benefits. But even more it is a warm and continuing relationship--not just the impersonal mailing of a check. More than 15 functions a year for widows and children are arranged ranging from baseball games to the famous Boston Pops concerts.

Right now the club is caring for some 200 families across the state. There are no fixed rules, nor is the help limited to families of men killed in the line of duty. It is an effort by private citizens who want to help their neighbors. And in these 20 years they have helped by some \$2 million worth.

Here are a few lines from the letters that arrive almost daily at the 100 Club headquarters. "We shall never forget how our lives were touched by many kind, loving and caring people."

"I was at the hospital this evening when the lovely basket of fruit arrived for my son. He broke down and cried."

"We're enjoying ourselves at camp. We learned how to field, hit, steal bases and a lot more things."

"I would like to sincerely thank everyone for once again making it financially possible for me to return to college this fall."

And from a bereaved widow: "God bless you for caring and understanding."

What if we had 50 statewide 100 Clubs?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "C.I.A."

On February 18 an ad appeared in the Los Angeles Times. It was surrounded by a heavy black border--red might have been more appropriate. Its purpose was to sell a book written by Philip Agee and Louis Wolf entitled "Dirty Work". The title aptly describes in my opinion what the authors are up to.

In large print the ad reads: "The C.I.A. couldn't suppress this book--and maybe it will stop some of their dirty work!" Then it continues as a message in the first person over the name of the man I assume is the publisher. It says: "When I announced that Philip Agee and Louis Wolf (that must have been a misprint. On the book his name appears as Wolf) had delivered the script for "Dirty Work", both the Central Intelligence Agency and the Justice Department sprang into action." He goes on to say how there were threats and intimidation, and so forth, to keep him from publishing but, "In view of what has been happening in Iran and Nicaragua and wherever the C.I.A. performs its dirty tricks, I was more than ever determined to make this book available to the American people."

Then in heavy black print he tells us one of the reasons why we must read the book. It "contains a list of more than 700 C.I.A. agents currently working in Western Europe. It completely blows their cover." What the publisher does not tell us is that "blowing the cover" of these individuals can mean their death. The murder squads of the KGB couldn't ask for anything that would please them more than to be handed a list of targets for their hit list. International espionage and counter-intelligence is not child's play. The stakes are high and our national security depends on having men and women who are willing to play for keeps. Remember our agent in Greece who was publicly identified a few years ago? He was shot down on his own doorstep almost within a matter of hours.

Mr. Stuart, whose name appears at the bottom of the ad and who I presume is the publisher, is asking \$24.95 for the book, which he calls an "expose of the C.I.A.--on a scale never attempted before."

I served on President Ford's commission to investigate the C.I.A. in 1975. I believe we did a thorough job and while we found some instances of poor judgment, the good far outweighed the bad. And the evidence was overwhelming that we do need a counterintelligence force in this dangerous world. While our commission was doing its work, the KGB was quadrupling its spy force in the U.S. We, on the other hand, have literally tied the hands of our intelligence forces--both the C.I.A. and the F.B.I.

This advertised book is Mr. Agee's second. He has violated his oath to not expose fellow workers he knew when he was an agent. He is hardly to be described as just an outraged citizen. If he is so opposed to counterintelligence, why does he exempt the Soviet Union from his wrath?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

Quite a while ago I did a broadcast about the coronation of Emperor Bokassa I of the Central African Empire. This is one of the newly emerging African States. It is also one of the poorest nations in the world.

Nevertheless, Emperor Bokassa spent about \$25 million to mark his entry into royalty. As I recall he imported from France 36 matched horses to pull his gold-and-jewel-trimmed carriage. His bejeweled, gold crown was also made in France as was his equally bejeweled golden throne.

Emperor Bokassa is a kindly but extravagant soul. He allowed his cabinet to watch while several prisoners were executed by being clubbed to death with rifle butts. If they'd refuse to watch they'd have joined the prisoners.

Just recently he bought a million dollar villa in Switzerland. It will be a handy hideaway if his one-and-a-half million subjects ever decide to do a little clubbing on their own.

I thought you'd like to know that the Administration in Washington has asked Congress for \$658,000 in foreign aid for Emperor Bokassa's Central African empire -- which I'm sure means for Emperor Bokassa.

Here is an item for those who still believe the Senator from Massachusetts is right and that we should have government-run medicine in America. A doctor in New Hampshire who previously practiced in England under their socialized medicine plan tells of a 28-year-old Englishman who waited for a submucous resection of the nose for eight years. He'd still be waiting but his doctor finally told the hospital authorities he'd do a write-up of the case for the Guinness Book of Records if they didn't O.K. the operation.

He probably wouldn't have been the record holder long if he had sent the story to Guinness. It seems there is a woman in Clitheroe Lancashire, England, who has been waiting for a bone operation since 1957.

The admissions officer at St. Thomas hospital in London admits that most of the 3,500 patients now waiting for admission will probably never be admitted. One can only presume they will have left this mortal soil before the hospital gets around to them.

Now some information we didn't have when the TV news was showing the riots in Iran on a daily basis. Boris Ponamarev (PO-NO-MAR-YEV) of the Soviet Unions Politburo has stated happily that Iran is traveling the road already taken by Angola, Ethiopia and Afghanistan. That is a road of course that leads to Moscow.

I'm sure Mr. Ponamarev isn't surprised. A report reveals that while the Soviet Union was posing as a responsible power, cautioning other nations (including our own) not to interfere in Iran; the Soviet underground radio was beaming messages in Iran calling for a holy war and telling the Iranians how to organize riots, make gas bombs and hand grenades.

Meanwhile, back in Russia where meat is a scarce item, here is the latest joke. "Can a horse run from Leningrad to Moscow? In theory yes; in reality, no. He'd be eaten in Kalinin (KA-LEEN-YIN) which is between Leningrad and Moscow."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Inflation"

Despite the umpteen million words that have been written and spoken about inflation, I'm going to add a few more. With all the rosy predictions about the right against inflation and the possibility of "victory", we now know that the inflation rate in 1978 was nine percent and there are hints it might actually have been 10 percent.

Have you ever wondered what things would be like if that rate continued for the next 20 years? I'll use the 10 percent rate, not just to look on the dark side, but because it's easier to figure.

In 1998--20 years down the road with a 10 percent inflation rate--when your grandchild asks for a candy bar, you'll give him \$1.35. Maybe you'll make it an even \$1.50 and tell him to keep the change and maybe that will buy him a stick of gum. Today's \$50,000 home will cost \$336,000 and if you can still afford to eat, the food you can buy now for \$100 will set you back \$673. That modest \$4,000 car sitting in the driveway will have a \$26,910 price tag. College tuition, which averages \$5,000 a year now, will be a hefty \$33,638. Heaven only knows what kind of money Junior will be writing home for.

Well, that's 10 percent inflation 20 years down the road. We're being encouraged to think the inflation rate might be brought under control at, say, a reasonable six percent. And sometimes it sounds as if those in government, plus their economic advisors, are willing to settle for that as a kind of status quo. That's a little like rolling over and going back to sleep because the fire in the house is only on the first floor.

Would you like to hear that same set of figures I just gave, readjusted down to a six percent inflation rate? That \$50,000 house will be a bargain at \$160,37. The candy bar for little Johnny or Alice will only cost 64 cents and that \$100 basket of food will run you \$321. Your modest compact car will only cost \$12,830 and college tuition will be \$16,036 a year.

All we have to do to prevent these ridiculous figures from becoming a fact of life is to end deficit spending by government. How did we get into this situation anyway? Well, back in the '60's, there was a decision to fund a great many social programs under the name "The Great Society" and to fund the war in Vietnam without raising taxes.

It takes political courage to raise a tax. Inflation is a tax, but not easily recognizable as such and no one in office has to cast a vote for it. As a matter of fact, inflation may even seem like fun for awhile. The government--without saying anything to anyone--turns on the printing presses and runs off several billions of dollars, all green and crisp. Business seems to pick up, money is easy to come by and everyone feels good. You get a raise and find yourself in a higher surtax bracket. At first you're inclined to be proud of that. It seems like you're getting ahead in the world. But then the warm glow turns out to be a fever. You discover you're earning twice as much, but suddenly you don't seem able to afford the same things you could back when you earned less. Maybe we can't go back, but we can head off that \$1.35 candy bar right now at 20 cents by simply telling government the party's over.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Human Rights"

By coincidence three situations dealing with our policy on human rights became news items almost simultaneously in recent weeks and that pointed up our government's inconsistency with regard to this subject. In fact, it is an inconsistency that perhaps should be called hypocrisy.

The first news item was that our State department has decided that violation of human rights is no longer a barrier to normalizing relations with Castro's Cuba. We still have two other unresolved matters standing in the way. Cuba's forces in Africa and a lack of compensation for private property seized by Castro during the revolution. But the slate is clean on human rights because a few hundred of Castro's thousands of political prisoners have been freed and allowed to join their families in the U.S.

The second item had to do with a cutback in economic aid to Nicaragua and the withdrawal of American personnel. This we are doing because, according to the State department, President Somoza is in violation of our standards of human rights. He may be -- I don't know. I do know, because it's a matter of record, that the revolutionary forces who are fighting against his regime are Marxists for the most part and many were trained and armed by Castro's Cuba. So it's one off and one on our human rights blacklist.

Item number three is the release of a report that has been in the making for about a year and a half. It was in September, 1977 that Panama invited the Organization of American States to send its Inter-American Commission on Human Rights to visit Panama and investigate what were called "unfounded, unjust and irresponsible charges of violations of human rights." These charges had been made in the discussion and debate over the Panama Canal treaties.

The results of that investigation have just been made public and they confirm the charges which the government of Panama had declared were unfounded and unjust. The Commission concludes that between 1968 and 1972 political activity was practically suppressed by the military regime. From 1972 to 1977 Panamanian citizens were deported in violation of the constitution. Restrictions were imposed on freedom of assembly, expression and association and there was interference in the judicial process.

All of that is only for openers. The commission reported on torture tactics engaged in by the Panama National Guard; electric shocks to the vital and most sensitive parts of the body, physical beatings of male and female prisoners, usually with a hose, the insulting fondling of female prisoners and threat of rape and long interrogation of prisoners while denying them food, water or sleep.

The commission also reported a written statement from Leopoldo Aragon who was a political prisoner for two years and then exiled to Sweden where he burned himself to death in a protest against our turning over the Canal to Panama.

Here is some of what he wrote: "Prisoners were running like cattle under the whippings and savage cries of the guards who were hitting them with clubs." In addition to this he told of prisoners being hung from tree limbs by their wrists, chaining them to torn trees and tying them on top of ant tunnels.

This October 1st we begin the turnover of the Canal to Panama.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Comparisons"

There are three so-called superpowers based on size and population in the world; two are Communist and one is free. If you don't mind trying to follow some figures you'll discover just how superior freedom is to the "workers paradise" that accepted the idiocy of Karl Marx.

In size, the Soviet Union is number one with 8.6 million square miles. China is next with 3.7, barely larger than our own country with 3.6 million square miles.

In population of course, China is way out in front with nearly one billion people. Russia has 262 million and we number 220 million.

We only have estimates for the gross national product of the Soviet Union and China and they are probably padded, but ours is almost twice that of Russia's and nearly five times that of China. The percentage of our work force engaged in agriculture is only about one-eighth that of Russia and one-twenty-sixth that of China, yet both of them have to import food or starve.

We produce seven times as many automobiles as the USSR and more than 600 times more than China. Those autos travel on more than three million miles of paved road in the U.S. There are only 200,000 miles in Russia, and 161,000 in China.

We outnumber them in telephones 155 million to only 22 million in all of the vast reaches of the Soviet Union and a mere five million in China. It makes you wonder what teenagers over there do in their spare time. And don't say they watch TV. We have 233 million sets to 60 million in the Soviet Union and only 700,000 in China. There are more than 11 times as many computers in use here than in Russia and 170 times more than in China.

Now let's get down to some of the differences in daily living. The average wage in our country is \$13,400. That is about four and one-half times Russia's \$3,000 and 37 times China's \$260. Perhaps you think their money goes farther than ours. Well, not if you translate a purchase into how long you have to work at the average wage to buy something--say a bicycle. An American would only have to work a day plus two hours. The Russian has to work seven full days and the Chinese worker puts in 67 days.

When it comes to elbow room in our homes, Americans average 450 square feet for each individual. In the Soviet Union it's 133 and in China they have a confining 30 square feet. That is less than half the space we consider minimum in a prison cell.

We aren't too far apart in life expectancy, but again we lead with an average of 73 years. In Russia it's 69 and in China, 65. I'll bet it seems longer though in those countries than it does here.

One can't help but wonder if China's number two man Teng Hsiao-ping, who was here recently, doesn't remember some of what he saw and question whether his country has chosen the right heroes to follow. The plain fact is, followers of Marx and Lenin have never come close to achieving what we have and we started with a totally undeveloped country.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Nuclear Power I"

It takes 12 years to get a nuclear power plant built in America. It only takes four or five in most other countries. The seven or eight years difference is not construction time in our country; it is paperwork and the multitudinous permits required by government. Those permits are largely the result of placard carrying demonstrators.

I'd like to mention a few things you won't read on one of those placards. To begin with, the first nuclear power plant began generating electricity in Shippingport, Pennsylvania in 1957. Today there are 72 such plants in the U.S. and 151 in other countries. In our country they provide about 12 percent of our electricity.

The placard bearers base most, if not all, of their protests on safety. Well, first of all, there is nothing you can do to make the nuclear fuel in a power plant blow up like a bomb. Second, in normal operation a nuclear power plant emits less radioactivity than a coal burning plant. Coal contains a small amount of uranium which goes out the stack with the smoke and soot.

Ah! But what about an accident to a truck carrying radioactive material? Well, what about it? Highly radioactive materials are transported in special casks that cost \$2 million apiece. They have been tested by crashing them into solid walls at 80 miles an hour and by hitting them with speeding locomotives. They didn't break and even if they had, the radioactive material is imbedded in ceramics.

In 1973 the Atomic Energy Commission organized an elaborate \$4 million study headed by Professor Norman Rasmussen of M.I.T. Two years later the findings were complete. The worst accident that could possibly happen would be a meltdown of nuclear fuel, a breaking of the protective shield (which incidentally can withstand a direct hit by a bomb) and in atmospheric conditions, which would keep the released radioactive dust in a cloud near the ground and blowing toward a densely populated area.

The odds on all that happening are once in a billion reactor years. If the U.S. were getting all its electricity from nuclear power that would be once in three million years.

A group calling itself the Union of Concerned Scientists presently advising Ralph Nader, has gotten attention by charging the Rasmussen report is wrong by a factor of 100. Well, if they are right, then a worst case might happen once in 30,000 years.

Let's analyze these two estimates and see what they mean. Rasmussen's report would mean a loss of 30 minutes in our average life expectancy. This is equal to the risk of smoking one cigarette every 20 years. If Nader's group is right, our life expectancy would be shortened by two days. That is the equivalent of smoking one cigarette every three months.

Critics of nuclear power raise the issue of waste disposal. A coal burning plant produces waste billions of times greater in bulk than a nuclear plant. The waste from one nuclear plant in a year would take less storage space than a dining room table. That hardly seems to be an insurmountable problem and certainly no reason for denying ourselves this economical, inexhaustible source of electric power.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Nuclear Power II"

On the last broadcast I commented on the misconceptions many of us have had regarding the dangers of generating electricity by the use of nuclear reactors. Today I'd like to give you some of the economic advantages of nuclear power.

We presently generate about 12 percent of our power in nuclear plants. That saves us 450 million barrels of oil each year. If we had to import that oil, it would add \$6 billion to our trade deficit. It also means consumers have saved between two and three billion dollars on their electric utility bills. Incidentally, we are increasing our need for electricity at a steady rate. Today, it amounts to almost 40 percent of all energy consumed and the percentage is growing.

Let's take one example of what nuclear power means in the Northeast states. You've seen or heard the news stories the last couple of years about the Seabrook plant in New Hampshire. A very active anti-nuclear power group calling itself the "Clamshell Alliance" has successfully delayed construction of the Seabrook plant. The group's name comes from the fact that it based its opposition on the claim that discharge of heated water from the plant would destroy a few acres of sea bottom as a breeding area for clams. Seabrook answered by changing its design and creating a cooling tower so that no hot water would bother the romancing clams. That didn't, however, cool down the demonstrators.

Construction resumed thanks to the herculean efforts of New Hampshire's then-Governor Mel Thompson, but he paid a considerable price for carrying out his duty. In spite of having kept his state economically sound with the lowest tax burden in the nation he was narrowly defeated in the '78 election because of a small temporary charge added to utility bills to cover the ongoing Seabrook construction costs. The charge will be removed when the plant is completed.

Unfortunately the good people of New Hampshire (undoubtedly influenced to a certain extent by the loud-mouthed "clamshellers") weren't aware that the Public Service Company of New Hampshire is providing them with electricity at a savings of more than 19 percent right now because of nuclear power. Nor did they know that every year that Seabrook is delayed they pay almost \$60 million extra. That's a pretty high price for letting the anti-nuclear demonstrators have their fun.

The House Committee on Government Operations has issued a report that nuclear fuel is about one-sixth the price of coal and one-eighteenth the price of oil in generating electricity. A recent report also set the cost for three years delay in construction of a nuclear plant at \$350 million. All of which must, of course, be paid ultimately by the consumers.

The history of man's progress is directly tied to man's access to power or, if you will, energy. It started with his discovery of the use of fire, the wheel and then fossil fuels to produce steam power and finally electricity. Our standard of living is directly proportional to our ability to reduce the cost of energy. We have brought development of nuclear power almost to a complete halt here in the U.S. at a cost to us of what must be trillions of dollars. Why?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Higher Standard of Living"

Here I go again on inflation. But I think you might be interested in a new study that has only recently been released by the New York Stock Exchange. The study was prepared by its Office of Economic Research, and is called "Reaching a Higher Standard of Living".

Quite a team worked on the report headed by William Freund. It included Professor John Kendrick of George Washington University (who was for a long time keeper of the national income statistics in the U.S. Department of Commerce); Edward Denison, Brookings Institute; Lawrence Klein, University of Pennsylvania; Albert Rees, National Bureau of Economic Research; and Professor Richard Quandt of Princeton.

Maybe the report should have been called, "Why We Can't Reach a Higher Standard of Living". The researchers found that in the 10 years between 1967 and 1977 real earnings of non-agricultural workers in the private enterprise only increased by \$2.50 a week. And that's before taxes.

Why and how did all those big wage settlements amount to so little? Well, in real terms our economy just couldn't deliver the products available for purchase to meet the increases in paychecks.

We know that inflation is a case of too much money chasing too few goods. We also know the government is running the printing press full time, turning our greenbacks. But the report reveals also that in this 1967-to-77 decade, the rate of productivity increases declined 45 percent. No other industrial economy has known such a drop. In West Germany, Japan and France, the increase in per-man hour productivity is twice as great as it is in our own country. It is almost twice as great in Italy.

There are three reasons for this: we are reinvesting as a percentage of our Gross National Product less than half of what those other countries are investing in research and development. The figures are the same for investment to replace or upgrade aging plants and equipment. And what we are investing is in unproductive environmental and safety features mandated by government regulations.

The high-salaried American worker who once made us the world's leading provider because of his high productivity--(what we chose to call "American know how") is now being outproduced because he is not being provided with the tools he needs to be competitive in the world market.

In a way we're all to blame. We have stood by while particular interest groups lobbied government for regulations and requirements without regard to cost effectiveness. We have let political demogoury influence tax policies. Our capital gains tax is the highest in the industrial world. So is the percentage of our industrial plants that are outmoded and approaching obsolescence.

Inflation plus tax policy has given us the lowest savings rate in our history. If we don't save (thus providing capital for investment) we don't grow. Right now it doesn't pay to save.

We are the only ones who can do something about this--we the people.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Student Economists"

Someone once called economics "the dismal science", but there's nothing dismal about it for a few hundred junior high school students who are taking an unusual course in the subject in Texas, Colorado, Iowa and California.

Called "Understanding Our Economic System", the course was developed by the University of the Pacific's Center for the Development of Economics Education. Basically, it is the study of how people produce, distribute and consume goods and services. According to both students and teachers, the course is anything but dry. By using examples of goods, services and institutions that touch on the youngsters' daily lives it deals with things that interest them.

For example, the course has them trace the origin of a pair of blue jeans for sale in a local store. The trail takes them to the manufacturer, the textile mill, a cotton farm -- even the banks that lend the money to the various producers.

Dr. Elmer Clawson, director of the Center that created the course says "We aren't teaching comparative economics or survival skills, but how the economy works."

Funding for the pilot course came from Foundation for Teaching Economics, whose founder, J.L. Hume, reasoned that a lot of legislation and regulation which hampers the smooth functioning of the U.S. economy has been the result of widespread ignorance about the basic economics. "Jack" Hume believes that those junior high school students who learn the basics today will be more savvy adults; adults who understand that their own self-interest is closely linked to a smoothly functioning market economy.

The same reasoning underlies another economic education institution, but this one is beamed at workers in American business and industry. It's the Center for the Study of Private Enterprise at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles. Headed by economist Dr. Arthur Laffer, this Center has as its purpose the development of information programs about basic aspects of the economy which companies can give to their employees. The causes and effects of inflation is one program. Through newsletters, posters, payroll envelope stuffers and other media, the program traces the history of inflation and nails the basic cause -- continuous government deficits. There have been programs on the role of productivity, profits, taxes and such current issues as the social security tax increases.

In the three years since it began, the Center for the Study of Private Enterprise has developed a list of more than 2,000 U.S. companies which regularly get its materials. Like the Foundation for Teaching Economics, this Center began as the idea of one man, Justin Dart of Dart Industries, who believed that economics was not a "dismal science".

TAPED - 3/27/79
AIRED - 4/9-4/27

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY
Disc 79-5

79-5 A

- | | | |
|----|-------------------|------|
| 1. | Panama | 2:57 |
| 2. | Small Business I | 2:52 |
| 3. | Small Business II | 3:03 |
| 4. | Scared Straight | 3:06 |
| 5. | Palestine | 3:07 |
| 6. | Miscellaneous I | 2:43 |
| 7. | Agriculture | 3:07 |

79-5 B

- | | | |
|----|----------------------|------|
| 1. | Rhodesia | 2:46 |
| 2. | District of Columbia | 2:44 |
| 3. | Miscellaneous II | 2:58 |
| 4. | Rural Renaissance | 2:57 |
| 5. | Washington Weather | 2:37 |
| 6. | SALT II - Part I | 2:33 |
| 7. | SALT II - Part II | 2:41 |
| 8. | Miscellaneous III | 2:47 |

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from April 9 through April 27th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Panama"

With the Senate debate on ratification of the Panama Canal treaty behind us, it's been easy to lose sight of the fact that complex and comprehensive implementing legislation will have to be passed by both houses of Congress. The treaty is supposed to go into effect October first. A number of bills have already been introduced.

We'll be hearing a great deal about the Panama Canal in the days to come. As a matter of fact the debate has already begun.

None of us who opposed ratification of the treaties wanted to be able to say, "I told you so," but the Panamanian government may leave us no choice. It is raising questions about the interpretation of the treaties which were thought to have fully resolved during the Senate debate. At least we were told they had been by the State department and administration spokesmen.

For one thing the Panamanians now claim they are entitled to possession of all moveable equipment in the Canal zone. There is no mention of this in the treaty, but when our Navy started to move about 150 million dollars worth of equipment out of the zone the order was rescinded--one can only presume in answer to a Panamanian protest.

Of even more serious consequence is a claim that Panama has retroactive jurisdiction over American citizens and businesses in the zone dating back -- believe it or not -- to seven years. The Panamanians say they intend to collect back taxes from our citizens and more than 140 businesses for that seven year period.

A Congressional committee heard testimony from police officials employed by the Canal company that they believe they may be prosecuted for actions they took in enforcing the law during those several years. Those were years in which rioting and bloodshed took place and the canal zone property had to be protected.

Another demand not covered by any clause in the treaty would have the U.S. renovate and restore to usable condition all buildings in the zone before they are turned over to Panama. This would be quite an undertaking. Many buildings have been deserted and unused for years.

You'll remember that we the taxpayers weren't going to foot the bill for any of the canal giveaway costs. Now it seems the bill is already up to about four billion dollars. Congressmen on both sides of the aisle are more than a little upset. Democrat John Murphy of New York, chairman of the Merchant Marine & Fisheries committee, wants the commission authorized to run the canal during this 20 year transition period to come under the control of Congress. The administration says that would be unacceptable to Panama.

Republican Congressman Bob Bauman of Maryland has introduced a bill calling for withdrawal of the instruments of ratification until, "their total costs and full implications for U.S. citizens" are determined.

Members of a Congressional subcommittee who met with Panamanian officials say there is such a difference in interpretation of the treaty that it is difficult to see how it can possibly be implemented. Congressman Murphy says it's questionable that a valid treaty even exists.

Meanwhile, Panama has discussed with Moscow the possibility of importing Soviet technicians.

I still don't want to say, "I told you so."

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Small Business I"

Corporate America may get the headlines but nearly ninety percent of the business ventures in our nation are classified as small business. And small business is responsible for half our Gross National Product, affecting directly or indirectly the lives and the livelihood of more than one hundred million Americans. It gives jobs to more than half the workers in our land.

All of us see them, know them and associate with them every day. The average small business man is the tool and diemaker who takes his savings and a bank loan and goes into business for himself. He is the fellow on the corner we buy our gasoline from, the druggist, the lunch counter proprietor, or the man or woman who has parlayed a lunch counter into the town's top cafe.

Small business is the backbone of the free market and the starting point for corporate or big business. Much of corporate America was once an individual with an idea for a service or product he thought people might want. And today we all take for granted mass produced conveniences and products which were once just an idea in someone's head. Henry Ford fits that description, so does a tailor who once made sail cloth work pants for the miners in Virginia City. His name was Levi.

You'd think our government would handle with care this unique heritage which has so much to do with our way of life. Unfortunately, that is not the case. For every ten small businesses that start up today, five will be gone inside of two years. A repressive tax code which makes it difficult to get start-up capital or ongoing capital to expand or even operate is part of the reason that small business is undernourished. Then there are federal regulations which overburden the proprietor with paper work and limit his or her ability to be innovative.

Recently, an item appeared calling attention to the decline in patents issued to Americans for inventions. In fact, 35 percent of the patents granted by our U.S. Patent office today go to foreigners.

In 1969, 100 new, "high risk" small business firms in such fields as electronics, energy research and development and environmental management were incorporated. But that was 10 years ago. By 1976 there was not a single new small business formation in these fields.

One former small businessman is now a U.S. Congressman from the fifth district of Pennsylvania, Richard T. Schulze. Based on his experience in business he has come up with some solutions to the problems of the small businessman and woman. These solutions are not the usual Washington approach of government loans and help funneled through bureaucracy. He wants to free this important segment of our economic structure from the harassment of government which caused the problems in the first place.

His colleagues on the Ways and Means committee are in full support. He's getting up to one hundred cosigners of his program which calls for seven simple steps and he needs our help. Last year his bill passed and was vetoed. He is back with a "Small Business Tax Relief Act of 1979." On the next broadcast, I'll give you a rundown on his seven points.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Small Business II"

On the previous broadcast I spoke of the problems besetting small business in America and of the importance to our well being of a healthy small business community.

Small business includes 90 percent of the businesses in America, accounts for more than half the jobs, and produces half our Gross National Product. But it is getting harder and harder for small business to survive, for new ones to start and old ones to expand and thus create additional new jobs.

The cause of this stricture on business growth is the government's general tax policy, plus increases in and the unfairness of the social security tax. Add the multitude of government regulations with their accompanying blizzard of paper work, and you have the makings of economic distress.

A druggist complains that every time he mixes a prescription, he must fill out forms that take more time to prepare than it took to make up the prescription. The average small businessman does not have a legal or accounting department as do the great corporations, so paper work takes up about one-fourth of his work time.

A former small businessman, Richard T. Schulze, became the congressman from the fifth district of Pennsylvania four years ago. He has introduced a seven point program to ease the burden on small business. He secured passage of such a bill last year only to have it vetoed. He's going again with the "Small Business Tax Relief Act of 1979." He needs our help.

His first of seven steps would give the small businessman or woman the same break homeowners get when they sell their home and realize a profit. If, after 18 months, they re-invest that money in another home, they pay no capital gains tax on the profit. Under Congressman Schulze's bill this would apply to small businesses also.

Point Two would increase the first year's depreciation for tax purposes from the present \$10,000 to \$25,000, easing the strain on that beginning period when half the small business ventures fail.

Point Three: When government mandates changes in equipment or new equipment to meet federal requirements, let small businesses write off the cost for tax purposes over a three year period.

Point Four would be of help in our balance of trade problems. It would simply allow small business to form separate companies for overseas trade as big business can do today:

Point Five permits the sole proprietor to choose whether to be taxed on the inflated value of his inventory, or to wait and pay a tax on the profit when the items are sold. As it is now, he pays a tax on inflation before he sells the items which depletes his cash reserves.

Point Six simply provides a refund to employers on overpayment of social security taxes for an employee who has worked for more than one employer during the year. As it is now, the government gets a windfall over and above the amount of tax it is supposed to get.

Point Seven is my favorite and could lead to a reduction in the ridiculous burden of paper work. It grants a five dollar tax credit for each form or document a small business is required to file under federal law. In other words, a little compensation for all those hours of pencil work.

We should all be supporting Congressman Dick Schulze's "Small Business Tax Relief Act of 1979," because it will benefit all of us.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

"Diplomatic immunity" is a phrase that usually brings to mind the right of ambassadors to carry papers, documents and such, in and out of a country without having to go through customs. It has a broader meaning in New York City which, in addition to its other problems, has to play host to the United Nations.

In something short of a year, Soviet diplomats mainly stationed at the UN have collected and refused to pay almost 7,500 tickets for illegal parking. But the record for a single vehicle is held by Zaire. A car registered to Zaire's U.N. mission has picked up 513 tickets in the same period all by itself.

Maybe this could be the answer to New York City's money problems -- send the tickets to Washington for payment.

Here's another item on our defense situation. While most Americans are deeply concerned about our falling behind the Soviets in strategic nuclear weapons, one American has a different worry. The President's strategic arms limitation adviser on the National Security Council, no less, declares that it is in our best interest to give up any remaining areas where we still have a strategic advantage. His reason? We might be tempted to throw our weight around in some risky ways if we think we're strong enough. Heaven forbid we should stand up to the Russians when it's so easy to give in!

That one leads to the State department sales force that is presently touring the country trying to sell us on the SALT II treaty -- which incidentally we're still waiting to see. One of their pitches is that we won't have to destroy any of our present weapons under the agreement. Pinned down by the Associated Press one official admitted that actually we'd have to scrap 60 of our B-52 bombers. But that doesn't count, he said, because we have them in storage and aren't using them right now.

On another subject -- an item that illustrates the difference between the free world and those "peoples republics" behind the iron curtain. It also says something about human rights. You'll remember that a part of the Helsinki pact had to do with the right of people to emigrate -- to leave a country if they no longer wanted to live there.

It is reported that the East German government has finished a 635 mile segment of fence nine feet high along its western border from the Baltic sea to the Czechoslovakian frontier. The cost is estimated at more than a half million dollars per mile. This fence isn't there to keep us free worlders out; it's to keep their people in.

It is described as a mesh of razor sharp metal triangles just big enough to get your fingers in for a hand hold. But when you try to climb, your weight closes the triangles, amputating your fingers. Don't worry about the pain, it won't last long. Anti-personnel mines on the fence posts on both sides of you are triggered, blasting you with a full pound of buck shot from each side.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Palestine"

In all the long and involved negotiations leading to peace between Egypt and Israel the most unsolvable problem has always seemed to be what can be done for and with the Palestinian refugees. And it is safe to say this problem concerning the fate of 1½ million people is probably the least understood by the American people. Or, put another way, it is misunderstood the most.

The general assumption is that the refugees (and now they have descendants) were ousted from their homes to make room for the newly created state of Israel. They, their children and their children's children live in Lebanon in internment camps waiting for the day when they can return to their homeland and again be a nation. I emphasize and underline that word "again" because that is the key to our misunderstanding.

You see the truth is there never was a nation called Palestine. Palestine was the name of an area populated by a variety of peoples or social groups--Armenians, Kurds, Maronites, Jews, Christians and others. And, that area was under a British mandate.

When Israel was created as a nation (carrying out a centuries old Bible prophecy) its borders enclosed less than 20 percent of the area called Palestine. When the British by a single stroke of the pen created the Kingdom of Transjordan, east of the Jordan river, the new kingdom encompassed 80 percent of the former mandate.

The present refugees included some Muslims who voluntarily left Israel preferring not to be members of the new nation. Some came from Jordan and others from the territories not included in either of the new nations. If there is a bond today we could call nationalism, it could be the result of their common plight as refugees. Or possibly it could simply be that having the instant creation of Israel and Jordan they have said, "Why not us?"

There is no common heritage as a people other than their Arab relationship and they were not at any previous time a nation. One, therefore, has to wonder if nationalism is a strong force among them and how many would choose to live in a new Palestinian state.

The West Bank of Jordan -- a territory under U.N. mandate -- is proposed as the site of the new nation. But the West Bank is not particularly fertile nor is it blessed with mineral wealth. It is, however, already heavily populated by Arabs, Jews and Christians and there is a very real question as to whether it could absorb a million and a half people.

The loudest, most persistent voice for a Palestinian state is that of Yassir Arafat, head of the P.L.O.--Palestinian Liberation Organization. He is the leader of terrorist guerilla bands who have pledged continued violence and the destruction of Israel. The P.L.O. has already assassinated West Bank leaders who might be a threat to Arafat's dream of heading up the new nation. No evidence exists that either he or the P.L.O. is the choice of the refugees.

Has any effort been made (and if not, why not) to canvas the refugees and see where the families and individuals would like to live? About 10 percent are Christians; 90 percent are Sunnu Muslims. Their language is Arabic, virtually identical to that spoken in Lebanon, Syria and Jordan. What if the Arab States and Israel were to offer citizenship to any who wanted to emigrate? What if all of us helped to fund such emigrations? It might eliminate a vexing problem. It might be worth a try.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Scared Straight"

While the three major television networks continue their frantic competition for audiences with star-studded spectaculars, 65 independent stations across the country stole the show recently by broadcasting a documentary called "Scared Straight." Originally broadcast in Los Angeles last year, "Scared Straight" provided viewers with a harrowing glimpse behind the maximum security walls of New Jersey's Rahway state prison. Without the benefit of typical network "hype", in many areas of the country "Scared Straight" drew larger audiences than the networks' popular offerings.

But this program was more than just another expose of the brutal hardships of prison life. "Scared Straight" is also an unusual success story.

Frank Bindhammer was convicted of murder in 1963. He was sentenced to a long term behind bars at Rahway state prison, infamous then and now for an inmate population made up of murderers, rapists and armed robbers. With nothing to lose and nothing in particular to gain, Bindhammer occupied his prison time not only by earning a high school diploma, but also by founding and operating a project called the Juvenile Awareness program.

The purpose of this program is to convince teenagers who have had serious run-ins with the law to go straight before it is too late. The methods of the Juvenile Awareness program are so simple that it makes you wonder why all the social workers, psychologists and prison experts who have been wringing their hands over the nation's prison system for decades have not thought of this before. Each day, twenty or so crimeprone teenagers are brought to the facility and locked in a room with a panel of inmates. For three tortuous hours, the youngsters must sit and listen as these prisoners rant and rave about the horrors of prison life. They are shouted at, sworn at, and told of the physical threats that await them, including homosexual assault. The intent of this shock treatment is to literally scare the crime right out of these young people.

But does it work? The documentary opens with interviews of 17 young criminals who are about to enter Rahway for the three hour session. They are cocky, confident and quite pleased that they have found a soft judge who only sentenced them to a three hour prison term. But as they listened to the incantations of the lifers, we see the expressions on their faces change. Soon the eyes of these young people who are so tough on the outside were brimming with tears. To say they were frightened is to put it mildly.

At the end of the show we get the results: a year later, only one of the 17 has been arrested for any crime. That's an admirable record which similar programs throughout the nation are attempting to match. As for Frank Bindhammer, the convict who started it all, he was released on parole last fall.

Along with the millions of other Americans who watched "Scared Straight", I was shocked to hear every obscenity imaginable broadcast on television. It's something television should not make a habit of, even in the name of realism. However, the program was shown at a late hour and the announcer was very careful to warn the viewers repeatedly that the show contained this crude language. So I'm sure most viewers came away from "Scared Straight" with a feeling of hope. After hearing so much about failure in society's efforts to reform criminals, a success story like this one is most welcome.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Agriculture"

Consumerism is a more potent political force than food production. We all eat and therefore buy food, but only a few million Americans are engaged in producing foods. On a sheer vote count it's easy to see which group will capture the interest of government as inflation sends prices skyward.

The housewife is inclined to see inflation as mainly a food problem. Shopping each week in the market she is particularly conscious of the price increases month after month. And it's understandably difficult to convince her that Americans eat better for a lower percentage of income than any other people on earth. Since 1960, food costs as a percentage of our earnings have gone down 21 percent. In that same period, the cost of government has gone up 20 percent.

Now the farmer and his family as consumers buy all the things we buy. Even the wheat farmer buys bread. As producers, the farmers also feel inflation when they meet the payroll, buy tractor fuel, farm machinery, fertilizer and so forth. I had a personal experience with this on our own ranch. We have a 1953 tractor which I bought second-hand more than 20 years ago for \$1,200. Just wishing one day I priced a replacement. I was offered \$4,000 in trade-in on the old one which would only leave me \$13,000 on top of that to buy a new tractor. I'm still using the old one.

Now maybe this makes the tractorcade more understandable. And yet I must say I did not agree with the demand the demonstrating farmers were making. Neither did the majority of their fellow farmers. They were asking government to solve their very real problem with a subsidy which, of course, would increase government regulation and control of agriculture. A subsidy is also the government's way of pleasing the consumer by making it appear that prices are being held down, while they take the difference out of your pocket in taxes to pay for the subsidy.

We came out of the great depression with a massive program of regulations, controls and subsidies for agriculture. Like most such government programs there were scores of conflicting and contradictory programs. I remember one in which the government had about a half-dozen separate programs, spending millions of dollars to tell chicken farmers how to increase egg production. A seventh program spent millions of dollars buying up surplus eggs.

They, in 1969, we began a move to put farming back into the free marketplace. The almost five-and-a-half billion dollar farm subsidy dropped to less than one billion dollars by 1975. The subsidies went down by 85 percent. Net farm income computed in constant dollars went up to 16 percent.

But then we fell into the same old sickness. In three years the farm subsidy rose and last year it was bigger than it was in 1969. The subsidies increased by 725 percent in those three years. Net farm income, again in constant dollars, went down by 14 percent.

Government interference in agriculture hasn't held down food prices and it hasn't increased farmers' income. They are worse off, we're worse off and government costs about seven billion dollars more than it did or should. Farm net income in constant dollars was almost twice as great in 1973 as it is now. When will we learn?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Rhodesia"

Writing in the Washington weekly HUMAN EVENTS, Allan C. Brownfeld reminds us of the truth of a line spoken by Adolph Hitler: "If you kill one man it is murder; while if you kill millions it simply becomes a statistic." Then Mr. Brownfeld goes on to illustrate that to our government the dead, both black and white in Rhodesia, killed by the terrorists of Nkomo and Mugabe have become just a statistic.

Allan Brownfeld had attended a press conference in Washington where he listened to a survivor of the Rhodesian passenger plane shot down by terrorists last September. You'll recall the incident. The guerillas, using Soviet ground to air missiles, blasted the airliner out of the sky. I believe 54 died in the crash, and 10 of the survivors were gunned down by the terrorists after escaping from the downed plane.

The man Brownfeld heard in the press conference was Hans Hansen, one of the eight who escaped death in the crash and the later massacre. He told how the survivors crawled from the plane and were met by the terrorists who ordered them to stand and move away from the plane. Hansen and his wife were apart from the rest, having returned to the plane to get clothing for those who were seriously hurt.

When they heard the order to stand, he asked his wife if they should obey. She being a Rhodesian (he's Danish) said, "No way!" They saw the terrorists rob the passengers of all valuables, then shoot them all after they bayoneted them -- men, women and children.

The Hansens were invited to America by the American Security Council to tell their story. Our State department refused to give Mrs. Hansen a visa because she is Rhodesian. Hans Hansen, traveling on a Danish passport couldn't be kept out. Our State department, if you aren't aware, gave visas to both Nkomo and Mugabe for visits to this country, and they were granted audiences with our Secretary of State.

Mrs. Hansen insisted that her husband come without her so that we, the American people, could hear the truth about the murderers our government insists on calling "The Patriotic Front".

I'm afraid, however, not too many Americans heard the story. According to Alan Brownfeld, none of the three major networks sent cameras or crews to the press conference, and not one word was carried in the New York TIMES, the Washington POST or any other major paper.

Hansen has expressed surprise that so many of us seem to have completely different views than those of our State department. This has made him optimistic. He says, "I believe there is a great future in Rhodesia under majority rule. Blacks and whites will be able to work together if only the terrorists are prevented from destroying what we have built."

Meanwhile terrorists are being trained in Angola by Cuban and Soviet military advisors. That information comes from one of the trainees who gave himself up after he and a companion killed 17 civilians in the Zwimba Tribal Trust Land. I wonder if Mrs. Hansen will accept an apology from at least one American who thinks our State department is shaming our country.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "District of Columbia"

Some time ago in one of these commentaries I discussed the matter of whether the District of Columbia should be given voting representation in the House of Representatives and two United States Senators. In other words, the District which in effect is our national capital, the city of Washington, would be treated as a state. As you know, a constitutional amendment to do this has been presented to the states for ratification.

During that previous broadcast I expressed my opposition to such a plan and gave some reasons for that opposition. Now a young congressman from Maryland, Representative Robert Bauman has delivered an eloquent argument against changing the present status of the District.

He points out that our Founding Fathers made two very important decisions: One, that our nation would be a federation of sovereign states; and two, that the new nation's capital would be a city created for that purpose in a federal district. If we give up those two principles we won't be creating a new state; we will be establishing a non-state with all the benefits of statehood.

There would be no state constitution, no governor, no legislature and no responsibility for its own financing. It would still be under the control of Congress. Voices raised in support of this mutation cry, "No taxation without representation!" Yet they have proposed charging citizens of Maryland and Virginia who work in Washington a commuter's tax.

The owners of these voices say nothing about the fact that citizens of the 50 states presently are taxed to support the District. Residents of Washington pay federal taxes as do we all. But for every 29 cents they pay, they get \$1.00 in return. In neighboring Maryland the citizens pay \$1.16 for each dollar they get back.

Washington, D.C. receives a direct \$300 million grant from the federal government to offset the revenue loss from untaxable federal land. No other state gets such a grant and yet some states have as much as 80 or 90 percent of their land in federal ownership. In California it's about half.

A point has been raised that the District is larger than seven of our states. One could reply that we all know the federal government is bigger than it should be. But even more to the point, so is Baltimore bigger than seven of our states, or New York. Should we start giving our large cities two senators?

Congressman Bauman points out that Puerto Rico, inhabited by three million people who are legally citizens of the U.S. and who have debated the question whether to apply for statehood or continue as a territory, might have another alternative. If this amendment passes, they could just follow precedent and say, "Never mind statehood, just treat us like a state and give us two senators".

I hope a great many of us will let our state legislators know we like things the way they are. There's an old saying -- "If it ain't broke, don't fix it". Well, the District isn't broke -- we are.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous II"

Congressman George Hansen of Idaho has been waging almost single -- handedly a battle to defend us against some of the nit-picking foolishness of the Occupational Safety & Health Administration (OSHA). Now he has introduced a bill to abolish it all together.

He took this action after the Senate Committee of Governmental Affairs made public a study by two Harvard professors who came to the conclusion that OSHA should go.

In their report they said: "Rather than continue on the course of its first seven years, we would argue that OSHA should be abolished. Safety and health in the work place would not suffer measurably. Significant private and governmental resources (they mean money) would be saved and an agency perceived primarily as a tool of government harassment would be eliminated." Amen!

On a far different subject, I wrote a column last January questioning whether all the Iranian students protesting in America were indeed Iranian students. A Texas paper, the El Paso TIMES, interviewed three such students attending (they said) the local University of Texas at El Paso. The paper quoted their denunciations of the Shah and their charges of Fascism. A few days later the El Paso TIMES printed a statement from University officials that said no such students were enrolled at the University and that the addresses they had given did not exist. So much for student protest.

Guess who is describing American medicine as a "vast, sprawling, highly expensive, and virtually non-competitive industry (translate that monopoly) commanding an ever-larger share of our nation's resources?" Joe Califano, that's who. He is the man who is Secretary of H.E.W. and whose budget is the third largest in the world. Only those of the U.S. itself and the Soviet Union are greater. And of course part of that H.E.W. budget pays for medicaid and medicare and several other health programs, all of which constitute a gigantic, wasteful government medical monopoly which would like to take over all health care in the U.S.

Here is one from the WALL STREET JOURNAL. Both the federal Transportation and the Energy departments have been pressuring us to forsake our automobiles and use, whenever possible, public transportation. We don't belittle or begrudge their efforts. The Environmental Protection Agency has been carrying the same torch and one of their crusades has been aimed at local governments urging them to make downtown parking more expensive. They figure that if it costs too much to park, we'll leave our jalopies at home in the garage.

Somehow though this doesn't apply in Washington where the bureaucrats dwell. The JOURNAL reports there are 30,000 parking spaces available to government employees free of charge. Another 10,000 pay five to 15 dollars a month (for private workers it's 50 to 75 dollars).

There has been a murmur that maybe government employees should pay something akin to the going rate. Transportation Secretary Brock Adams says he just isn't going to have his employees treated differently than other government employees.

Heavens no, Brock! Treat em all the same -- just like us.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Rural Renaissance"

Ever since the dark days of the Great Depression, rural Americans by the millions have given up farming and flooded to the nation's cities. Most surviving farm units have become larger, more highly capitalized, more dependent on expensive machinery and chemical fertilizers. The role of agricultural corporations has expanded sharply. Small farms decreased in numbers, many owners just barely managing to hang on.

One result of these trends has been big increase in America's agricultural productivity per farmer. America today is the world's foremost model for producing food and fiber from the land, in terms of the value the yield generated per farm unit. Were it not for the bounty of American agriculture, the nation's balance of trade problem would be far worse than it is.

But even as this large scale agricultural production creates large quantities of food for the national and international markets, a new small-scale agriculture is growing beneath it. This small-scale agriculture will probably never displace large-scale agriculture in the national marketplace, but it seems destined to have an important and beneficial role to play in sparking a modest rural renaissance in many parts of the nation. And one of the pioneers in this trend is the Frank P. Graham Experimental Farm and Training center in Anson County, North Carolina.

The Graham center was launched in 1972 when the National Sharecroppers fund bought 508 acres of abandoned cotton land near Wadesboro, North Carolina. The land was worn out. The people who had farmed it for over a century had moved on to the textile mills and sometimes big city welfare rolls, unable to nurse a marketable crop out of the depleted soil. But the Sharecroppers fund had a vision -- a vision of rebuilding those worn out acres, and in doing so to teach rural people how to build a new life for themselves on the land.

Today the Graham center has grown to 652 acres. The fields have patiently been rebuilt, largely with feather meal, seaweed, bone meal, ground granite, tankage and other natural soil conditioners. Hundreds of rural people -- blacks, whites, and Indians -- have come to the center to learn how to make a success out of small-scale farming. The center's beans, squash, tomatoes, yams, lettuce and other crops not only feed the trainees, but generate good income from the produce markets.

The trainees don't just learn about soils and crops, There are practical courses on carpentry, masonry, welding, equipment repair, and bookkeeping, too, for the small farmer cannot afford to hire outside specialists. Later on, when the Graham center's graduates get small farms of their own, the center continues to provide them with the expert advice they need to make them go. A hog-raising project has been added now, specially designed to match the resources of the small farmer who cannot afford giant hog-raising facilities.

The product of the Graham center is really not so much yams and pork as farmers -- independent, self-confident, skilled young men and women who are equipped to earn a modest but decent living doing what they love. The Graham centers' graduates may never add a billion dollars to America's farm output -- but they are going to add a lot to the strength of America's rural communities, and thus to the strength of America itself.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Washington weather"

With the freakish weather we've been having these last two years, particularly in the East and Midwest, it's easy to think that maybe the government has stopped predicting it and has started regulating it.

Anyone having business in our nation's capital has learned at one time or another that a light snow fall is a major disaster. Normal living isn't even attempted until nature rights itself and melts the snow.

But we're indebted to a Washington writer with NATIONAL REVIEW for a new slant on how the capital deals with this assault by nature.

During the most recent snow flurry this writer was listening to an all-news radio station when the regular news was interrupted for a special report directed to all government workers. Remember Washington is a one-industry town and we all know what that industry is, don't we?

Anyway the special bulletin was "Because of the winter storm, the office of Personnel Management has declared a Condition 3 effective immediately. We repeat, for all federal employees Condition 3 is in effect today." That almost has the dramatic sound of those wartime bulletins calling all military personnel to report to their posts immediately. You used to wonder if the enemy had landed on Long Island.

Well, our alert Washington correspondent for NATIONAL REVIEW got on the phone and made a few calls. He learned that "Condition 3 is a rare civil service bird, a day on which only those workers identified as 'essential' -- identified by themselves -- need report to work. In other words, all workers receive full pay regardless of whether they show up and those who do show receive no overtime pay." Well, there you have it, and all this time millions of trusting Americans thought all government employees were essential.

Our source for this story continued his phoning, starting with the 12 cabinet officers. There were three no shows, but then at cabinet level they could have been out in other parts of the nation.

At the State department a suspicious young lady guessed that about 120 employees were on hand. In answer to a follow-up question she admitted the normal force was about 7,000. I'll confess I've always suspected that only one out of 600 at the State department could really be essential. And, with 6,900 absentees, that must have been one of our better days in foreign relations.

We weren't so lucky at H.E.W. They said about half of their 37,000 employees living in the metropolitan area were on hand. But we can put a question mark on that one. Our writer offered to pay a dollar for everyone who filed a time card if the fellow on the other end of the phone would put a dollar for everyone who didn't. It was no deal.

Maybe we could really streamline government if we moved the capital to Northern Maine.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "SALT II - Part I"

At least once a week, if not more often, we read or hear the result of an opinion poll. The majority of pollsters are, in my opinion, conscientious, honest and pretty dependable. We must realize, however, that pollsters don't ask questions just to satisfy their own curiosity. They are employed by others and sometimes those others want specific questions asked in a specific way. A simple truth in polling is, "if you ask the wrong questions, you get the wrong answers."

Here's a case in point. Most polls in recent months having to do with U.S. foreign policy and our defensive strength vis-a-vis the Soviet Union have shown a growing concern on the part of the American people. It is safe to say that Americans do not trust the Soviet Union and feel we are in or close to a dangerous situation.

Now it is possible to say this is borne out by a CBS-New York TIMES poll regarding the SALT II treaty. The poll shows almost two-thirds -- 63 percent of the respondents favoring such a treaty.

On top of that comes an NBC-Associated Press poll in which 81 percent apparently support the SALT II agreement. The tendency is to accept these figures as evidence that Americans are worried about our military strength or lack of it.

But how do these figures relate to all the evidence that indicates we don't trust the Russians? If there is a lack of trust shouldn't there be a real concern about whether we could depend on the Russians to keep the treaty?

These questions were on the minds of a number of distinguished Americans of both political parties who make up the Committee on the Present Danger. They are people well-informed in the areas of foreign policy and national defense -- many of them former cabinet members in both Democrat and Republican administrations. They are, as the name of the group implies, concerned with our present defense policy and dedicated to presenting the truth to the American people.

They decided to look for some answers to the questions bothering them. An inspection of the questions asked in the two polls revealed the respondents had been asked simply whether they favored the concept of arms limitation and a limit on strategic (read that nuclear) weapons. It is surprising that in view of the questions the polls didn't get a 100 percent affirmative response.

Then, and we should be grateful to them, the committee commissioned its own poll. The answers were quite different than those offered by CBS-New York TIMES and NBC-Associated Press. On the next broadcast -- tune in same time, same station -- I'll tell you the answers they obtained and the questions they asked. I hope our U.S. Senators see this poll before they vote on SALT II.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "SALT II - Part II"

In the previous broadcast I told of three polls and that the answers to the third were quite different from those obtained on the first two.

CBS-New York TIMES and NBC-Associated Press each took a poll in which the respondents were simply asked whether we should or should not have an agreement with the Russians limiting strategic nuclear weapons. You'd think everyone would say "yes" to such a question and most people did. In one poll the "yes" vote was 63 percent -- in the other, 81 percent.

Only the results of the polls (not the questions) were made public. They were used to convey the idea that Americans are overwhelmingly in support of the SALT II agreement.

This disturbed the Committee on the Present Danger, a bi-partisan group of distinguished citizens concerned about our declining defense capability. Knowing that most published data shows the American people increasingly suspicious of Soviet intentions, the committee made it a point to find out what questions had been asked in the polls. Then they did some polling of their own. The result was very different.

A reputable pollster was employed and a series of questions, each one highly specific and all dealing with SALT II were asked of the respondents. The responses show that the American people are skeptical about SALT II, don't know much about it and are not prepared to support it without additional safeguards.

Less than 10 percent strongly supported SALT II and a comparable number strongly opposed it. A slightly larger group reluctantly supported it in spite of some misgivings. In other words, the vast support the treaty is supposed to have comes down to 20.3 percent. By contrast, 41.7 percent, more than twice as many, would have to see more safeguards before they would support it, and almost 30 percent say they don't know enough about it to have an opinion.

There was a true-false question which revealed the people are not only uninformed, they've been misinformed. With the don't knows excluded more than half said the treaty would require both nations to reduce defense spending. They are wrong. A full three-fourths said the treaty would limit the explosive power of nuclear warheads. They are wrong. More than two-thirds said the treaty would require each side to reduce its ability to make a nuclear attack on the other. They are wrong. Almost three-fourths -- 71 percent -- said the treaty would provide for verification to insure that the other side wasn't cheating. They are wrong. And the 68 percent who thought the treaty would regulate the number of strategic missiles or warheads each side could have are also wrong.

This poll demonstrates that a searching national debate should be held and that the Administration should give the American people the unvarnished facts about the treaty -- what it will and will not do. This the Administration has not done.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous III"

With taxes on everybody's mind, it might be appropriate to puncture some of those balloons Washington unleashes every once in awhile on the subject of taxes. Standard procedure among some in the Capitol is to assail any who criticize business taxes or the upper surtax brackets in the income levy as advocating windfalls for the rich.

This was true a year ago when adjustment of the capital gains tax was introduced. The administration called it a break for millionaires. Now we all know that the capital gains tax is the tax you pay if you've sold something for more than it cost you when you originally bought it. An image has been created of anyone realizing a capital gain as someone rich enough to own stocks, real estate, art treasures and so forth.

Now we learn that half the people reporting capital gains for tax purposes have incomes of \$15,000 a year or less. And by way of an economic report to the U.S. Senate Finance Committee we also learn that much of what the tax collectors call a capital gain in this age of inflation is no such thing.

In one year individuals reported four-and-a-half billion dollars in capital gains for tax purposes. When the purchase price and the selling price were adjusted for inflation, the four-and-a-half billion dollar gain was actually a one billion dollar loss. But they had to pay the tax on the four-and-a-half billion dollars.

While we're talking about money I hope you'll remember how often and how persistently the communist parties in European countries like Italy and France deny any connection with the Soviet Union. They protest that Euro-communism is independent of Russia. Well an enterprising French reporter has just uncovered the fact that the French Communist party keeps its money in the "Banque Commerciale pour L'Europe de Nord." That bank, it so happens, is owned by a Frenchman and the Soviet Union. Their partnership is like mule and rabbit stew -- one mule to one rabbit. The Frenchman owns three-tenths of one percent of the bank; the Soviet Union owns 99.7 percent. So much for the independence of Euro-communism.

Now let's turn to crime. A local news story out here in California deserves wider circulation. Investigators for the Orange county office of California's State Justice Department got wind of a character who was trying to peddle an illegal automatic pistol.

They wired up an informant with a hidden microphone which could be picked by a remote control tape recorder and sent him out to buy the pistol. The meeting place was a parking lot; the time was 8:30 at night. Buyer and seller were right on time and the sale was made with every word duly recorded.

But before the two state officers could arrest the seller, men poured out of automobiles and slapped handcuffs on the buyer.

It seems the seller was an informant for the Sheriffs department who was wired up for sound and sent out to sell the gun. He sold it to the wired up informant for the state officers. Who says crime doesn't pay?

Taped: 4/16/79
Air: 4/30-5/18/79

RONALD REAGAN
RADIO COMMENTARY
Disc 79-6

79-6 A

- | | | |
|----|------------------------------------|------|
| 1. | New England Energy Barriers | 2:48 |
| 2. | Land Use: The California Precedent | 2:35 |
| 3. | The Real Impact of Inflation | 2:26 |
| 4. | Real Estate Signs | 3:14 |
| 5. | Jonestown | 2:48 |
| 6. | David & Goliath | 2:58 |
| 7. | Schools | 2:49 |

79-6 B

- | | | |
|----|---------------------------|------|
| 1. | Budget | 2:54 |
| 2. | Food Stamps | 2:45 |
| 3. | Bilingual Education I | 2:37 |
| 4. | Bilingual Education II | 2:49 |
| 5. | Regulations Go To College | 3:02 |
| 6. | The Salcido Family | 2:54 |
| 7. | Miscellaneous | 2:48 |
| 8. | Free Enterprise | 2:50 |

PLEASE NOTE

These programs are provided for airing from April 30 through May 18th, 1979 inclusive. Maintaining this schedule will enable your station to air all newly recorded programs as received.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "New England Energy Barriers")

Of all the regions of the United States, the six states of New England are most dependent on outside energy resources to keep them warm, moving and productive. Eighty percent of New England's energy comes from oil. Since New England has no oil of its own, all of it must be brought in -- and 79 percent of it comes directly from abroad at very high cost.

A number of projects have been launched to make New England less dependent on outside oil. And, yet, almost every plan to increase New England's energy independence has been the subject of attack by one group or another. In most cases, the plans have been dropped altogether or else, if they are moving forward, the final costs have mushroomed.

For 10 years the Pittston Company has been trying to build a 250,000 - barrel-a-day refinery at Eastport, Maine. Right now it has been stopped by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife service, which fears that the refinery will endanger the breeding area of bald eagles. If Pittston wins that one, it will have to face the National Oceanic and Atmospheric administration. This federal agency seems to think the refinery will threaten Atlantic whales.

The two nuclear reactors planned for Seabrook, New Hampshire, have been the focus of every kind of obstruction, including physical attack. One of the main arguments against the plants is that their warm water discharge will discomfit the clams on the nearby ocean floor. Repeated delays and expensive design changes forced by the anti-nuclear protesters and their lawyers already guarantee that Seabrook power will be far more expensive than first estimated, if, indeed, the plants are ever allowed to go "on line".

Tenneco wants to build a badly needed storage facility for liquefied natural gas in Narragansett Bay, Rhode Island. But it will not be built because yachtsmen objected to tankers entering their sailing areas.

Central Main Power company had to abandon its proposed Sears Island nuclear plant due to environmentalist opposition. It redesigned the plant to be coal-fired, but approval is being held up because of fears that it might lower the air quality at the little-visited Campobello International park.

In Vermont, wave of opposition surfaced when plans to explore for uranium ore were announced. A major hydroelectric project in Maine was halted to protect a bit of flora called the Furbish lousewort. A power company wind generator on Block Island, Rhode Island, was recently taken out of service due to local complaints. Do you know what the problem was? The wind generator interfered with the complainants' TV reception.

There's every reason to believe that most New Englanders would like to have many of these energy projects go forward. Yet, a small but very well-organized, well funded movement seems determined to seize upon every tactic to delay, halt, or drive up the costs of virtually every plan for making New England's energy future less precarious. Some day there must be a reckoning. Let's hope the victory doesn't go to those who seem determined to have New Englanders freeze in the dark.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Land Use: The California Precedent")

California has a reputation for starting things that sweep the nation. Take blue jeans and the tax revolt, for instance. But, not every California precedent is positive. The latest one isn't. It involves a ruling by the State Supreme Court. If it stands, it might one day affect property owners everywhere.

The story begins in Tiburon, a small city which hugs the shoreline of San Francisco Bay. Like all California cities, Tiburon was required by state law to prepare a general plan designating proposed uses of land inside the city limits for various private and public uses. Tiburon hired two consulting firms to make recommendations in 1972. As a result, the city made widespread modifications in its zoning. The consultants recommended that a large portion of Tiburon Ridge, above the main part of town, be acquired for open space. In the rezoning, the ridge was designated "Residential Planned Development and Open Space Zone." The allowable building destiny was so low that Donald and Bonnie Agins (EH-JINS) owners of a five acre parcel on the ridge, were effectively prevented from developing their property.

They sued for damages, claiming the city had, in effect, taken their land without compensation. Complicating the matter was the fact that at one point the city started, then dropped, eminent domain proceedings to acquire their property.

The suit asked for \$2 million, claiming that it was a case of "inverse condemnation." The implications of the case were great for many other Californians whose property had been caught up in similar situations in the wake of "open space" and "land freeze" rules, regulations and ordinances that swept the state in the early 70's.

The Agins' case made its way to the State Supreme Court which ruled recently that although such government action (as the Tiburon rezoning) may be invalid because of its excess, remedy "by way of damages in eminent domain is not thereby made available."

The Pacific Legal Foundation, a public interest law firm which filed a friend-of-the-court brief in the case, argued that if a property owner's only recourse in such cases is to get the ordinance thrown out as unconstitutional, only a Rockefeller could afford the cost and any legal victory would be a hollow one, for the local authorities could simply rewrite the offending ordinance to produce the same result.

The foundation says, "The court's precedent-setting decision, if allowed to stand, will effectively destroy a landowner's ability to protect his private property rights."

A petition for rehearing has been filed by the Agins. If they are successful, property owners everywhere can breathe a little easier. If they are not, watch out for another California precedent.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Real Impact of Inflation"

The worse inflation gets, the less your money buys, and the fewer choices you have about how to spend or save the money you make.

Right now the cost of living is increasing twice as fast as wages. A dollar earned is two dollars spent -- just to stay even.

Moreover, inflation gets ever tighter, like a hangman's noose. First we can't afford to save. Then we can't afford to buy what we need. Then we can't afford to keep what we have. Our standard of living is declining precipitously, and our economy is on the brink of another recession.

Yet the nation's economic analysts seem to believe that people can buy whatever they want, despite inflation. We read of the "strength in consumer spending", the public's "urge to buy", and "a surprising willingness" to go into debt.

One national news magazine noted for its careful research recently asked "Why do people save a smaller part of income and let debts pile up?" and answered "They are in a rush to buy now because prices appear to be headed into the clouds".

That analysis doesn't make sense to me. Inflation has left most people with little or no choice about what and when they buy. For every person who can afford to buy something he really doesn't need now to avoid higher prices later, I believe there must be thousands who are going into debt to pay inflated prices for things they need to survive from day to day: food to put on the table, fuel for heating and transportation, and repairs and replacements for worn-out cars, stoves, furnaces and refrigerators.

The price of fuel alone has tripled since 1970. Many families now find that rent and utilities take half or more of their incomes, and in a recent study of 800 low-income families in Milwaukee, shelter costs averaged 93 percent of income, leaving seven percent for food, clothing and everything else.

Ask yourself how much choice you have in spending what you make. When was the last time you were able to live within your food budget? When was the last time you got out of an auto repair shop for less than you thought it would cost? And when was the last time you could afford to buy something you really didn't need to avoid paying a higher price later?

The real impact of inflation is that it erodes our standard of living and our freedom to spend and save as we wish. Perhaps our economists would understand this impact better if they spend less time at their computers and more time managing their family finances.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "Real Estate Signs")

Back in 1889, Ralph Waldo Emerson said, "...if a man can build a better house or make a better mousetrap than his neighbor, the world will beat a path to his door." Well, that was ninety years ago and Emerson's philosophy has been proven true time and again. Make a better product or offer a more dependable service and you're certain to get a bigger share of the market.

We've also seen that once you've established your reputation in the business world, you can capitalize on that success and expand your operation by setting-up a franchise to market your goods or services to an even larger audience. But be careful, become too successful and your competitors may stop at nothing to bring you to your knees. At least that's what the real estate franchisers -- especially Century 21 Real Estate Corporation -- are finding out.

In several states throughout this country there are some part-time real estate commissioners who are also full-time real estate brokers who are trying to tell real estate franchises how to make their signs. These commissioners have proposed rules designed to restrict the way in which a local real estate franchise may use its franchisor's federally-registered trademark. While the rules vary from state to state, they generally require the franchisor's logo to be reduced in size so that it is no larger than the franchisee's name.

Because Century 21 is the largest of the real estate franchisors, it is in the middle of a swarm of legal actions over these regulations.

The rationale for this bureaucratic interference in the size of business signs is that the commissioners are protecting the public from "deceptive advertising". The argument is usually made that if the name of, say, Century 21, is much larger than that of the local franchisee, people will think that the big national company is legally liable for all local transactions. Yet, Century 21 says that all of its advertising makes it clear that local offices are independently owned and operated.

While the franchise systems may be relatively new to real estate, it has served other industries well for years -- from hotels to service stations to fast food restaurants. When you consider that in 1977 franchises accounted for one-third of all retail sales in the United States, it's hard to believe that this volume of business was founded on deception.

Behind the stated reason for the regulations lies what may be the real reason, an effort to reduce the effectiveness of the franchisors' national advertising programs by making their names less visible. In other words, if you don't join 'em, beat 'em --by out-regulating them. After all, if you can nullify Century 21 or Red Carpet -- or any other franchisor - you get more of the business yourself.

One of the key principles behind the franchise system is the right of a franchisee to use the franchisor's trademark. It helps give small brokers more leverage in competing with larger local ones who can afford extensive advertising and it enables them to use the franchisor's sales tools, and national advertising information network. As a result, the consumer should benefit from a consistently high standard of service throughout the country. Somehow it seems to me that to meet the competition by imposing arbitrary and frivolous rules concerning the size of signs is not what Emerson had in mind. It is, however, a sign of the times and a good example of what people today have had enough of -- excessive interference by government in their lives.

It's unfortunate, but today when you figure out a way to build a better mousetrap, some bureaucrat manages to come along with a better mouse.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Jonestown"

The terrible tragedy at Jonestown is fading into the past. It isn't a pleasant topic and I don't relish bringing it up, but there is a little known facet to the horrifying series of events which should have received more attention than it did.

There has been talk of investigating cults for the purpose of learning how we might learn to anticipate and thereby prevent another such happening. Some who knew the Reverend Jim Jones in the beginning of his ministry remember him as a sincere clergyman who somehow went wrong. But little attention has been given to what you might think would be the cap to the entire story -- Jim Jones own personal account of his career as a minister or cult leader.

Yes, there is such a document -- a transcript of a tape that he recorded in which he told his life story and his philosophy. It was found at Jonestown after the mass suicides and murders. The full text was printed last December 6th in the Georgetown, Guyana CHRONICLE, a time when Georgetown was teeming with American reporters.

The only American paper that carried the story so far as I know was the New York TIMES on page 20 under a heading that read, "Paper Calls Jones Communist in 1950's"

Now that headline on the story was a bit misleading. It was Jones who called Jones a Communist. In his own rambling account he made it clear that he was a Communist from the beginning and occupied the pulpit only for the purpose of furthering his philosophy. His entire account is filled with profanity and vulgarities as he tells how a legitimate clergyman offered him a church even though he was cursing religion and the church. Jones expresses the belief that the clergyman who put him in the pulpit did so deliberately because he, too, was a Communist.

I know it is hard to believe such a thing but years ago when the American Communist Party moved to get control of the motion picture industry, it had the help of a clergyman in one of our established religions. At first many of us thought he had been duped by the party and wasn't aware of what was really going on. Then when it became clear that he was knowingly doing their work we found ourselves asking, "how does a man of the cloth become a Communist?" The answer came from a man in law enforcement who was a specialist in Communist tactics. He said, "Men of the cloth don't become Communists--Communists become men of the cloth."

So it may have been with Jones. In his taped autobiographical account he said "Life is a gamble and I'd rather gamble on the side of communism." He expressed great admiration for Stalin and he turned to Mao Tse-tung when Stalin was put down by the Soviets. He also admired Castro and wished he could have led a revolution as Castro did.

Obviously I haven't been able to recite in full the amazing story of Jim Jones but it should be more widely known. Jonestown was not the result of religious fanaticism -- quite to the contrary.

RONALD REAGAN

(Reprint of a radio program entitled "David & Goliath")

Mrs. Madeline Williams, editor of the Ft. Worth, Texas NEWS-TRIBUNE, wrote a David-and-Goliath story that is not only highly entertaining, but inspirational and instructive as well.

David is Donald Woodard, Jr. whose title is "Advertising Account Executive" representing the NEWS-TRIBUNE. Goliath is a compliance officer in the Ft Worth area office of the U.S. Department of Labor. At issue was whether the NEWS-TRIBUNE was violating the "Child Labor Requirements" under the Fair Labor Standards act.

Donald, who was facing his first grilling by a public official, is a 17-year-old high school junior. After he told the man his title, the dialogue went like this:

"How long have you had that title?" "Two Years." "Two years exactly?" "Two years exactly." "You have been an employee of the NEWS-TRIBUNE two years?" "No sir. I am not an employee. I am an independent agent. I represent the NEWS-TRIBUNE." "That's what I mean. There is an employee-employer relationship here." "No sir, there is not." Then as the government man reached for his Department of Labor handbook, Donald beat him to it with a Webster's dictionary that proved his point. The government agent said, "But you sell their product?" "No sir. I sell advertising and strictly on commission." "Now Donald, I'm here to protect you." "Against what?" "The government recognizes that some kids..." "Please sir, do not call me a kid." "I'm sorry. The government recognizes that certain classifications of employees need protection..." "I am not an employee. And what do I need protection against?" "H.O., what the department calls 'hazardous occupations'." "The government protects you as a salesman. It is conceivable you could work all day and not sell an ad and then you wouldn't get any money for your work?" "It is not conceivable, sir." "What is not?" "That I would work all day and not sell an ad." "Yes, well now. As an outside salesman you are entitled to \$4.35 an hour. That's one-and-a-half times the minimum wage." "I don't work by the hour." "But that's what you are to be paid when you spend your time and don't make any sales." Donald was outraged. "Do you think I would accept money for something that I didn't do? I wouldn't take it. The government couldn't make me take it. That's an insult."

At this point Mrs. Williams displayed several copies of the NEWS-TRIBUNE showing page after page of full and half-page ads Donald had sold. She said that he felt very strongly about free enterprise. In fact he feels there is too much government.

Goliath made one last try. "All right we come to your brother Blake, he's only 15 and he works here."

Mrs. Williams explained that Blake has a contract with his brother that had been worked out under their fathers guidance. Donald chimed in and said, "Blake is my assistant. He sold his share of the free enterprise ads."

Goliath ordered that 15-year-old Blake not work over a certain number of hours --never after 7 p.m. or before 7 a.m. and asked if Mrs. Williams would see to that. To which she replied, "No, but I can ask Donald to. He works for Donald you know."

Mr. & Mrs. Woodard must be very proud parents.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Schools"

I believe a case can be made that the decline in the quality of public school education began when federal aid to education became federal interference in education.

Some years back when federal aid was first proposed, it was offered only on the basis that local governments were hard pressed to meet increasing school costs. At the time many educators were fearful that control of the purse strings might mean control, period, and therefore academic freedom would be lost.

Of course the proponents of federal aid denied they had any intention of interfering with school matters -- they just wanted to help meet financial needs. Taking them at their word, Senator Norris Cotton of New Hampshire, made a common-sense suggestion. He said if the problem was one of finance alone then why not give to the states a tax source which would be theirs to control and spend? He introduced a bill to turn over to the states the tobacco tax. There would be only one string attached -- the proceeds were to be used for education. Of course his bill was defeated, which should tell us something about what the proponents of federal aid really had in mind.

Last year the National Education association, which has favored a national school system for a long time, was defeated in its effort to get a bill passed creating a federal Department of Education. The White House is pledged to such a department and has gone out of its way to tell the N.E.A. (now one of the most potent lobbying forces in Washington) that it will continue to support the idea.

The question is, will we who oppose the plan do as we so often do and sit back thinking that last year's victory was the end of the war? If we do we'll have -- before the year is out -- a bill creating a Department of Education. And that will mean the end of local control of our schools.

The plan is to move fast before opposition can develop. The Senate Governmental Affairs committee recently passed out to the Senate floor by a 16 to one vote, a bill patterned after the one defeated last year. It seems likely the Senate will pass it.

If it is to be defeated it will have to be in the House. This won't be easy. Last year the lobbying forces marshalled by H.E.W. were busy fending off tuition tax credits, among other things. This year nearly 100 organizations have lined up behind the N.E.A. to flood Congress with letters and postcards. A meeting was held in January to plan strategy with top administration officials led by the Vice President. One of the strategies is to nail down eight new freshman congressmen before the opposition can get to them. Incidentally, samples of the letters and postcards were displayed at the meeting. They hope to put a half million of these in the mailboxes of Congress.

One congressman said: "What they want is a central national voice for establishing education policy." All of us should be aware that the new department will be of cabinet level. We'll be adding a new cabinet officer and creating a new bureaucracy of gigantic size to oversee the thousands of public schools now administered by local school districts.

When will we learn the wisdom of the old saying -- "If it ain't broke, don't fix it."?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Budget"

Not many of us are aware that the federal budget, which is usually announced as the President's budget, really is a parentless child. For some reason neither the Congress nor the Executive branch has really faced up to the fact that the federal budget is the responsibility of everyone and therefore, in reality, no one.

When the Office of Management & Budget starts putting the budget together, it is faced with programs voted by Congress which makes up about 80 percent of the whole. The Executive branch has a "say so" over the other 20 percent. When completed, the budget is sent back to Congress where it is dished out to the appropriate committee having jurisdiction over its various sections. Finally, it is returned to the president for signature or veto.

Now it's true that Congress finally, after 200 years, passed a bill creating a budget committee which supposedly is to weigh the entire budget against estimated revenues. The intent was to create some responsible agency which could think in terms of matching out-go to income. But, since the budget has grown by 140 billion dollars in the last three years -- the largest increase in history -- one can hardly say the committee has been a success.

The framers of the Constitution must not have had this in mind. They gave the President the power of veto over any individual bill including appropriations. And of course, the Congress can override a veto, but it takes a two-thirds vote. Congress has found a way around this. It can put an absolutely essential spending item into a bill with extravagances the President would like to veto but can't because he'd be vetoing the essential item also.

The answer to this is so simple it has been found by most of our states. Most state constitutions require a balanced budget and most give the governor the right of line-item veto. A few Presidents have asked for this.

Let me use California as an example. The California Constitution requires a balanced budget and the governor is responsible for submitting such a budget to the legislature. The legislature can remove some things from the budget or reduce the cost of some and it can add to the budget.

When it is returned to the Governor he can, by item veto, eliminate things the legislature has added to the budget; but he cannot put back those things the legislature has removed. To re-increase the budget the legislature must override each veto by a two-thirds vote.

An amendment to the Constitution to give an item veto power to the President would eliminate an existing abuse of power by the Congress. The Congress, of course, would retain the right to override. But the taxpayers would have the protection of a President and a Congress, each able to restrain excessive spending by the other. Through this process the President has the responsibility for every dollar spent except in the event of an override of his veto. In that case the Congress must face the people and, in effect, justify its increase in the budget.

Does it work? Well, in California for one eight year period, vetoed spending items totaled 16 billion dollars.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Food Stamps"

The 1979 budget calls for 6.2 billion dollars to provide food stamps for those eligible to receive them. The administration has asked that this be increased by \$700 million to a total of \$6.9 billion. A Congressman -- Representative Tom Coleman of Missouri -- has come up with what sounds like a better idea. He makes a case that improved administration and tightened regulations can save \$700 million without taking "a single crumb of food out of the mouths of those who receive food stamps."

First of all, he cites government figures which show that 12 percent of the program funds were issued in error last year and by coincidence 12 percent cashes out to an even \$700 million. Now, Congressman Coleman doesn't demand perfection. He's willing to concede that it's only human to make mistakes. But he doesn't think it's unreasonable to ask that the number of boner be cut in half -- from 12 percent to six percent, thereby saving \$350 million.

The Congressional Budget office has estimated that between \$124 and \$162 million could be saved if the government would require people who are issued food stamps on a temporary basis to accept them as a loan. For example, strikers, as well as the unemployed, are presently eligible for food stamps, Congressman Coleman proposed that when those recipients are back at work and earning twice the poverty level--which amounts to about \$13,000 a year -- they repay the government for the food stamps they were given to tide them over. This would save the taxpayers between \$124 and \$164 million a year.

Put that at \$150 million and we have \$500 of the \$700 million the administration wants to spend. The Congressional Budget office further says that \$200 million more could be saved by reducing the number of stamps now being given to people who are already receiving food from other government programs. That makes the total \$700 million and wipes out the need for hiking the budget by that additional amount.

I'm not even going to mention how much more might be saved if we'd honestly ask ourselves why strikers should be subsidized by the taxpayers and given food stamps.

Congressman Coleman appealed to the House Agriculture committee to endorse these reforms. The committee rejected his proposals by a vote of 16 to 14. He intends to continue trying for them in the Budget and Appropriations committees and, if need be, on the floor of the House. I think he deserves our help. He sums up his case very succinctly: "by eliminating waste and inefficiency in the Administration of food stamps, we could save more than enough money to keep the system running without taking food away from those who truly need it." Who can be against that?

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bilingual Education I"

Not very many Americans would hold still for scratching out the inscription on the base of the Statue of Liberty in New York Harbor. "Give me your tired, your poor, your huddled masses yearning to breath free, the wretched refuse of your teeming shore. Send these, the homeless, tempest-tosed to me. I lift my lamp beside the golden door."

There are some who call her Miss Liberty and others equally appropriately call her "The Mother of Exiles". But, by whichever title, she symbolizes the fact that for 200 years this nation has been the melting pot of the world.

From the earliest pioneer to the most recent immigrant we are a collection of people from every spot on earth. We have in common a love for freedom that made us or our ancestors willing to tear up roots come to a strange land, learn its ways and its language and create a new ethnic breed called "American".

Learning our language never seemed to be an insurmountable problem in the melting pot process. A man of Italian origin told me one day he and his brothers and sisters learned English in our public schools, and at night taught their parents. We provided free night time classes for newcomers to our shores. They all learned and no one thought we were asking too much. Each was aware that if someone had come to his or her motherland -- a Frenchman to Germany, a German to Italy or vice versa, they would be expected to learn that country's language.

As a new governor, I first learned of bilingual education -- or rather the lack of it in our schools. In California the problem had to do with our large Spanish speaking community. Children coming from homes where Spanish was spoken had difficulty learning other subjects in the classroom because of their inability to speak English.

This was first brought to my attention by a group of mothers of such children. They told tragic stories of children being put in classes for the backward or handicapped when their only problem was language. I asked why mothers of Hispanic heritage couldn't serve as volunteers to aid English speaking teachers. If a child was having a problem such a volunteer could talk to him or her in Spanish and see if the difficulty was misunderstanding due to unfamiliarity with English. I was informed that the law required that anyone helping in the classroom have a teachers certificate.

Frankly I think that's silly. If a good purpose can be served by granting a waiver with regard to our legalities then that waiver should be granted. But, getting to the point -- bilingual education was presented to me as a case of training a cadre of teachers in two languages so they could be assigned to particular schools where a sizable percentage of students were of ethnic background -- in California's case, mostly Mexican. My thought was that such teachers would be entitled to premium pay for the extra trainging they had received.

Next broadcast I'll tell you what bilingual education has come to mean in our schools.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Bilingual Education II"

On the last commentary I spoke of the understanding I had as governor of California that bilingual education (which was just beginning to be talked about) meant bilingual teachers who could help students who spoke a foreign tongue and were unfamiliar with English. In California and several other Southwest states where we have a great many Americans of Mexican descent, language is a problem in many of our schools.

Today, we have bilingual education in American schools. We even have a federal office of bilingual education. The director-designate of that office has stated that he believes being taught in one's native language perhaps should be considered a "human right".

Now I'm quite sure that if a native-born American child finds himself and his family living in a foreign land he isn't going to be taught in his native tongue. But that seems to be what bilingual education means in these United States.

Today our government spends \$150 million a year teaching children of other cultures in their own language. The melting pot tradition in which we taught the foreign born how to fit into our society has been forsaken in favor of teaching them how to be different and remain apart from the mainstream of American living.

Our schools are now teaching students arithmetic, history, geography and such in 70 different languages. There are approximately 290,000 students in our land who are being taught in such tongues as Aleut, Cambodian, Punjabi, Tagalog (TAH-GAHL00G), the original language of the Philippines, and of course Spanish, for that is the native tongue of about 80 percent of the 290,000.

In 1974 a suit brought in behalf of 1,800 ethnic students resulted in this verdict -- "schools receiving federal funds must rectify the language deficiency in order to open instruction to students who had linguistic deficiencies."

Well I'm all for that and think that's what we should try to do. It seems to me the court ruled that where the linguistic deficiency was inability to speak English, they were to be helped to overcome that which means special added instruction in the official language of our country. And, at the beginning, that was the idea. They would be taught in their own language only until they could make a transition to ours.

Today "transition" has been changed to "maintenance". The new goal is to help them maintain proficiency in their original language.

Representative John Ashbrook of Ohio has declared we are actually preventing children from learning English. The present \$150 million budget for the bilingual program is slated to go to \$400 million in the next four years.

What is next -- traffic signs and so forth in 70 different languages? Don't laugh. In San Francisco, where they've been debating whether to license self-service gas stations, one city supervisor says only if the instructions on the pumps are printed in English, Spanish, Chinese and Tagalog. Incidentally, even the Filipinos speak English instead of Tagalog.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Regulations Go To College"

More than a century ago the French writer, Alexis de Tocqueville, journeyed to our shore to satisfy himself about how such a great miracle had been performed in such a short time. We were the talk of the world because of our prosperity and industrial growth. He came, he saw and he admired. He admired so much he wrote a book about us.

Even so, however, he included in his book some words of warning to us. He said that if we weren't on guard we could find ourselves covered by a network of regulations that would control "virtually every aspect of human life and behavior."

As you well know I've spoken on these broadcasts a number of times about how unnecessary government regulation is slowing our economic growth and limiting our prosperity.

Today I'd like to tell you about another area you might not be aware of that is in danger of being smothered by the federal government's spreading regulatory net.

Not too many years back our respect for academic freedom was such that colleges and Universities were exempt not only from government regulation but even such federally mandated programs as Social Security and Workers Unemployment Insurance. But beginning in 1964 -- a time when few voices were being raised in warning that government was usurping powers it was never intended to have -- the federal government has increased by 1,000 percent the number of laws pertaining to higher education.

Today there are 34 congressional committees and 79 subcommittees overseeing 439 laws affecting higher education. The Department of HEW has declared that if one student on a campus is receiving federal loan, that college or university, public or private, is subject to federal regulation. Hillsdale College in Michigan is fighting this ruling by the Secretary of HEW in the courts. We can only wish them well.

The regulations cover every aspect of college life -- the hiring and firing of faculty -- also their promotions, wages, salaries and benefits. There are also regulations having to do with building construction, record keeping, financial aid and to some degree, educational programs and curriculum.

One president of a modest-size independent university told me the administration cost of complying with government required paperwork on his campus had gone from \$50,000 a year to \$625,000. There is a study which estimates the total bill for all colleges and universities has gone to two billion dollars a year. But, brace yourself -- modifications to meet energy efficiency standards and requirements of OSHA could cost more than 11 billion dollars.

All of this catches higher education at a time when inflation and erosion of the value of endowments has created an unprecedented crisis. It is doubtful that some institutions can keep their doors open. Federal aid is hardly an answer to this since it presently costs some schools and colleges about 50 cents in administration costs for every dollar received from the government. And one way or another -- through taxes for public universities and colleges or contributions and tuition for independent colleges and universities -- we the people pay these costs in addition to all the other extravagances of government.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "The Salcido Family"

A few weeks ago, the Los Angeles TIMES carried a story of tragedy striking a California family. The victims were not public figures and possibly the accidental death of a family head would not normally result in press attention beyond the obituary column. There were, however, facets to this story that made it well worth reporting.

Jose Salcido, a kindly, conscientious 50-year old father of 13 children, liked by his neighbors and fellow workers for his uncomplaining acceptance of life, was killed in a senseless, unexplainable accident. Unloading his pick-up truck, he walked around the front of the parked vehicle which suddenly lurched forward, crushing him against a brick wall.

For Jose it was the last of a chain of personal tragedies. His wife had died after suffering the agony of cancer over a long period of time. A son had been killed by gunfire from a roving gang in a passing car and another son had accidentally drowned.

The TIMES told this story and printed a picture of the heartbroken children of Jose Salcido. A few days later, the TIMES wrote another story about the Salcidos. I thought you might like to know about that story too.

On March 23rd, the day after Jose's death, a man from Beverly Hills drove to La Puente. He handed the eldest daughter \$300 and left without giving his name. A short time later, a woman in the neighborhood, suffering from arthritis and barely able to walk, made her way to the Salcido home with the \$100 she had collected in a door-to-door solicitation from neighbors. Two tourists visiting California from Pennsylvania sent a donation. The TIMES was receiving calls and letters from all over Southern California.

One woman gave a check for \$500. She said she wanted to provide "immediate help!" That immediate help was deeply appreciated by the 13 children of Jose Salcido because it took care of a large part of the funeral costs.

Their parish church started a drive and by this time the Los Angeles TIMES had received several hundred dollars from people who asked that it be forwarded to the family. This money was deposited in a special checking account in the name of the eldest son, Frank Salcido.

The children of Jose Salcido have been amazed by the help that has come to them from strangers. They have also discovered how kind the people of this land can be. One letter accompanying a check said it all. "This is for the children of Jose Salcido. It is for them to know there are always others who care; that despite personal tragedy, the world is not always the dark place it seems to be; that their father would have wanted for them to go on with courage and strength, and still open hearts."

Because I know that some will ask, that bank account is in the name of Frank Salcido -- Crocker National Bank, East Valley Blvd., La Puente, California.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Miscellaneous"

If a man biting a dog is news this little item from New England should be in headlines. A New Hampshire jobs director has given Washington a problem it's having trouble solving.

Judy Gustafson has sent back to CETA -- the Comprehensive Employment and Training act office--three million dollars left over from a five-and-one-half million dollar grant. Her accompanying letter is in pure Yankee language. "We did our very best to spend the money but had no takers."

Judy figured this was the only proper thing to do. She hadn't anticipated causing trouble for the federal government, but that's what she did. It seems that Washington has no machinery for getting money back. One of the bureaucrats involved in the transaction said "It's never happened before so we're not quite sure exactly what we do about money being returned to us."

I wonder if they've thought about applying it to the National Debt? One thing for sure, Judy Gustafson had proven the validity of New Hampshire's claim that it is what America used to be.

Can you guess what America's leading growth industry is? Professor Murray Weidenbaum at Washington University claims regulation is. In 1971 federal regulators spent 1.2 billion dollars. The new budget asks six billion dollars. That's a 400 percent increase in less than 10 years.

Atheist Madalyn Murray O'Hair, the same Mrs. O'Hair who got prayer banned from our public schools, is on a crusade to get "In God We Trust" removed from all U.S. money. I hope she fails. Looking at the decline in the dollar, we've never needed those words more than we need them now.

I want to be very careful with this next one. Being well aware of the emotions on both sides of the issue concerning "equal rights regardless of sex", I don't mean to offend anyone with this item.

The genders have been used as general terms for centuries in ways that actually have no reference to sex identity. For example, we use the term "man" or "mankind" when we speak of all humanity. We call a battleship a "man-of-war" yet we always refer to a ship as "she".

Now having said that, I'll give you the news item and run for cover. The Department of Defense has recommended that gender-designating words be removed from military vocabularies. Graduates of the Naval Academy at Annapolis will become midshippeople. The Navy will now have ordinance persons, torpedo persons mates and able bodied seamen will be called sailors. A Captain on the U.S.S. Detroit says, "I thought there were more important things to worry about." He's right, there are, but silliness has triumphed again.

Crime doesn't pay, or does it? Convicts in federal prisons don't have to buy 15 cent stamps -- their letters are mailed free. That is, free to them. For the taxpayer there is a charge. Last year the bill for this inmate privilege was \$580,000.

RONALD REAGAN

Reprint of a radio program entitled "Free Enterprise"

OUR FREE MARKET SYSTEM IS USUALLY TERMED "Capitalism" and by that definition capitalism has hardly been around long enough to deserve all the evil for which it is being held responsible.

Most of us aren't really conscious of how recently the capitalist system came into being. Possibly we look back and think of the extravagant luxury of kings and emperors and see that as capitalism. We have a modern counterpart today in the rulers of Marxist nations. The ruling heirarchy of the Soviet Union live on a scale more akin to royalty than do the heads of capitalist countries.

Maybe our trouble is caused by the term "capitalist" itself. Actually all systems are capitalist. It's just a matter of who owns and controls the capital -- ancient king, dictator or private individual. We should properly be looking at the contrast between a free market system where individuals have the right to live like kings if they have the ability to earn that right and government control of the market system such as we find today in socialist nations.

We have a visible example of the contrast between the free market and government ownership in a household necessity we take for granted. The invention of Alexander Graham Bell -- the telephone -- offers us irrefutable proof of the superiority of the free market.

As recently as 1880 there were only 34,000 miles of telephone wires on the whole North American continent. There were dozens and dozens of small telephone companies using several different kinds of equipment and there was no interconnection between their different companies. The same situation prevailed in all the other so-called advanced nations.

If someone had openly advanced a plan to put a phone in every home, on every farm, in every hamlet and city, and hook them all together, I'm sure someone would have said "only government has the resources to do that."

Now strangely enough in most other countries government did take over the telephone system and to this very day the telephones in a great many countries are part of the postal system. In America the government wasn't bulldozing its way into the free marketplace as it is today. For that we can be grateful. The casttered, competing phone companies were left to the magic of the marketplace. And that magic worked as it always does.

We take the phone so much for granted it's hard to realize things weren't always this way. We can dial directly to any point in the country and to a great many outside the country. It only takes a few days' trip to some of those other countries where the telephone is a government service to realize there is a difference. A long distance call can be quite an adventure; so can getting a phone installed.

But here we have them in our cars if we like; and they're in planes, trains and on boats. We bounce long distance calls off privately-owned satellites and use telephone lines for network radio and remote broadcasts of sporting and special events.

And all of this came about because private individuals wanting to make a profit for themselves kept thinking of better services to offer, confident that we'd want that better service.