The original documents are located in Box 39, folder "Reagan - Announcement of Candidacy, 11/20/75" of the Ron Nessen Papers at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Copyright Notice

The copyright law of the United States (Title 17, United States Code) governs the making of photocopies or other reproductions of copyrighted material. Ron Nessen donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections. Works prepared by U.S. Government employees as part of their official duties are in the public domain. The copyrights to materials written by other individuals or organizations are presumed to remain with them. If you think any of the information displayed in the PDF is subject to a valid copyright claim, please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

July 15, 1975

Reaction to Reagan Announcement

(If asked)

As the President said in his South Lawn news conference, his philosophy in politics has always been to run his own campaign, to run on his record, and to do his best to convince first the delegates, and then the voters, that they should vote for him. The President has never based his campaign plans on what somebody else might or might not do.

#



Citizens for Reagan For President

Sen. Paul Laxall Chairman

CONTACT: LYN NOFZIGER MATT LAWSON John P. Sears 202-223-8560

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE Tuesday, Nov. 18, 1975

Exec. Vice Ch. **George Cook**

Editorial Advisory: Ronald Reagan Appearance Schedule, Nov. 20-21

H. R. Gross

Louie B. Nunn

Treasurer

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring Henry Buchanan

WASHINGTON, D.C. -- The following tentative schedule of appearances

for former California Governor Ronald Reagan has been released by

the Citizens for Reagan Committee. This schedule will be followed, assuming

Gov. Reagan announces that he will become a candidate for the Republican

Presidential nomination.

THURSDAY, NOV. 20:

Washington, D.C. (EST)

9:30 a.m. News Conference (30 min.), Grand Ballroom, National Press Club (corner 14th & F Streets, N.W.). Announcement on Candidacy Decision.

10:30 a.m. Depart National Press Building

11:00 a.m. Depart National Airport; charter flight

Miami, Florida (EST)

1:10 p.m. Arrive Miami International Airport

1:40 p.m. Speech (20 min.), Main Ballroom, Ramada Inn (3941 West 22nd Street) 2:15 p.m. News Conference (20 min.) in partitioned, designated area of North-South Room, Ramada Inn. Filing facilities available.

3:30 p.m. Depart Ramada Inn for airport

3:50 p.m. Depart Miami International Airport

Manchester, New Hampshire (EST)

Arrive Manchester Airport, Main Terminal 6:40 p.m.

8:25 p.m. Speech with Q&A Session (approx. 1 hr.) before "Town Meeting," Main Ballroom, Sheraton Wayfarer Hotel, Manchester. Filing facilities available.

OVERNIGHT: Sheraton Wayfarer Hotel, Manchester

FRIDAY, NOV. 21:

8:00 a.m. News Conference (20 min.), Main Ballroom, Sheraton Wayfarer Hotel

8:25 a.m. Depart Wayfarer Hotel for airport 8:50 a.m. Depart Manchester airport

Charlotte, North Carolina (EST)

10:50 a.m. Arrive Charlotte Airport

11:05 a.m. Speech (15 min.) on arrival at Cannon Aviation Hanger

News Conference (20 min.) in National Guard Auditorium, Charlotte 11:25 a.m. airport. Filing facilities available.

12:25 p.m. Depart Charlotte airport

Chicago, Illinois (CST)

Arrive O'Hare Airport, Butler Aviation Terminal

1:15 p.m. News Conference (20 min.), Butler Aviation Terminal

1:45 p.m. Depart O'Hare Airport

Los Angeles, California (PST)

4:00 p.m. Arrive Hollywood-Burbank Airport

4:05 p.m. "Homecoming Celebration" with speech (15 min.) to Rally, just outside Hanger #24

4:30 p.m. News Conference (30 min.) inside Hanger #24. Filing facilities available.

6:00 p.m. Depart Hollywood-Burbank Airport for Beverly Hilton Hotel

Citizens for Reagan

For President

Sen. Paul Laxait Chairman

CONTACT: LYN NOFZIGER

202-223-8560

EMBARGOED FOR RELEASE UNTIL

9:30 a.m., Nov. 20, 1975

John P. Sears Exec. Vice Ch.

STATEMENT BY THE HON. RONALD REAGAN NOVEMBER 20, 1975

George Cook

H. R. Gross

Louie B. Nunn

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring

Thank you for coming.

Henry Buchanan Treasurer

I have called this press conference to announce that I am a

candidate for the Presidency and to ask for the support of all Americans who share my belief that our nation needs to embark on a new, constructive course.

I believe my candidacy will be healthy for the nation and my party.

I am running because I have grown increasingly concerned about the course of events in the United States and in the world.

In just a few years, three vital measures of economic decay--inflation, unemployment, and interest rates -- have more than doubled, at times reaching 10 percent and even more.

Government at all levels now absorbs more than 44 percent of our personal income. It has become more intrusive, more coercive, more meddlesome and less effective.

Our access to cheap and abundant energy has been interrupted, and our dependence on foreign sources is growing.

A decade ago we had military superiority. Today we are in danger of being surpassed by a nation that has never made any effort to hide its hostility to everything we stand for.

Through detente we have sought peace with our adversaries. We should continue to do so but must make it plain that we expect a stonger indication that they also seek a lasting peace with us.

(MORE)

2021 L St., N.W., Suite 340, Washington, D.C. 20036 • Phone: 202 / 223-8560

In my opinion, the root of these problems lies right here—in Washington, D.C.

Our nation's capital has become the seat of a "buddy" system that functions for

its own benefit—increasingly insensitive to the needs of the American worker

who supports it with his taxes.

Today it is difficult to find leaders who are independent of the forces that have brought us our problems—the Congress, the bureaucracy, the lobbyists, big business and big labor.

If America is to survive and go forward, this must change. It will only change when the American people vote for a leadership that listens to them, relies on them and seeks to return government to them. We need a government that is confident not of what it can do, but of what the people can do.

For eight years in California, we labored to make government responsive. We worked against high odds—an opposition legislature for most of those years and an obstructive Washington bureaucracy for all of them. We did not always succeed. Nevertheless, we found that fiscal responsibility is possible, that the welfare rolls can come down, that social problems can be met below the Federal level.

In the coming months I will take this message to the American people. I will talk in detail about responsible, responsive government. I will tell the people it is they who should decide how much government they want.

I don't believe for one moment that four more years of business-as-usual in Washington is the answer to our problems, and I don't think the American people believe it either.

We, as a people, aren't happy if we are not moving forward. A nation that is growing and thriving is one which will solve its problems. We must offer progress instead of stagnation; the truth instead of promises; hope and faith instead of defeatism and despair. Then, I am sure, the people will make those decisions which will restore confidence in our way of life and release that energy that is the American spirit.

REACTION TO REAGAN ANNOUNCEMENT

"The President will continue to concentrate on his duties as the President. The President expects the American people to judge him on his record as President, and believes, based on that record, he will be nominated by his party and elected by the people of the country."



Citizens for Reagan For President

Sen. Paul Laxalt Chairman John P. Sears Exec. Vice Ch.

George Cook H. R. Gross Louie B. Nunn

Mrs. Stanhope C. Ring Henry Buchanan Treasurer CONTACT: LYN NOFZIGER 202-223-8560

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESS:

Governor Reagan will vary the attached speech slightly at each stop to meet the local situation.

attachment



SPEECH BY RONALD REAGAN, NOV. 20-21, 1975

There's a passage in the Bible that says, "If the trumpet gives an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself to the battle?"

Well, just to make sure no one mistook the sound of the trumpet, I took it to Washington this morning to announce my candidacy for the Presidency.

I chose Washington because it is such an intimate part of our troubles: inflation, recession, unemployment, bureaucracy and centralized power.

There are times in a nation's history when the people become aware that only a new and constructive course can solve the problems besetting them. America is in such a time now.

Ironically, it was in another troubled time more than four decades ago that we set in motion some of the forces which have brought us to this present time of decision.

Back in the Depression years there were those who promised to overcome hard times. Franklin Delano Roosevelt embarked on a course that made bold use of government to ease the pain of those times. Although some of his measures seemed to work, he was soon moved to sound a warning. He said, "...we have built new instruments of public power in the hands of the people's government...but in the hands of political puppets of an economic autocracy, such power would provide shackles for the liberties of our people."

Unfortunately, that warning went unheeded. Today, there is an economic autocracy, born of government's growing interference in our lives. Yet Washington, for all its power, seems powerless to solve problems any more.

I am running because I have grown increasingly concerned about the course of events in the United States and in the world.

In just a few years, three vital measures of economic decay--inflation, unemployment, and interest rates--have more than doubled, at times reaching 10 percent and even more.



Government at all levels now absorbs more than 44 percent of our personal income. It has become more intrusive, more coercive, more meddlesome and less effective.

Our access to cheap and abundant energy has been interrupted, and our dependence on foreign sources is growing.

A decade ago we had military superiority. Today we are in danger of being surpassed by a nation that has never made any effort to hide its hostility to everything we stand for.

Through detente we have sought peace with our adversaries. We should continue to do so but must make it plain that we expect a stronger indication that they also seek a lasting peace with us.

In my opinion, the root of these problems lies right here—in Washington, D.C. Our nation's capital has become the seat of a "buddy" system that functions for its own benefit—increasingly insensitive to the needs of the American worker who supports it with his taxes.

Today it is difficult to find leaders who are independent of the forces that have brought us our problems--the Congress, the bureaucracy, the lobbyists, big business and big labor.

If America is to survive and go forward, this must change. It will only change when the American people vote for a leadership that listens to them, relies on them, and seeks to return government to them. We need a government that is confident not of what it can do, but of what the people can do.

For eight years in California, we labored to make government responsive.

We worked against high odds- an opposition legislature for most of those years and an obstructive Washington bureaucracy for all of them. We did not always succeed. Nevertheless, we found that fiscal responsibility is possible, that the welfare rolls can come down, that social problems can be met below the Federal level.

I am convinced that under the layer of self-doubt that seems to have settled like a fog on our country, the true, strong spirit of the American people still glows, ready to be reignited so that we can once again have a sense of mission; a pride in our capacity to perform great deeds.

Washington seems to have lost track of the American Dream. But you and millions more like you across this land have not. You are determined to be free and independent, to solve your own problems and to help your neighbors solve theirs. Over the last ten months, visiting nearly every corner of America and meeting many thousands of people, I have seen this determination in their faces and I have heard it in their voices.

I have become a candidate because I believe strongly in this American spirit to move forward; to try the untried; to dream the new dream--knowing that our energy and our ingenuity can turn them into realities.

In the coming months I will take this message to the American people. I will talk in detail about responsible, responsive government. I will tell the people it is they who should decide how much government they want.

I don't believe for one moment that four more years of business-as-usual in Washington is the answer to our problems, and I don't think the American people believe it either.

I am here to tell you that I shall be running in your primary. Not just running, but putting all my energy into it. I cannot reach the goal alone. I need your help. Together, we can reach it.

We, as a people, aren't happy if we are not moving forward. A nation that is growing and thriving is one which will solve its problems. As we work toward our goal, we must offer progress instead of stagnation; the truth instead of promises; hope and faith instead of defeatism and despair. Then I am sure the people will make those decisions which will restore confidence in our way of life and release that energy that is the American spirit.

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC NEWS RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS" ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1975

GUEST:

RONALD REAGAN - Former Governor of California and Candidate for the Presidency

INTERVIEWED BY:

BOB CLARK - ABC News Issuea and Answers Chief Correspondent

PRANDK REYNOLDS - ABC News Correspondent

This is a rush transcript for the press. Any questions regarding accuracy should be referred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS



ANNOUNCER: Former Governor of California and candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, here are the issues:

Will your challenge to President Ford destroy Republican chances of holding on to the White House?

How do you propose to reduce the power of the federal government without substantially increasing local and state taxes?

If you were President, would you go to China to advance detente?

* * *

MR. CLARK: Governor, your challenge to President Ford has been greeted with alarm by some liberals and moderates within your party. Senator Percy says your nomination would wreck the party, and Senator Mathias is talking about starting a third party.

Do you have a plan to make peace with the liberals, to keep them under the Republican banner and under your banner if you win the nomination?

MR. MEAGAN: Well, Bob, I have always disagreed with those Republicans or those outside of the party who insist on hyphenating Republicans, giving them saliva tests and classifying them into narrow brackets as to where they stand philosophically. I think all of us must have certain basic agreements or we wouldn't be in the Republican Party.

f

B

I think they are wrong, and I think what they are ignoring is a record of eight years that stands up there for anyone to look at, the record of my administration in Sacramento, California.

They can look at that record, and I doubt if they can classify that into the narrow categories that they are viewing with alarm. So I hope that by our practice of the 11th Commandment, which was given birth in California, that their fears will be eased.

MR. CLARK: Do you mean by this, Governor, that you don't think it is necessary for you to offer any special olive branch to the liberals? You think they simply have to look at your record? Is that your view?

MR. REAGAN: I think they barked rather early, and maybe if they will sit down in good faith and have a discussion -- which I would be very happy to have with them -- they would find out that their fears are groundless.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, one of the reasons, I suppose the major reason why liberals express misgivings about you is because of some of the things that you have said and the programs you have offered.

For example, your proposal to cut federal spending by consequent \$90 billion, with a / reduction in federal income taxes of about 23 percent, that you propose to give so many of these programs now funded in part or in whole by the

B

5.

federal government back to the states. Is there anybody else that you can think of in the Republican Party that really believes that kind of a program?

MR. REAGAN: Well, yes, as a matter of fact, it has been Republican philosophy for quite some years, and many times in the platform, that there was an overcentralization of government under Democratic regimes and over these last 40 years of Democratic control of the House and Senate, and that the Republican Party was pledged to government at the levels nearest the people. I think that is standard Republican philosophy.

Now, my so-called cut of \$90 billion with the total based on the '76 budget projection, it was based on the amount of money that is invested in programs that properly, regardless of the money, properly belong at the state and local level.

And my own experience in California indicates that this is so, and I think that most people today believe that. I think many of our ills would disappear if some program such as welfare and education were turned back to the states where they properly belong.

MR. REYNOLDS: What would that do to the states themselves in terms of their own financing? For example, take
the state of New Hampshire. You will be interested in New
Hampshire before very long. New Hampshire now gets, on the
subject of welfare you would propose to return all welfare
obligations back to the states. Well, the federal government

9.23

pays 62 percent of the New Hampshire's total welfare expenditures. That means New Hampshire has to either assume that or cut it down.

MR. REAGAN: This is true, and I made the point this would not be a net gain, but if these programs were turned back -- let me say, also, not an instantaneous cancellation of Federal government, and hopefully somebody picks it up. I think you would have to have an orderly phasing of these programs to local government or state government. I think state governments at the same time when this happens should be reviewing whether they should indeed pass the program on to their local communities. Then I think that you would have to have taxes increased at state and local levels to offset this, or to maintain some of these programs. Some programs undoubtedly would be dropped, because the federal government has many programs. You know there is nothing that is closer to eternal life than a government program once started at the federal level. But the thing is, what we learned in California with our own welfare reforms is, not only can they be better administered, they can be more economically administered. Now, if the federal government stopped preempting so much of the tax dollar, taking all the sources of taxation at the federal level, leaving local and state governments strapped as to where they are to get the money they need, if this was reduced at the federal level there would be leeway

24 25

1

2

2

8

15

6

7

8

68

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

for the states and local governments to take these over.

They would also be run at a much lower cost. The administrative overhead of running any program at the federal level is much greater than it is at any other level of government.

MR. CLARK: Governor Reagan, as I am sure you are aware,
New Hampshire is quite proud of the fact it is the only state
in the country that has neither state sales mr state income
taxes. Campaigning in New Hampshire on a program to turn
back responsibility for numerous federal programs to the
state, in candor wouldn't you have to tell the people of New
Hampshire that you are going to have to increase your tax burden and that probably means either a sales tax or a state
income tax?

5.



MR. REAGAN: But isn't this a proper decision for the people of the state to make?

MR. CLARK: But isn't this going to be forced on them if they are forced to take back these federal responsibilities?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, how they were to administer them, whether they would administer them is properly a decision to be made at the state level in these particular programs.

Let's emphasize I made it very plain in the same address in which I outlined this overall plan, I made it very plain that there are functions that are properly federal, properly belong to the national government and should stay there. This doesn't mean they can't be improved. It doesn't mean they can't be made more efficient. I am sure they can be.

But, as you have just said, the federal government is -your situation with regard to states -- now, in California we
have an income tax too, but we realize we are limited in that
income tax because the federal government is in there first
and that is the most elastic tax, that is the one that
grows with the economy the most, and the federal government has
pre-empted it to such an extent that local and state governments
are hard put to find legitimate sources for taxation.

MR. CLARK: Governor, that raises an interesting point.

You have lost a celebrated item here in California, proposition one where you attempted to put a limit on the amount of state taxes that should be collected and paid the taxes to the total

8

B

5

6

9

20

95

92 13

94

15

16

17

18

19

20

22

21

23

24

25

personal income in the state.

If you become President, would you try to do the same thing with federal taxes? Would you think of some outer limit that might be placed on federal income taxes?

MR. REAGAN: As a matter of fact, it is not just income taxes; it is all taxes. The perentage of the earned dollar that government takes is too high. That all governments take is too high.

It is one of the things that is holding down our economy.

We lost in California on that. We would take more than a half hour if I tried to explain it in full. Frankly, we were just out-muscled. The big lie defeated us and we didn't have the muscle to overcome it, but 69 per cent of the people who voted against that program had been deceived into believing they were voting against a tax increase.

MR. CLARK: If you become President, might you think in terms of a proposition one on the federal level?

MR. REAGAN: Well, you take your prolem to Congress but that is already there. There is legislation that has been introduced in Congress by a group of congressmen who saw this California experiment and believed --

MR. CLARK: Would you support it, though?

MR. REAGAN: I certainly would.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, before we leave this whole area,

what would your program, if fully implemented, do to the poorer states?

All states are not equal. California seems to be in pretty good shape, but what about Arkansas and Mississippi and some of these other states who don't have --

MR. REAGAN: It is true, there are states that get more from the federal government than they return to the federal government. They are low-taxed states. They are not burdened with heavy taxation, but let me ask you something: One of those high tax-paying states, so-called wealthy states, is New York.

Is New York, today, in a position to solve its own problems and at the same time send money to some other states?

MR. REYNOLDS: Is New York in a position to assume all of the programs that you would give back to New York, all Welfare costs, all aid to education and everything else?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, because many of these programs, you see, are -- the manner in which the federal government insists on their implementation is excessive, and the rules and regulations force upon states and cities like New York things that administratively they would not do if they had the leeway to do it.

Now, let's point out another thing. If Welfare were returned to the state level, a state could have a limitation, or a residency requirement in order to get welfare, which they

22

24

23

always had, until the federal government was involved to such an extent that the Supreme Court ruled that, no, you could move anywhere in the United States you wanted and instantly be eligible for Welfare in whatever state you chose.

Now, states like New York and California that have tried to do more than other states, that had higher Welfare payments, found themselves with an in-migration from these other states. But if you returned this to the states and the federal government was not involved, a state like New York that was burdened with this great in-migration could have had a rule that said "Oh, no, you have to live here a year before you are eligible for Welfare."

MR. REYNOLDS: Now that you have raised the topic, suppose we ask you, what do you think of the way the President has handled the New York situation? Are you in agreement with him as far as New York's finances are concerned?

MR. REAGAN: I am worried about a precedent being established that might be passed on, or that might lead to other cities saying, "Well, we can be careless with our bonding and we can float more bonds than our credit requires and count on the federal government to bail us out."

I do recognize that the President has placed this on

New York, reversing the trend that led to their problem.

There is no question but that the victims in New York are the three million working tax-paying citizens, working in the private sector who must put up all the money that pays for everything

d de

else; who for some 20-odd years have had their political leaders deceive them as to the practices they were following to the place that New York now has a per capita dost for basic services that is more than twice that of all the other big cities in the United States.

MR. CLARK: We would like to get a specific answer on

New York. If you were President do you think you would have

made the offer that President Ford has made to make direct

federal loans to New York City to help get it out of its

financial crisis?

MR. REAGAN: I wish I could give you an answer to that.

As I say, I am worried about the precedent.

On the other hand, I don't want to see those three million working citizens I have mentioned victimized with creditors holding the bag and with bondholders in the same position.

I haven't had an opportunity to study all the ramifications. I heard the President make his statement. It sounded like a practical plan. I have the concern that I have mentioned. I frankly want to give this more study before I tell you that is the solution that I would pick.

* * * * * *

MR. CLARK: Governor, as you know, Vice President

Rockefeller hasn't quite taken himself out of the 1976 picture.

He has declined to say flatly thathe will not be a candidate

for the Republican nomination.

Do you view him as a rival for the nomination?

MR. REAGAN: No. I am aware of his position and it is similar to a position he has taken in previous national elections and that is a decision for him to make.

I have said that I will not be surprised if, now that I have declared, if others do not follow suit and get into the race.

MR. REYNOLDS: Do you expect John Connally to come in?

MR. REAGAIN: I don't know. I think that John Connally

certainly is available and would not refuse if there was an

indication from enough people that they thought he should make
a run for it.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, what is your strategy, to knock
the President out in the early primaries, force him to withdraw?
MR. REAGAN: My strategy is a little more
naive than that. My strategy is to take my case to the people
as to what I believe should be done with regard to the problems
and what I think the solutions are, what the policy should be,
and let the people decide.



B

MR. REYNOLDS: The President has indicated no great willingness to debate you. Would you like to debate Mr. Ford, say up there in Manchester?

MR. REAGAN: Well, I have to say this. I know that the challenge and the rejection of debate is kind of a campaign tactic that is used both ways, in politics. I have to say that I believe the people can find out what you believe, what your principles are, without the two of you appearing simultaneously.

MR. REYNOLDS: You don't think it is easier to choose between the two of you, if they could see you side by side discussing these issues, having a free and frank exchange of views?

MR. REAGAN: Well, is it any different than seeing each candidate frankly express his views and then someone else -- and you gentlemen of the press make no -- you leave no stone unturned to pin each one of us down on what the other one has done and what you would do likewise. I am not sure that it is beneficial.

MR. CLARK: Governor, one more question about Vice President Rockefeller. He has refused to say that if you win the nomination he would support you. If by some chance he became the Republican nominee, would you support him?

MR. REAGAN: Well, he is not even a candidate yet.

I will wait and answer that when he becomes a candidate.

I think I would be surprised and disappointed if Vice President Rockefeller took that attitude with regard to a Republican nominee. I would be surprised, myself. I believe in the philosophy of the Republican Party. I know that the Vice President and I differ philosophically on a number of points. At the same time, we have a most friendly and cordial relationship.

MR. CLARK: Governor, would you say -- this is a way out of the dilemma we put politicians in on this -- would you simply say you would support the nominee of the Republican Convention, whoever he may be?

MR. REAGAN: Well, now, that is a hypothetical question.

MR. CLARK: Is that hypothetical? There aren't very many candidates.

MR. REAGAN: Wait a minute. You can get into all sorts of things. Would I, when I was a Democrat, would I have stayed with my party in '72 when they chose a man who I thought was so far afield from what the American people wanted, then the answer would be no. So you can't rule that that can't happen to any party as it did to that one. I don't think it could happen to the Republican Party, but you can't make a flat assertion that it won't.

MR. REYNOLDS: You are well on your way right now to reviving talk about a third party with you heading a third party possibly?

MR. REAGAN: No, I rule that out.

MR. CLARK: Neither you nor Vice President Rockefeller will say they will support the nominee of the party. Doesn't this inspire the sort of divisiveness that Republican leaders in both the left and right wings, the liberal and conservative wings, are trying to avoid?

MR. REAGAN: No. There are two candidates at the moment for the nomination of the Republican Party - myself and President Ford. If President Ford wins, I will support him.

MR. CLARK: There have been reports when you telephoned President Ford to tell him you were going to challenge him for the nomination he told you, as the report read, that this would cause bitterness and divisiveness within the party and weaken its chances of defeating the Democrats next year. Did the President say this to you?

MR. REAGAN: The President expressed a concern. I made my pledge to him about doing nothing divisive. He made the same pledge to me. He did express a concern that in spite of this, the other people who are involved in campaigns, that the danger was there. Well, I have the experience of a '66 campaign in California in which we all did observe the 11th Commandment, and we put the Republican Party back together in this state for the first time in 50 years, that it had been a united party.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, do you believe the President's current trip to China -- he is on his way there today -- is worthwhile?

MR. REAGAN: Well, he expressed the hope it was to improve chances for peace. In that regard I hope it is successful.

Frankly, I have to wonder if it isn't time for China to come visit us.

MR. CLARK: Governor, one of the questions that is still
h anging over our relations with China is whether we should
upgrade our diplomatic relations with China and establish an
embassy in Peking. Now, the one could be that this would mean
abandoning Taiwan. If you were President, would you take that fur
ther step toward closer relationships to China?

MR. REAGAN: Not if it in any way reduced our relationships with Taiwan. Taiwan is an ally. We have a treaty
with Taiwan. I believe Taiwan as a trade partner is an
economic force in the world far in excess of Mainland China. But
while I want better relations on an honest basis with Red
China, as I am sure everyone else does, that this country
not, if it means sacrificing our relationship with Taiwan.

MR. CLARK: Would you, as President, place conditions over further moves toward detente with the Russians? Would you want specific for instance, on the subject of further talks toward mutual

reductions of nuclear arms?

MR. REAGAN: I have criticized detente because I don't

out to be, and as it is supposed to be. I believe Russia is spirit, the violating certainly the/intent of detente, with its help to the rebels in Angola and its involvement in the civil war in Angola. I think that the Soviet Union with its out-spending us in both nuclear and conventional weapons, its rapid build-up trying to atain a superiority, none of this is in the spirit of detente, and I think detente, a worthy idea -- none of us wants confrontation, we want a world that can find areas where we can discuss our problems and talk about them -- I believe the United States, however, should insist that we not give more than we are getting.

MR. REYNOLDS: Is that what has happened, Governor? Have we given more than we have been getting?

MR. REAGAN: I think we have. As I say, we are not involved in Angola, we are not involved in Portugal as the Soviet
U nion is. We have just had the Congress of the United States
I think dangerously reduce our defense budget, but we know
that the Russians are outspending us, 60 percent in nuclear
weapons, 25 percent in conventional weapons. They have added
2,000 pieces of artillery and 1,000 tanks to the forces in
Eastern Europe that are opposed to the NATO line. We have added
none. I think this is not detente, as I view it.



MR. REYNOLDS: You have said that you believed the Vladivostok Agreement should be renegotiated. How would you persuade the Russians to do this?

MR. REAGAN: I think we gave away too much in Vladivostok.

SALT I started out on a basis of equality. This is all actually former Secretary Schlesinger was aiming at with the budget he submitted. It was not a superiority but an equality of arms.

To maintain a status quo. What was left out in Vladivostok was throw weight. We counted numbers of missiles. Well, if we are going to have "x" number of little rocks and you are going to have "x" number of great hig rocks, it is not going to be an even contest if we have to start throwing them at each other.

MR. CLARK: Governor, we wanted to ask you a couple of specific questions.

President Ford is under pressure from conservatives and the oil industry to veto the compromise oil energy package finally being worked out by Congress. If you were President, would you veto this compromise bill?

MR. REAGAN: Yes. In two ways it violates to me everything that we need to do. First of all, it wtakes away any stimulant for the production of new sources of energy in this country, and, second of all, it does away with one important factor in attempting conservation.

Now, there is a need for conservation on the part of the

make all of us that have to drive into the gas station and fill up the tank, at the same time we have to recognize it is going to encourage further use of petroleum sources.

MR. CLARK: And, Governor, another specific question:

Do you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit courts from ordering school busing to achieve racial balance or integration?

MR. REAGAN: Well, before we turn to a constitutional amendment — I know it is awful easy to look at that as a simple answer to many things, and I don't think the Constitution should deteriorate into involving itself in what should be done by statute and legislation. If that is a last resort, yes, because I am unalterably opposed to forced busing. I don't think it has solved the problem. It has added to the bitterness we were trying to alleviate.

education is one of the areas where I think the federal government should get its nose out. Again, if control of schools was turned back to the local level, then those decisions would be made by the people at the local level in the local school districts and forced busing usually has come from decisions at the federal level.

MR. REYNOLDS: What is your alternative to busing, Governor?

E

MR. REAGAN: I think there are a number of alternatives.

I think, for one thing, you start out, if there are schools of unequal quality, if you have schools in a metropolitan area like New York and Los Angeles, where in certain areas they are inferior in facilities and teaching quality to others, you upgrade that. But I think there are things that you can do --

MR. CLARK: Governor, I hate to interrupt you in the middle of an answer as complicated as this one, but we are out of time. Thank you very much for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

MR. REAGAN: Thank you.

••

SERALO SERALO