

The original documents are located in Box 17, folder “Presidential Statements and Remarks (1)” of the Michael Raoul-Duval 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. Michael Raoul-Duval donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

OCTOBER 6, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(San Francisco, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AND
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH
EDITH GREEN
GEORGE FELDMAN
AND
DOM DIMAGGIO
CO-CHAIRPERSONS OF THE
CITIZENS FOR FORD

SUTRO RESIDENCE



9:28 A.M. PDT

THE PRESIDENT: Good morning, everybody. It is typical San Francisco weather, which we enjoy.

I am especially pleased this morning to have the opportunity of announcing a Citizens For Ford Committee, and the three co-chairpersons are all very good friends of mine. Let me announce them individually.

First, former Congresswoman Edith Green of Oregon. Edith and I served in the House of Representatives together for 19 years. She was on the other side of the aisle but we worked together in many, many areas in order to try and enact good legislation. She was a wonderful person to have on your side but a person that was awesome if she was on the other side. But I always felt that Edith Green was one of the most able, most articulate, most dedicated Members of the House that I knew in my 25-plus years as a Member. So, I am extremely pleased to have Edith Green as one of the co-chairpersons of the Citizens For Ford Committee.

The next is George Feldman of New York and Massachusetts. I first got to know George Feldman in 1958 when he was the staff Director of the Select Committee on Space. I was a member of that committee. He was chosen by the then Chairman of that committee, the former Speaker, John McCormack. I worked with George Feldman for the whole time in the hearings and the writing of the report and the preparation of the legislation.

Subsequently, George served under President Kennedy as the Ambassador to Luxembourg and to Malta. In addition, he was a delegate to the United Nations. He was a member of the Law of the Sea Conference in 1961.

Our friendship has gone on from 1958 to the present time. And I thank him for his willingness to participate in the Citizens For Ford Committee.

MORE

The third member of this top group is Dom Dimaggio. Dom is well-known out here on the West Coast. I have known Dom Dimaggio-- because I am an avid reader of the sports page -- I know from the records that he was one of the outstanding baseball players of all-time. He had a batting average of 300 over a good many years in the American League. He contributed significantly to the success of the Boston Red Sox.

He is a person who has shown an active interest in public affairs, and I am very, very pleased to have Dom Dimaggio as a member of this group of three.

So, I would like the three of them -- Edith, George and Dom -- to come down here and we have agreed that we will answer some of your questions concerning the organization or any questions that they might like to respond to.

QUESTION: Mr. President, is this a group for Democrats primarily?

THE PRESIDENT: This is a group that will permit Independents and Democrats who wish, to support the Ford candidacy. It doesn't put an emphasis on either group. It is a citizens committee that will seek to invite and involve non-Republicans on my behalf.

QUESTION: Mrs. Green, why did you decide to go Republican?

MRS. GREEN: I really did not decide to go Republican. In my own State of Oregon, I am supporting a good many of the Democrats. By and large, I am supporting Democrats.

If the question is, why did I decide to support Ford, the reasons are many. As the President said, I worked with him in the House of Representatives -- I was going to say 20 years, 19 is correct -- and during all of these years we knew that President Ford, Jerry Ford at that time, as the Minority Leader, was a very honest, decent, capable guy. We knew that when he got up on the Floor he had done his homework, that he said what he believed in and he perhaps was not the flamboyant kind of a person as Adam Clayton Powell or maybe Bella Abzug, but he was a guy to be trusted and that, very frankly, is the reason that I am supporting him.

QUESTION: Mrs. Green, did you think you did not have an alternative in the other candidate? (Inaudible)

MRS. GREEN: I never, in the 20 years that I ran for office, tried to say things adversely about my opponent. And my comments are not against anybody else but they are for the President, and I guess I just really do not know Carter. I do not know what he stands for and, believe me, I tried to find out.

MORE

I do know that the record that the President has set, not only during the time he was in Congress but since, is one where I feel I have confidence in the way the country would be run.

I might add one other thing. When I was in the House I was one of those -- some 400 I think, about -- who voted for Jerry Ford for the Vice Presidency, and I think I do not need to remind you that at that time there were 300 FBI people who were out investigating everything that he had ever done and said -- almost from the day you were born, I guess -- and that was a Democratically-controlled Congress and it was when Watergate was just beginning to surface and the Democratically-controlled House and the Senate were certainly looking at everything that Jerry Ford had ever done.

It went to the Judiciary Committee in the House. They investigated again. He came through with flying colors and in a Democratically-controlled House and Senate -- as I recall, the vote was somewhere around 400 to 30 or at least there were about 30 of the Democrats who would not support him -- but the big majority, 10 to 1 of Democrats and Republicans, voted for him because they did trust him and knew that he had been a decent and honorable guy.

QUESTION: How are you setting up the national committee? Are you going to have groups in every city?

MRS. GREEN: We will try to reach as many people as possible. We are going to talk about that this afternoon and certainly we want to appeal to as many -- not only the Republicans but also the Independents and the Democrats.

QUESTION: Mr. President, how do you think you will do on the debates tonight on foreign policy and defense?

THE PRESIDENT: Helen, I am looking forward to it. I would like to wait and see how it comes out, but I am optimistic and I am looking forward to it.

QUESTION: Mr. President, does the formation of this group at this time, a month before the election, indicate that your campaign is in a little trouble with Democrats and Independents?

THE PRESIDENT: Not at all. I think it is a reflection that there are many, many Independents and Democrats who are uncomfortable with my opponent and who believe that the record that I had, both as a Member of Congress and as Vice President and as President, is one that they can wholeheartedly support.

We find there is a groundswell of Independents and Democrats, and this is reflected in the increase of the Ford margin in the polls, so Dom and Edith and George are going to be the heads of that group to stimulate an even greater movement toward the Ford candidacy.

QUESTION: Thank you very much.

THE PRESIDENT: It is nice to see you all. See you tonight.

END (AT 9:37 A.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 6, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(San Francisco, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH THE PRESIDENT

THE PALACE OF FINE ARTS



8:05 P.M. PDT

QUESTION: Mr. President, you have said tonight that these issues were complicated and difficult to discuss. Do you think that you did a good enough job of discussing Eastern Europe, or do you think you left some confusion?

THE PRESIDENT: I answered all of the questions, I set forth our policies, and the final note, of course, is that we are at peace, and we are going to keep the peace.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you think that Mr. Carter responded to the first question or went and made an opening statement?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I thought he was very general, as I indicated. He covered a great many issues without talking about any answers. Therefore, I thought that he ought to be pinned down and I thought the questioners made a big effort to do so. I certainly hope that the American people will make certain in the future that he gives specific answers to specific questions.

QUESTION: Who won the debate?

THE PRESIDENT: I think we did all right. We enjoyed it.

QUESTION: How do you think you did in comparison to Carter?

THE PRESIDENT: I am not the best one to pass judgment on that. I felt comfortable, I answered the questions specifically and I feel very good about tonight, just as I did about the first one.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. President.

END (AT 8:08 P.M. PDT)

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(San Francisco, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH THE PRESIDENT

THE SUTRO RESIDENCE

8:36 P.M. PDT

QUESTION: Mr. President, could you tell us who you talked with since you came home?

THE PRESIDENT: I talked to my wonderful wife and to Secretary Kissinger.

QUESTION: Well, what did they have to say to you?

THE PRESIDENT: They all thought we did quite well.

QUESTION: They think you won it?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, they are a little prejudiced but I think they were optimistic about the outcome of it.

QUESTION: What did Secretary Kissinger have to say? Anything specific about how the debate had gone with this subject?

THE PRESIDENT: He just felt that we had taken the offensive and we had talked affirmatively about our successes. That was the truth, so he was very pleased.

QUESTION: Do you agree with Mrs. Ford and the Secretary that you won it?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, I don't disagree with my wife very often, so on this occasion I will agree with her, as I do on most.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. President.

END (AT 8:37 P.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 6, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
..... (San Francisco, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
TO THE
BAY AREA PRESIDENT FORD COMMITTEE
TELEVISION DEBATE PARTY

THE ST. FRANCIS HOTEL

8:55 P.M. PDT

Let me thank all of you for coming here, and let me express my deepest appreciation for not only being here, but the support that you are going to give us in the weeks ahead. We have less than three or four weeks to go before November 2, so we have got a lot of work to do and we have got to do it fast and well, and November 2 will be a great victory for the American people.

I am honored to have on the platform here tonight a number of my very close personal friends and very ardent and strong and effective supporters. Let me introduce them to you.

First is Senator Howard Baker of Tennessee and Mrs. Baker. And then, of course, is your Attorney General from the State of California, Evelle Younger. We have two of my very close and very helpful friends from the United States Congress, Congressman Pete McCloskey, and another very good friend from the State of California, an outstanding Member of the House of Representatives, Don Clausen. And then there is a man who I have long admired, who I think will be an outstanding Member of the United States Senate, Dr. Hayakawa.

Now, just a minute to be serious. The reason we are going to win on November 2 is that for the last two years we have had good policies domestically and we have had sound and effective policies internationally. We started from behind, and how many can remember just a few weeks ago when the polls showed that we were 32 points behind? I would much rather be a slow starter and a fast finisher.

I said in Kansas City we don't concede a single State, we don't concede a single vote, that we were going to campaign from the snowy banks of Minnesota to the sandy plains of Georgia, and we are. California is one of the most crucial and critical States in this election. I am encouraged by the polls. We are behind, but we are going to win. Thank you for making it possible. Thank you for tonight.

END (AT 8:58 P.M. PDT)

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(San Francisco, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AND
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION

PALACE OF FINE ARTS

12:19 P.M. PDT

QUESTION: Mr. President, as Jimmy Carter was leaving the auditorium here, he said that he thought that your insensitivity towards blacks for not apologizing for the Earl Butz affair made that a legitimate issue for this foreign policy debate. How do you answer that?

THE PRESIDENT: It seems to me that Governor Carter ought to think back to his comment about ethnic purity which was interpreted to be a slur against blacks, and his subsequent apology. I don't think his record is clear in itself. I think we took the appropriate action in the way we handled the Butz matter.

QUESTION: No apology was appropriate, then?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, Earl Butz did apologize. Earl Butz did get a reprimand by me. That was done several days before his resignation. But I think it is appropriate to bring up the fact that a few months ago Governor Carter, with his ethnic purity comment, did slur blacks and he apologized. Earl Butz did likewise.

QUESTION: Mr. President, Jimmy Carter says that when you two debate tonight, you will be debating as equals. Do you agree with that?

THE PRESIDENT: I will let the American people decide that.

QUESTION: Mr. President, some of your aides have indicated that you, as President of the United States, will have more constraints on you tonight than Jimmy Carter will. I don't understand why this is so. Can you explain? Or do you believe that?

THE PRESIDENT: I will speak very frankly. I believe that a President under these circumstances, who has got a good record, can speak forthrightly, straightforwardly and frankly, and I intend to do that.

QUESTION: So you see no constraints?

THE PRESIDENT: I don't see any.

MORE

QUESTION: Do you plan to make any new announcements tonight in terms of foreign policy and defense initiatives?

THE PRESIDENT: Listen carefully.

QUESTION: That is a hint, Mr. President, isn't it?
(Laughter)

QUESTION: Are you going to be more aggressive tonight than you were at the other debate?

THE PRESIDENT: Ann, we will wait and see.

QUESTION: What is the answer to Helen's question?

QUESTION: It sounds like you have got something new up your sleeve.

THE PRESIDENT: I just said that you should listen carefully.

QUESTION: Mr. President, how do you feel about this report by the Congressional investigators, the General Accounting Office, criticizing your handling of the MAYAGUEZ incident?

THE PRESIDENT: It is always very easy for someone 18 months after a very critical issue has taken place to write a report. Of course, none of those "Johnny-come-lately" Monday morning critics were there when the incident happened. So, they didn't have to make the minute-by-minute decision. I can't help but feel that the issuance of that report at this time is another example of partisan politics, and I don't think the American people will believe somebody who, with the luxury of 18 months afterward, can sit back and write a report. I think they will believe a President who was there and had to make decisions on an incident that was important to the American foreign policy.

QUESTION: How important is tonight's debate in the overall campaign?

THE PRESIDENT: They are all very, very important, and I look at this one as important, and I look at the one on the 22nd as important.

QUESTION: This one has no special significance?

THE PRESIDENT: They are all very important.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. President.

END (AT 12:24 P.M. PDT)

OCTOBER 7, 1976

(Beverly Hills, California)

REMARKS OF RONALD REAGAN
FORMER GOVERNOR OF THE
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
AT THE
GOP FUND-RAISING DINNERS
OVER CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION



Bob, ladies and gentlemen:

In an election year 40 years ago an American of unquestioned patriotism, one-time Presidential candidate Al Smith, Mr. Democrat himself, went before a nationwide radio audience. Sadly, he told his fellow Americans that after a lifetime in the Democratic Party he could no longer follow the leadership of that party as it took this Nation down a path that led to socialism and the loss of freedom. His final words were, "I am going to take a walk."

Four years ago, the Democratic leadership took that party down a path that millions of patriotic Democrats couldn't follow and now the same leadership is charting the same course. Rank and file Democrats will take a walk once again. They will walk to our party, if you and I will make them see what the Republican Party offers is what they themselves want for America.

If I may paraphrase the first President, George Washington, "We have raised the standards around which the brave and the honest can rally." For the first time in my memory, our party has a platform fashioned at the grass-roots level by party members, which makes clear what the Republican Party represents.

Our opponents have a platform replete with promises fashioned by the party leadership and tailored to the specifications of their Presidential candidate. Indeed, Jimmy Carter was the principal architect.

On the cover of the Democratic platform, it proclaims, "This platform is a contract with the people." But those who become a partner in that contract are pledged to more and bigger Government, more spending and more inflation. In page after page it calls for the Federal solutions to all the problems besetting us -- federalization of welfare, compulsory socialized medicine and Federal regulation of the economy -- and that last probably spells out better than anything the fundamental difference between our parties and our two candidates.

MORE

They endorsed the Humphrey-Hawkins bill, which would give the Federal Government the power to set production and employment goals, allocate resources and labor, control marketing.

Their platform pledges to give Washington the full power to engage in national economic planning, deciding where we will work, what kind of work we will do, what we will be paid, what we will produce and what the price of the products will bring.

A man named Mussolini did that some years ago and they called it fascism. Their platform proposes over 60 new or expanded Federal spending programs and the expansion or creation of some 22 Washington agencies, offices and bureaus.

And then it implies there will be no added cost to Government. And if that is true, then Jimmy has made some kind of special deal with the tooth fairy.
(Laughter)

Our platform calls for less Government spending and less inflation and a return of authority to levels of Government closer to the people in such fields as welfare and education, freedom in the marketplace for the worker, the farmer, the shopkeeper and particularly the energy industry to reduce our independence on foreign oil.

In the Democratic Convention, where their platform was born, we heard speaker after speaker last July deplore the unsolved problems of human misery with no acknowledgement of their 40-year record of failure to deal with those problems. They denounced inflation and unemployment as if someone else were to blame.

Our platform contains an answer to their hypocrisy. It says the platform above all rejects deficit spending by the Federal Government which erodes the purchasing power of the dollar. And then it goes on to explain that the number one destroyer of jobs is inflation and the number one cause of inflation is Government's expansion of the money supply and credit created out of thin air to pay for deficit spending.

Inflation is the direct responsibility of years of Democratic control of a spendthrift Congress. There hasn't even been a day in the last two decades where they could not have curbed the spending, ended inflation and in so doing reduced unemployment if they wanted to, or if they knew how, but this would have gone counter to their doctrinary liberalism which Jimmy Carter pleads publicly on television for all to see about the inequities and loopholes of the tax structure.

I wish he would answer one question: Which Republican Congress created the legislation that created that tax structure?

MORE

There has only been one Republican Congress in the last 40 years, and that was 22 years ago. The position of our two parties on the urgent problem of defending freedom in an increasingly hostile world is also spelled out in the platforms. Again, compare, for the difference is there for all to see. The Democratic platform speaks of an adequate defense and then asks for a \$5 to \$7 billion cut in the defense budget. That is a little like the young fellow who called his girl on the phone one night. He said, "Honey, I love you so much. I would climb the highest mountain, I would swim the deepest ocean to be at your side. I will be over Wednesday night if it doesn't rain."
(Laughter)

The Republican platform states unequivocally our belief in military superiority as the best way to keep the peace, and it is specific in its promises to develop new weapons systems to achieve that superiority. It does more. It counters the dangerous wording of the Democratic platform, which would tempt aggressors, as North Korea was tempted by injudicious language a quarter of a century ago. We paid with the lives of 33,000 young Americans.

Our platform renews our allegiance to our allies and states that American troops will never again be committed to the purpose of our own defense or that of our allies unless we intend to achieve our stated purpose. In other words, no young Americans will be asked to fight and die for their country unless it be for a cause their country intends to win.

On November 2 Americans will go to the polls. Before November 2, you and I must bring to their attention the real choice that we have: Increased spending; increased inflation, with all that it means; increased control of our daily lives by a Government that has grown beyond the concept of the governed; or we can have the right to choose, to control our own destiny, our own lives; to raise our children as we think best; to have Government once again the servant, not the master.

We can do this by returning to Washington
Gerald Ford and Bob Dole.

Thank you very much.

END

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Hawthorne, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT
NORTH AMERICAN ROCKWELL
B-1 DIVISION

9:35 A.M. PDT

Bob, Congressman Rousselot, Congressman Moorhead, ladies and gentlemen:

Let me at the outset congratulate you, Bob, and the B-1 Division of the Rockwell International. It is a great privilege and a very high honor for me to have the opportunity of being here with you today.

Last night, as some of you may know, I engaged in a very serious discussion about the need for maintaining a strong national defense. My opponent and I differ on how to go about that process. One of those differences is represented by the model that you work on, that I have just seen, and I think it is a crucial issue in this campaign.

But first, let me congratulate all of you for winning the Zero Defect Award. I am glad you are not working for the Carter campaign. (Laughter) I might say parenthetically that there are a lot of defects to chose in that campaign, but one of the biggest of Mr. Carter's defects is his opposition to the B-1 bomber.

As you and I meet this morning, thousands of American servicemen all around the globe are standing watch, some patrolling borders, some sailing a ship and some manning our aircraft. As Commander-in-Chief, I am responsible for each one of them. We owe each one of those young Americans not just our support and our prayers -- we owe them the very best equipment that this country can buy.

Our current manned bomber, the B-52, is already more than 20 years old, and by the time the B-1 is ready to take its place the B-52 will be in operation over four decades. I don't believe that any President should ask any serviceman to defend his country in a combat aircraft that is older than he is.

Last night, we both agreed on the need for toughness in facing the Soviet Union.

MORE

But toughness requires more than talk. It requires having the right weapons systems. If we want peace in the world, we have to let our enemies know we are willing to defend the peace. They may or they may not understand that in English, but this B-1 is the message that they will clearly understand.

The B-1 is one of the clearest examples as to what is at stake in this campaign. My opponent either favors the cancelling or the delay of the B-1. His running mate in the Senate, Senator Mondale, voted against the B-1 in the Senate no less than three times. They say the B-1 is unnecessary. I certainly hope and pray that is true, but what if those critics are wrong?

The very fact that we don't have the B-1 could well invite a challenge from abroad. If we are wrong about buying the B-1, the cost will be measured in dollars and cents. If we are wrong about not buying the B-1, the cost could well be measured in lives and in blood.

As President, I will not take the chance. Our children will live in a future where Soviet technology poses an increasing threat to the security of the United States. The B-1 bomber provides graphic proof to our friends and to our enemies that 200 years have not diminished America's commitment to freedom.

The B-1 bomber is not the only major difference in this campaign. Another fundamental critical issue is the proper size of America's defense budget. The issue is simple. Our opponent wants to cut it. We want to keep intact and keep it strong.

Over the last year and a half, our opponent has cited various figures as to how much the defense budget ought to be cut. About a year ago, Mr. Carter said it could be cut \$15 billion. A few months ago he changed and said it could be cut \$7 to \$9 billion, and now the figure they use is \$5 to \$7 billion.

They are vague about the place where those cuts could be made, but the realities of manpower needs and pension requirements and many, many other fixed costs insure that a cut of that magnitude -- whether it is 15, or 7 to 9, or 5 to 7 -- would have to come from weapon system procurement. That would be a strategic tragedy for America. It would be an economic tragedy for the State of California and other States which do the research and development and build this wonderful weapon system.

MORE

Our opponent's platform amounts to an overall policy of "fire them and hire them." First, \$5 to \$7 billion in defense cuts would put you and thousands and thousands of others out of work. Then the Humphrey-Hawkins bill would try to put you back to work in dead-end public service jobs. That formula would be a triple disaster. It would mean less defense, it would mean less real employment, it would mean more taxes and more inflation.

Our opponents have managed to turn the words of President Teddy Roosevelt upside down. Some of you may recall that Teddy Roosevelt once said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Our opponent wants to speak loudly and carry a fly swatter.

Such an attitude is a danger to our military and diplomatic stability abroad and to our economic stability here in America. World peace depends on continued American military strength. Over the years, the workers of California have played a vital role in maintaining that strength and keeping that peace.

You have done a great job. In the next four years I am going to see that you keep right on doing it.

Thank you, and congratulations.

END (AT 9:45 A.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 7, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Los Angeles, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN CALIFORNIA CAMPUS
DOHENY LIBRARY

12:37 P.M. PDT

Glenn, Dr. Hubbard, Bob Portnoy -- I should say, Bob Fluor and Hugh Portnoy -- students, faculty and guests:

It is great to be at the home of the University of Southern California, the home of the conquering Trojans. I will tell you one thing: I would rather run against Jimmy Carter than Rickey Bell any time. (Laughter) And I might add that I started out way behind, but I have been swimming upstream ever since.

By November, I hope to be known as the John Naber of politics. The opinion polls have been very encouraging lately. As I said in Kansas City a few weeks ago, the only polls that count are the polls that the American people go to on November 2.

My campaign experts tell me if past performance is a guide, your age group will be the least represented at the polls on election day. When I was Minority Leader in the House of Representatives, I worked hard with many others to lower the voting age to 18. Even though some of the experts said young Americans would vote against my party more than for it, I wanted to open up the system, make sure that you had a voice as to what goes on in your Government.

But for one reason or another most people your age have never taken advantage of this new right and this new privilege. The experts say the majority probably won't vote in this election. I hope that forecast is wrong, and I believe it is wrong.

You have the biggest stake in the country's future. You must take an active interest in the work of your Government. One reason for the low turnout, probably, the low turnout of the past, must be that some of you have been disappointed so many times.

MORE

Through most of your lives America has been in turmoil. Some of our most beloved leaders were assassinated, including my good friend and our President John F. Kennedy, who spoke here as a candidate in 1960 and whose memory is honored with a plaque in your library.

There was a war that seemed to have no end. There were destructive riots in our cities and on some of our campuses. We suffered runaway inflation and the worst recession in 40 years. We were betrayed by wrongdoings at the highest level of our Government.

But let me assure you that things are better in the United States of America today, and they are going to get better in the future.

On August 9, 1974, as I said on taking the oath of office as President, our long national nightmare is over. In the last two years, the United States of America has made an amazing comeback and, as I said a moment ago, we are not through yet.

In the last two years trust has been restored to the White House. We have turned the economy around. We are at peace, and I will keep it that way.

We have entered an era of good feeling. We have given the American people a fresh start for the future.

On July 4 of this year, we celebrated the biggest birthday party in our Nation's history. America was 200 years old and going strong into the future. We found ourselves healed and united as never before. We found that we were looking at the future with faith instead of fear. For all our faults, for all of the troubles we have had in recent years, we felt proud to be Americans, proud of this great country that we live in and work for and will do our best for in the future.

We still have our share of serious problems. We still have goals that have not been reached. But we have found a strength in ourselves and in our national character that is more powerful than all of our armaments, more precious than all of our wealth and as enduring as the United States Constitution.

As we look back to the days of the American Revolution, we felt the same strong spirit which guided the courageous men and women who founded this Nation.

MORE

We realize more vividly than ever before that we are the heirs of the greatest, the most constructive, the most enduring revolution in the history of mankind. As we move forward into the third century of America's independence, we know that the challenges of the future will be greater than those we faced in the past.

Here at home our greatest challenge is to insure that every American who wants a job can find a job, a job that gives a person pride as well as a paycheck, a job with an opportunity for advancement, a job generated by the demands of a healthy economy, not manufactured by a big brother Government.

We must make it easier for people to buy a home, a home of their own, while they are still young enough to enjoy it. We must make sure that our older people don't have to go broke just to get well. We must make it possible for every young American to get an education of the highest quality, an education that you can use when you get out of school -- U.S.C., Michigan, Yale or any other of the outstanding educational institutions in this country today.

We must make sure that our streets and campuses are free from the threat of violent crime. We must try harder to protect our environment, to purify the water that we drink and the air that we breathe. We must enlarge our capacity for recreation, enrich and preserve our treasure of natural beauty and our heritage of history throughout America.

We must keep America strong and secure, but with volunteers and not with a military draft. Above all, we must keep the peace that America enjoys today, the peace that finds no Americans in combat anywhere throughout the globe right now.

I am the first President in 20 years to stand for election in a time of peace. You are the first generation of college graduates who in 15 years do not have to face the prospect of going to war, and I intend to keep it that way.

Keeping peace with freedom is the key to all of our hopes and aspirations. Without peace, we cannot concentrate on improving the quality of life in America. Without freedom, life has no quality at all. Therefore, I will take every possible step to build peace, not only for ourselves, but for all of the world.

MORE

We are taking those steps today toward peace where the going is hardest, but where the stakes are the highest -- the Middle East, Southern Africa and the strategic arms limitation talks with the Soviet Union.

After so many years of war, we are proud as a nation to stand for peace. We are proud to stand for what is right in the world -- human dignity, decency, equality and freedom.

Last night in the debate, I spoke of America's firm support for the aspiration for independence of the nations of Eastern Europe. The United States has never conceded -- and never will concede -- their domination by the Soviet Union. I admire the courage of the Polish people and have always supported the hopes of Polish-Americans for freedom of their ancestral homeland.

It is our policy to use every peaceful means to assist countries in Eastern Europe in their efforts to become less dependent on the Soviet Union and to establish closer and closer ties with the West and, of course, the United States of America.

I am very much aware of the present plight of the Eastern European nations, and as I declared in this year's Captive Nation Proclamation, and I quote, "The United States supports the aspirations for freedom, independence and national self-determination of all people. We do not accept foreign domination over any nation," period.

We really believe, as our founders did, that these are the inalienable rights of people everywhere. We believe that America is a very special country, that in 200 years we have passed from open rebellion against foreign misrule to a peaceful, continuing revolution for the rights of free men and women.

If we are to be true to our heritage, Americans must continue to have the confidence that we control our own lives and we can leave our children a better world than we found; that Government will be under our control, a capable servant, and not a meddling master.

We did not throw off the bonds of oppressive Government in the 18th century only to create one for ourselves two centuries later. The greatest danger I see in America today is the overwhelming of the individual -- you and millions like you in this wonderful country -- being overwhelmed by the massive institutions of Government, business, labor, communications -- yes, even education.

MORE

I see Government growing too large, too powerful, too costly, too remote, too deeply involved in our daily lives. The mounting troubles in Great Britain, our old and honored ally, offer compelling evidence that we cannot keep relying on Government alone to solve all of our problems.

Faced with the greatest financial crisis in the history of British democracy, Prime Minister Callaghan, before a recent convention of his Labor Party, had the courage to say, and I quote him, "Britain for too long has lived on borrowed time, borrowed money and borrowed ideas. We will fail," he said, "if we think we can buy our way out of our present difficulties by printing confetti money and paying ourselves more than we earn."

That is advice that I think in good conscience we should take. We must not let that happen in America now or in the future. We better avoid it. We can avoid it, and as long as I am President of the United States, we will avoid it.

We must have a new generation of freedom in America--not the freedom to shirk our responsibilities and to let the Government assume them, but the freedom to do what we want to do and what we ought to do.

With the Government's help -- but not at the Government's direction -- that is the kind of America that I want. That is why I am a candidate for the Presidency of the United States and why I come here on this wonderful campus and ask you for your help on November 2.

Thank you very much.

END

(AT 12:56 P.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 7, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Los Angeles, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
GOP FUND-RAISING DINNERS
OVER CLOSED CIRCUIT TELEVISION

THE BEVERLY HILTON HOTEL

7:52 P.M. PDT

Bob, Governor Reagan, Mrs. Reagan, Holmes Tuttle, Margaret Brock, Cardinal Manning, Rabbi Magnin, distinguished guests at 22 dinners across the land, ladies and gentlemen:

It has been seven weeks since Kansas City. We have got the issues, we have got the momentum, and we have got less than four weeks to win a great victory for the America people, and we will.

I said in Kansas City that we wouldn't concede a single vote, we wouldn't concede a single State -- and we haven't and we won't. Governor Reagan and I are teaming up to say we are going to carry California with its 45 electoral votes, we are going to elect a Republican Senator and a number of new Republican Congressmen America can be proud of in the next session of the Congress.

I told you in Kansas City that I was ready and eager to debate Mr. Carter face to face on the real issues. I still am, if I can ever pin him down. (Laughter) I don't think he knows what the real issues are.

We have heard a lot of double-talk from Mr. Carter, a lot of conversation, a lot of irresponsible promises. I still don't know where Mr. Carter stands on most issues, and I am not sure he does, either.

I can sympathize when he says he will have to take a few years of study to examine the problems and get all of the facts. That is reasonable. Let's give Mr. Carter a few more years to prepare himself, but not on the taxpayer's money or time.

You know what I will do, because you know what I have done for the past 26 months.

MORE



You know where we were then and you know where we are now -- at peace, recovering from a recession, rebuilding pride in America; America's 200 years of freedom.

You know what I have done as President despite the blockade of a Congress stacked two to one against me.

We heard before the Convention that our party was sick and dying. Now we hear the voters are overcome with apathy, and don't really care who wins this great election. I don't believe that. I don't believe the American people believe that. There will be a big election and we are going to win.

The American people do have a clear choice; they do care. Our job is to get them to the polls November 2 to register the right choice for this country for the next four years.

Make no mistake: This election is about the direction that America will take in its third century of independence. Mr. Carter can be deficient on details but the general direction of his philosophy is very plain -- it is unstable, it is unreliable. It won't work because it hasn't worked.

Mr. Carter wants more Federal Government. I want less. Mr. Carter wants higher Federal taxes for middle income taxpayers. I want lower taxes for middle income taxpayers. I want lower taxes for everybody, especially the overburdened man in the middle. Mr. Carter wants less defense. He wants it on the cheap. I want the strongest and best military capability that science and money can provide, and we will keep it under the Ford Administration.

Mr. Carter wants to reduce our commitments to our allies. I must maintain America's leadership for peace and for freedom around the world, and we will, during the next four years. There are serious differences; real choices to be made. Mr. Carter and his party's platform chart one course for this country. No matter how he zigs and zags, there is no doubt where he wants to go.

The direction Mr. Carter would take us is the same one that brought us double-digit inflation, a tax load that kills initiative and slows expansion, a slowdown in research and development and oppressive interference by a know-it-all Federal Government. I want a new direction, a direction with more freedom and more liberty for 215 million Americans.

MORE

This year my budget cut the rate of Government growth by half. Congress added \$18 billion more. Despite the extravagance of a majority in the Congress, I will submit a balanced budget by 1978. I have cut 11,000 jobs from Federal bureaucracy. Next year, with a better Congress, I will make our Government more responsive and more responsible to you, the taxpayers.

My 59 vetoes saved the American taxpayers over \$9 billion. Mr. Carter constantly criticizes.

If his party's Congress had not overridden 12 of my vetoes, I would have saved all of you \$16 billion more for the middle income taxpayer. That would save each hard-pressed family \$200, and that is what we have got to do in the months and years ahead.

When I say I stand for smaller Government, my performance proves it. Mr. Carter says he is for reforming and reorganizing bureaucracy, but his performance tells a far different story. Ask your friends from Georgia.

What do you think you will get from a liberal President and another two-to-one liberal Congress? One guarantee--you certainly will get more spending and bigger deficits, and you can depend on that.

Another thing you will get is more runaway inflation. You certainly won't get lower Federal taxes.

You won't get less Federal Government. So, the choice before our country is clear. You know where I stand.

As dedicated Americans, we are not motivated by the love of governmental power, but by the concern and the fear of it. I am talking about those who worked hard, pay their taxes, obey the laws and want to enjoy their God-given liberties.

We are committed to a policy of peace through strength in a world where freedom is still threatened by aggressors who would destroy our freedom. The United States of America must remain and will remain number one.

MORE

I know how deeply all of you are devoted to these wonderful principles. I thank you for your steadfast support. But, there is one more effort I ask of you.

Republicans alone cannot win this election. The principles we hold are just as dear to millions of our friends and neighbors who prefer to be Democrats and Independents.

Between now and November 2, I ask every Republican to persuade just one Independent and one Democrat -- two concerned citizens who feel as we do about the new direction that this country must take -- to go to the polls and vote their true conviction.

If you do this -- person to person, friend to friend -- we can win, and we will win a great victory for the American people.

We must go forward together. There is no way we can lose except by resting before the last poll closes.

Together, not as partisans but as proud Americans, let's get America off to a good start on our third century of freedom and liberty.

Thank you.

END

(AT 8:05 P.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 8, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Los Angeles, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
PRESIDENT FORD COMMITTEE RECEPTION

THE SHERATON UNIVERSAL HOTEL

10:22 A.M. PDT

Mike, Congressman Thomas Moorhead, distinguished public officials, ladies and gentlemen:

It is just wonderful to be here. Betty and I enjoyed being with you last night. We both want to thank you for your support. I would like to take just a few minutes, if I might, to talk about some of the things that are an issue in this campaign and to set the record straight on several issues that involve the future security of this country, both domestically and internationally.

Number one, each and every one of us believe in a strong America. That means a strong national defense program. Mr. Carter about a year ago called for a \$15 billion reduction in the defense program. You can't keep America strong with that kind of a cutting of the Army, the Navy, the Air Force and Marines.

Mr. Carter, waffling as he usually does, (Laughter) has said that he would either cancel or delay the production of the B-1 bomber. At the present time, we are flying the B-52s, a great aircraft, but they are about 20 years old. By the time the B-1 is built and deployed the B-52s will be anywhere from 30 to 35 years old.

I don't believe that we should send young American pilots flying an aircraft that is older than they are.

The B-1 is a plane that will help us maintain the peace and protect our national security. It is an integral, important part of our overall defense program, and Mr. Carter is very wrong when he wants to either cancel or delay it and President Ford believes it must be produced and deployed for our national security.

MORE



A great President of the United States, Teddy Roosevelt, once said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Mr. Carter speaks loudly and carries a fly swatter. (Laughter)

But, if we are going to keep America strong at home, we must spend less, have lower deficits and lower taxes so that the free enterprise, the great engine of a strong America, will have a chance. Mr. Carter has called for tax increases for all taxpayers from the medium to the middle income taxpayer. That means he wants to increase taxes for all taxpayers from \$14,000 up. That is wrong. I believe that we must reduce taxes for the middle income taxpayers, and we will.

I recommended in January of this year that the personal exemption should be increased from \$750 to \$1,000 to help the shortchanged middle income taxpayers. That is what we are going to do with a new Congress.

The best tax reform I know is tax reduction. Let me say that the Ford Administration believes that we must cut spending and we must cut taxes, and that is what we are going to do in the next four years.

Mr. Carter talks about the bad tax program that we have at the present time. Let me remind you and remind him that if our tax legislation is bad today, for the last 22 years the Democrats controlled the Congress, and they have written every tax bill that is on the law today.

So, I say to you if we are going to be strong at home, have a healthy economy, if we are going to be strong so that we can maintain the peace that we have, we have to beat Jimmy Carter and elect Jerry Ford.

I am proud to stand before you, as well as any other audience in this country today, and say that I am the first President in 20 years who can say as he seeks election that America is at peace, that not a single young American is fighting or dying on foreign soil. That is a record that we are going to keep for the next four years.

One final word -- this is a wonderful group. We have got a real mission to perform. Before the Convention in Kansas City, we were 30 some points behind. We have been closing that gap rapidly. We have the momentum because we have the right program. We tell the American people the truth. We don't make a mistake one day and apologize for it the next. The United States believes that the policies of this Administration -- peace with freedom, a strong economy predicated on the private enterprise system -- is the way to keep America, not only for ourselves but, more importantly, for our children and our grandchildren.

MORE

Page 3

I go before you and the American people proud of what we have done in the last two years and optimistic about what opportunities we have for progress in the next four years. We may still be behind by a narrow margin, but with your help and with the right program and the fact that Mr. Carter makes mistake after mistake, we are going to win that election for the American people November 2.

Thank you very much.

END (AT 10:30 A.M. PDT)

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Glendale, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
DAYS OF THE VERDUGOS FESTIVAL

THE CITY HALL

12:05 P.M. PDT

Mayor Haverkamp, Congressman Thomas Moorhead and your former Congressman and my old and very dear friend, Allen Smith, Jerry Keithley, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is great to be in Glendale. It is wonderful to be here on the opening of the Verdugos Festival, and I thank you for inviting me. I can see why you like to relive the romantic days of the Spanish land grants. In those days, the Government gave its citizens property. Nowadays, Government just tries to take it away from you, and we are going to stop it.

In the last few days I have had the privilege and honor of visiting San Francisco, Los Angeles, Beverly Hills, Universal City and now Glendale. The weather gets better, the welcome is warmer, and I thank you very, very much.

But, with this kind of welcome in Glendale, I know we are going to win California on November 2. One of the most important issues in this campaign -- especially here in California -- is taxes. The people of California have already heard all four sides of the tax question. Unfortunately, three of them came from Jimmy Carter.

Let me give you some examples. First, back in February Mr. Carter said he wanted to eliminate the home mortgage interest deduction on your Federal income tax. That was one of those loopholes that he was talking about. Not long after that he said maybe he would not eliminate that deduction. As it stands now, nobody is sure, least of all Mr. Carter.

Second, a few weeks ago Mr. Carter suggested he would raise income taxes for everyone over the median income level, about \$14,000 per year. Now he says that isn't what he meant. He says he has not studied the subject at all, but he will let us know what he decides after he has been in office for a few weeks.

MORE

I say that is too late, and I say that very sincerely and very specifically.

I say we should know -- 215 million Americans -- before election what Mr. Carter plans to do about your taxes.

Third, Mr. Carter's platform calls for between \$100 billion and \$200 billion in new Federal spending. Yet, he talks about balancing the budget without raising income taxes.

He can't have it both ways. You know it and I know it. He can't talk about compassion and not have compassion for the hard working middle income taxpayers in this country.

The American people have a big heart, but too many politicians mistake that big heart for a blank check.

It is not an act of compassion to rob older citizens of their fixed income by feeding inflation with more Federal spending.

It is not an act of compassion to prevent a young couple from buying a home because Federal borrowing for deficit spending drives up interest rates.

It is not an act of compassion to put coming generations of Americans deeply in debt and mortgage their futures before they are born.

You work hard for every dollar that you earn. Your tax dollars should work just as hard for you, and that is the way it will be under a Ford Administration.

You know who pays for every campaign promise. You know when the bills come due you get stuck with them.

In the last two years I vetoed 59 extravagant spending bills sent down to the Oval Office by an irresponsible Congress.

My vetoes saved \$9 billion.

MORE

If Mr. Carter's friends in Congress had been interested in saving money, as I am, my vetoes could have saved \$16 billion more. We hope for a better Congress with Thomas Moorhead and with Dr. Hayakawa representing you in the United States Senate.

But my idea of tax reform is tax reduction -- cut spending, cut taxes, keep more of your own money. For ten years now Federal spending has grown at an alarming rate thanks to an overtaxing, overspending, overbearing Congress.

The budget that I submitted to the Congress last January cut that rate of growth by one-half. I asked for a \$28 billion tax reduction and a \$28 billion cut in Federal spending, a dollar of tax reduction for a dollar of a reduction in Federal spending.

I asked for an increase in your personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000. That is tax relief for the middle income taxpayer of this country. They have been shortchanged by the kind of a Congress we have had for the last 22 years, and we have got to change that Congress so the middle income taxpayers will get the kind of a tax reduction that they deserve.

I asked for tax incentives to increase business investment in high unemployment areas. Congress refused. Mr. Carter calls our tax system -- he says it is a disgrace to the human race. If that is true, then it is a disgrace to the Democratic majorities who have controlled both the House and the Senate, written every tax law, and every tax loophole for the past 22 years. You know where to put the blame.

The direction America takes in the next four years will be determined by the decision you make on November 2. And let me use an illustration, if I might.

The crisis in Great Britain, a long and wonderful ally of the United States, tells us all we need to know about the danger of too much Government, too much spending on borrowed money. The British pound, their currency, has sunk to its lowest level in all-time history.

Inflation in Great Britain has been running over 25 percent. Government spending now accounts for 60 percent of the entire British economy.

Listen to what Prime Minister Jim Callaghan of Great Britain, a courageous man who represents the head of that Government -- he said, "We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and boasting Government spending. I tell you in all candor," Prime Minister Callaghan said, "that that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist, it worked by injecting inflation into our economy."

MORE

He went on to say, "And each time that that has happened, the average level of unemployment has risen. Higher inflation followed by higher unemployment, that is the history of the last 20 years."

And then the Prime Minister went on with another observation that I think is so pertinent in this political campaign. He said, "Each time we did this the twin evils of unemployment and inflation have hit hardest those least able to stand them -- the poor, the old and the sick." My friends, this is really what this campaign is all about.

Mr. Carter and his party platform offer more promises, more programs, more spending, more taxes, more inflation, and more unemployment, and we are not going to let that happen on November 2.

The unemployment figures for September came out this morning in Washington, D. C. Unemployment dropped by one-tenth of a percent. We are moving in the right direction, but not with makework jobs at the taxpayer's expense. We are moving in the right direction toward full employment by stimulating the private economy, where five out of every six jobs exist in America.

Let me make one other additional comment. I have been talking about how we can strengthen our economy here at home. But it is equally important that we strengthen our capability to meet the challenge of any aggressors abroad.

How many of you remember a statement made by a former great President, Teddy Roosevelt, who said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick"? Mr. Carter speaks loudly and wants to carry a flyswatter.

Mr. Carter wants to cancel or cut back the B-1. He wants to keep our pilots flying the B-52s that are 20 to 25 years old today. I don't believe we should send a young pilot in a plane that is older than he is.

The best way I know to keep the peace is to be strong at home with an economy that meets the challenges that we must face, with a military capability that will meet every challenge from any source around the world, and you can't do that with the kind of a \$15 billion cut in defense spending that Jimmy Carter wants to make.

It will weaken us in our challenges from those countries behind the Iron Curtain or the Bamboo Curtain. But a military program that I stand for is one of strength so that we can negotiate with our adversaries from a position of strength. Don't buy the weak military program in this critical period that Mr. Carter wants to foist upon the American people. It is wrong for America, and don't stand for it.

MORE

Let me conclude by saying that Jerry Ford says that Government is already too large, too powerful, too costly, too remote and too deeply involved in your daily lives.

I want to make Government your capable servant but not your meddling master. That is why I am a candidate for the Presidency on November 2.

As Glendale celebrates its proud past, I ask you to think about your children's future and your country's future. I ask for your help on that fateful day of November 2. I ask for your support, your vote.

Let me conclude by saying that Jerry Ford hasn't and won't let you down.

Thank you very much.

END (AT 12:26 P.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 8, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Glendale, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AND
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION



THE CITY HALL

1:05 P.M. PDT

THE PRESIDENT: Let me make an observation or comment. Perhaps it could have been more precise in what I said concerning Soviet domination of Poland. I fortunately had the opportunity of being in Poland in 1975. No Democratic President has ever visited Poland while in office, so I had the opportunity to see the Polish people, to get their reaction from an American President.

And I was there for the purpose of indicating to the thousands and thousands of Polish people that the United States believes in their desire for freedom and independence. I recognize that there are Polish -- or in Poland there are Soviet divisions, but anybody who has looked straight in the eye at thousands of fine Polish people knows that their desire for liberty and freedom is just as great as the desire for liberty and freedom of the American people.

It is tragic that the Soviet Union does have some divisions in Poland. It is a tragedy that I hope in the future the Poles will be able to find another solution because the unquenchable spirit of the Polish people is something that I admire and respect.

I join the Polish-Americans in this country who know that their ancestral home is the home that where for centuries there was freedom, and we want freedom for their relatives and their loved ones and their people in the land that they came from.

President Ford does not believe that the Polish people over the long run -- whether they are in Poland or whether they are Polish-Americans here -- will ever condone domination by any foreign force.

QUESTION: Mr. President, today in virtually all of Eastern Europe, does the Soviet Union have military dominance?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: As I said the other night, the Soviet Union does not have domination of Yugoslavia. The Soviet Union does not militarily dominate Romania. I was perhaps not as precise as I should have been. I recognize there are Soviet divisions in Poland. I regret it and I am very proud of the courageous attitude of the Polish people who want freedom, who have the aspirations for liberty, just as we do in the United States, and I fully support their hopes and aspirations.

There are several other countries in Eastern Europe that tragically have Soviet military forces in their country. That is not what President Ford wants and that is not what the American people want.

QUESTION: Mr. President, has this caused you any political trouble?

THE PRESIDENT: I have no way of knowing. I firmly believe that the Polish-Americans in this country know of my strong support over the years, not just recently, for the Captive Nations Resolution. It was enacted frequently in the Congress of the United States, and I always supported it.

So, any Polish-American or any other ethnic American who knows of President Ford's record of full support for the Captive Nations Resolution knows where I stand.

QUESTION: Did you come out to put an end to this misunderstanding?

THE PRESIDENT: I hope and trust that my observations this morning will put an end to a misunderstanding. It was a misunderstanding, and I hope and trust that my very deep and firm convictions have now been said again, as they have over the years.

THE PRESS: Thank you, Mr. President.

END

(AT 1:10 P.M. PDT)

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Lawton, Oklahoma)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
LAWTON MUNICIPAL AIRPORT

6:40 P.M. CDT

Senator Dewey Bartlett, Senator Henry Bellmon, Senator Paul Laxalt, my good friend Tom Steed, my good friend John Jarman, Mayor Gilley, distinguished guests on the podium, ladies and gentlemen:

It is great to be back in Oklahoma, and thank you very, very much. Senator Bellmon and Senator Bartlett tell me you have a pretty good football team in Oklahoma this year. My alma mater, the University of Michigan, learned it the hard way last year. I told them that the University of Michigan was not bad this year. I hope they are good. Dewey, maybe I can win that two bucks back again.

Tomorrow I am going to have the honor of attending the Texas-Oklahoma football game. Does anyone here know who is going to win that game tomorrow?

I just thought I would ask. As I said, we are stopping down at the Texas State Fair tomorrow, and I may get a question about it. As President, I have to be impartial about the game. I even have to change sides during the half. Of course, if my opponent were there, I am sure he would find some way to sit on both sides at the same time.

Now let me give you some straight talk about taxes and national defense. You love America, as I do. You want an America strong and decent here at home. You want an America strong and at peace, with freedom throughout the world. This country has restored trust in the White House in the last two years. This country has restored peace abroad. We should be proud of the fact that not a single young American is fighting and dying on any foreign soil tonight, and we are going to keep it that way.

You should be proud that we turned an economy around, that America sees brighter stars, skies, like you see in Oklahoma right here today. We are proud of that progress.

MORE

Now let me give you a little straight talk about taxes because if I could put a tax on empty rhetoric in this political year, we would have the national debt paid off in one week. When we talk about taxes, we are talking more than just about money. Every tax dollar represents your time, your energy, your hard work. Those tax dollars ought to work just as hard for you as you have worked for them.

Mr. Carter's platform calls for new Government programs that would cost between \$100 billion and \$200 billion each year. He never puts a price tag on those programs. He just says he will soak the rich, close the loopholes and everything will be just fine.

Let me say this: If we put a 100 percent tax on all personal income over \$50,000 in America, it would produce less than \$9 billion a year. Where is the other \$191 billion going to come from? Two choices: One, Mr. Carter can have a \$191 billion deficit. Two, he can do what he said he would do and raise taxes on every American family above the median income of \$14,000, and we don't want that.

I say to you there is a better way: Cut spending, cut taxes, keep more of your own money. To me, tax reform means tax reduction. For ten years now spending has grown at an alarming rate, thanks to an overtaxing, overspending, overbearing Congress.

The budget that I submitted to the Congress this year cut that rate of growth by one-half. I asked for a \$28 billion tax cut. I asked for a \$28 billion restraint on the growth of Federal spending so we could have an honest tax reduction.

For every dollar we cut in spending, we could cut a dollar in taxes. Unfortunately, the Congress refused to make those reductions in spending. They went \$18 billion more in the spending than I recommended, and the net result is they only cut the taxes of the American people \$10 billion this year.

In January of next year we are going to do a lot better with a much better Congress. I will tell you the kinds of tax reductions I want. I asked for an increase in the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000 per person. That means that the middle income taxpayer who has gotten short shrift, shortchanged by the Congress over the years will get the kind of tax reduction that the American people need and want, and that is what we stand for, and we are going to get it next year.

MORE

I asked for tax incentives to increase business investment in high unemployment areas. Congress refused. I sent back to the Congress 59 bills that I vetoed. I saved you more than \$9 billion. If Mr. Carter's friends in the Congress had been more interested in saving rather than spending, we could have saved another \$16 billion.

But, let me say those vetoes did a lot of good. I thank those in the Congress who supported me. I appreciate the support from people like Henry Bellmon, Dewey Bartlett, John Jarman, Tom Steed. Those are the kinds of people that have stood with you and stood with me in these tough decisions to save your hard earned tax dollars.

But, let me say another word or two. One day Mr. Carter proposes doing away with tax deductions for home mortgage interest payments, for taxing church properties other than church buildings. The next day he says that wasn't what he really meant.

One day Mr. Carter talks about balancing the Federal budget and fighting inflation. The next day he turns around and talks about new programs that would cost at least \$100 billion annually.

We have seen Mr. Carter go from labor halls and blast away at businessmen for paying less than their share of taxes and say their burden should be increased. Then he goes to Wall Street in New York City, the 21 Club, and tells businessmen, "Don't worry, I didn't mean what I said."

We have seen Mr. Carter call for cuts of \$15 billion in the defense budget, not once but twice -- in Savannah, Georgia, March 15, 1975; in Beverly Hills, California five days later; then last Wednesday night we saw him deny it in San Francisco.

Mr. Carter can change his mind as often as he wants to -- and he does it plenty of times -- but he can't change the facts. He was wrong when he denied he ever said, "We should slash, we should gut our defense budget by \$15 billion."

The American people asked Mr. Carter, "What are they supposed to believe?" Mr. Carter replies, "Don't worry, I will tell you what I plan to do after November 2."

But let's talk about national defense. You have got a great national park here just a few miles away. A great American President, Teddy Roosevelt, once said, "Speak softly and carry a big stick." Mr. Carter speaks loudly and carries a fly swatter.

MORE

He wants to cut %\$15 billion out of your Army, your Navy, your Air Force and Marine Corp. He wants to cancel or delay the B-1 bomber, which is aimed at replacing the B-52. The B-52s are about 20 years old, and by the time we phase in the B-1, they will be another five years older.

But, let me be very, very precise in this. President Ford does not believe in sending young pilots in planes in combat that are older than the pilots themselves. They deserve better than that from the American people.

Now let me give you a little advice. If I were concerned about keeping America strong and Jimmy Carter were President, I would be worried sick. If I were concerned about inflation and high taxes and Jimmy Carter were President, I would be very, very worried. If I were concerned about bringing unemployment down without spending billions and billions on dead-end Humphrey-Hawkins jobs and Jimmy Carter were President, I would be very worried.

My friend, that is really what this campaign is all about. Mr. Carter and his platform offer more promises, more programs, more spending, more inflation and more taxes. Jerry Ford says that Government is already too large, too powerful, too costly, too remote and too, too deeply involved in your lives.

I want to make Government your capable servant but not your meddling master. That is why I am a candidate for President in 1976.

Now let me make one final observation and comment. This country is strong and this country is beautiful. But we ought to learn from past history. As we look around the world, one of our great and staunch allies over the years has been Great Britain. But Great Britain is faced with the gravest financial crisis in its illustrious history.

Just earlier, a week ago, Prime Minister Callaghan had the courage to say as he spoke to his Labor Party Convention in England -- and I quote him, because I think his words are what we ought to listen to. Prime Minister Callaghan had this to say: "Britain for too long has lived on borrowed time, borrowed money and borrowed ideas. We will fail if we think we can buy our way out of our present difficulties by printing confetti money and paying ourselves more than we earn."

MORE

Those are strong words by a man who leads a country whose past has been great but whose crisis is serious.

Let me say from the bottom of my heart that this country is strong, but we have those who are running for the Presidency who want to borrow more money, spend more money, have higher taxes, and lead us down the road to more and more inflation.

Let me say very specifically to each and every one of you, as long as Jerry Ford is President of the United States, we will not have that kind of a Government. We will have a strong Government at home with less taxes, less inflation, less Federal spending, and we will have a Government that is strong enough to preserve the peace and to maintain our deterrent forces and to look at each other and say we are proud of America.

I come before you as a President who wants to serve you for the next four years, and to come back to Oklahoma, to Lawton, and say, I kept my promises.

I want, I need your support. I won't let you down. Thank you very, very much.

END (AT 6:55 P.M. CDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 8, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Lawton, Oklahoma)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
UPON SIGNING A PROCLAMATION DESIGNATING
NATIVE AMERICAN AWARENESS WEEK, 1976



THE MONTEGO BAY HOTEL

8:10 P.M. CDT

Before signing the Proclamation, I would like to make some additional remarks.

I would like to say a few words about a very important issue. No State in the Union has more residents who are native Americans than the great State of Oklahoma. No domestic matter has given me greater pride than my Administration's record of turning about the discrimination and neglect that all Indians faced for so many years.

In January of 1975 I signed the Indian Self-Determination Act, a magna carta for Indian people. Today we recognize Indian tribal Governments, including those in Oklahoma, as vital Government organizations in their own right.

Just a week ago I signed the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, which authorized significant improved resources for Indian health delivery care.

I know you are very proud of the fine accredited hospital here in Lawton, but many Indian hospitals are not accredited. We must -- and we will -- bring them up to standards.

In a few minutes I will sign a Presidential Proclamation declaring October 10 to 16 as Native American Awareness Week. The Administration support for Indian programs is not just rhetoric. We back up our words with action.

Eight years ago the Bureau of Indian Affairs -- its budget was \$262 million. Today it is \$777 million. The Indian health budget was \$113 million; today, \$425 million. Our manpower training budget for Indian people is four times bigger than it was only four years ago. The record of support for Indian programs and for the protection of Indian trust rights is clear and precise. America wants those policies to continue, and I can assure you that they will.

MORE

Let me say to the Oklahoma delegation, and Senator Paul Laxalt here from Nevada, as well as the tribal leaders, and I am delighted to have the opportunity of participating with them in the signing of this Proclamation.

There are about one million American Indian citizens, and some may say this is a very small minority. I count American Indian people, however, not in numbers but in the honored place that they hold in our multi-cultured society and in the future of our nation.

The 215 million of us are keenly concerned with the one million. The welfare and the progress of native Americans is high on the agenda of the American conscience.

My Administration is equally determined that history is going to continue to be changed, that the Indian shall no longer be lowest in poverty and slimmest in opportunity, and we are making those changes now.

I sign this Proclamation as a signal of that determination and as an invitation to all of my fellow citizens to reaffirm that our first Americans are among America's most respected and honored citizens.

Thank you all very much.

END (AT 8:10 P.M. CDT)

Mike

return this to me
when you are finished.
thanks

P

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 8, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Los Angeles, California)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AND
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH THE SAN FERNANDO VALLEY
BUSINESS AND PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATION



THE SHERATON UNIVERSAL HOTEL

9:05 A.M. PDT

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very, very much, Matt. It goes without saying that I am delighted to be in this wonderful valley and to have an opportunity of making a few comments and then responding to some questions, which I am sure that you have on your mind.

But, before doing so, I would like to give you some very straight talk on the question of taxes. I say straight talk because if we could put a tax on empty rhetoric in this political year, we would have the national debt paid off in a week. (Laughter)

When we talk about taxes, we are actually talking more than just about money. Every tax dollar represents your time, your energy and your individual hard work. Those tax dollars ought to work just as hard for you as you work for them.

Mr. Carter's platform calls for new Government programs that could cost at a minimum of \$100 billion each year. If you take a further analysis, those programs would add up to \$200 billion in additional Government expenditures every year. He never puts a price tag on those programs. He just says he will soak the rich, close the loopholes and everything will be just fine.

If we put 100 percent tax on all personal income over \$50,000 a year in America, it would produce less than \$9 billion per annum. I ask in all honesty, where is the other \$191 billion coming from if you use his minimum cost of those new programs?

There are two choices. One, Mr. Carter can have a \$191 billion deficit. Two, he can do what he said he would do and raise taxes on every America family above the median income of \$14,000 per person. I say there is a better way -- cut spending, cut taxes, keep more of your own money. To me, tax reform means tax reduction.

MORE

For ten years now Federal spending has grown at an alarming rate. The facts are it has grown at a rate of about 11 percent per year, thanks to an over-taxing, overspending, overbearing Congress. The budget that I submitted to the Congress in January of this year -- I proposed a cut in the rate of growth of Federal spending by half, from about 11 percent to 5.5 percent.

I asked for a \$28 billion tax reduction. Unfortunately, Congress gave only about a \$10 billion tax reduction. I asked for an increase in the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000. Congress refused to act. Just the other day I was talking to some employees in a plant in the Washington, D.C. area, and one of the questions that they asked me was about tax reduction at the Federal level.

I said, "How many children do you have?" He said three. If you took the tax reduction proposal that I recommended--an increase of the personal exemption from \$750 to \$1,000, it would mean that that individual with three children, a wife and himself would get \$1,250 additional tax exemption in his Federal income tax return.

That is understandable, that is equitable and it is right, and we are going to submit it to the Congress again in January of 1977.

But, in addition I ask for tax incentives to increase business investment in high-unemployment areas. Again Congress refused.

Many of you know that I sent back to the Congress 59 bills with a veto stamp on them. Congress has supported 43 of those 59 vetoes and, as a result, we saved \$9 billion in expenditures from the Federal budget.

If Mr. Carter's friends in Congress had been more interested in saving money than spending it, we could have saved an additional \$16 billion.

Mr. Carter calls our tax system a disgrace to the human race. If that is true, then it is a disgrace to the Democratic majority in the Congress, who has controlled both the House and the Senate, written every tax law and every tax loophole for the last 22 years.

That is where the blame belongs.

MORE

One day Mr. Carter proposes doing away with tax deductions for every home, mortgage, interest payment, or taxing church properties other than church buildings. The next day he says that is not what he meant. One day Mr. Carter talks about balancing the Federal budget and fighting inflation. The next day he turns around and talks about new programs that would cost at least \$100 billion each year.

We have seen Mr. Carter go to labor halls and blast away at businessmen for paying less than their share of Federal taxes. He says their burden should be increased. Then he goes to Club 21 in Manhattan and tells businessmen, "Don't worry, we won't hurt you." Now you can't have it both ways.

Let me give you a little advice. If I were a businessman and Jimmy Carter were President, I would be very, very worried. If I were concerned about inflation and Jimmy Carter were President, I would be extremely worried. If I were concerned about bringing unemployment down without spending billions and billions on dead-end Humphrey-Hawkins jobs and Jimmy Carter was President, I would be extremely worried.

The unemployment figures for September came out just this morning. They were announced in Washington as they are every month. Unemployment dropped nationally by one-tenth of a percent.

We are moving in the right direction. But not with makework jobs at the taxpayer's expense. We are moving in the right direction toward full employment by stimulating the private sector of our economy -- where five out of the six jobs exist in America -- and that is the right approach and that is the Ford Administration's attack on the problems of unemployment.

Let me talk very seriously for just a minute. The recent crisis in Great Britain tells us all we need to know about the dangers of too much Government, too much spending on borrowed money. The British pound has sunk to its lowest level in the history of that great country. Inflation has been running at about 25 percent. Government spending in Great Britain now accounts for 60 percent of the entire British economy.

Listen to what Prime Minister Jim Callaghan of Great Britain, a very courageous man in a serious crisis, said just last week--and he made this comment in speaking to his Labor Party convention, a party that has played a very important role in helping to create the problem. But here is what Jim Callaghan said in speaking to his own party convention: "We used to think that you could just spend your way out of a recession and increase employment by cutting taxes and increasing Government spending. I will tell you in all candor that option no longer exists and that insofar as it ever did exist it worked by injecting inflation into the economy, and each time that has happened the average level of unemployment has risen. Higher inflation, followed by higher unemployment -- that is the history of the past 20 years in Great Britain."

Then the Prime Minister continued, and again I quote, "Each time we did this the twin evil of unemployment and inflation have hit hardest those least able to stand them -- the poor, the old, the sick."

My friends, that is really what this campaign is all about in America. Mr. Carter and his party offer more promises, more programs, more spending, more taxes, more inflation. Jerry Ford says that Government is already too large, too powerful, too costly, too remote and too deeply involved in your personal lives.

I want to make your Government your capable servant, not your meddling master. That is why I am a candidate for the Presidency in 1976. I ask for your help, your support, and your vote on November 2.

Thank you very much.

I will be glad to answer questions.

Yes, sir?

QUESTION: Mr. President, the preservation of the Hollywood-Burbank Airport is extremely important to people in this area insofar as jobs and transportation alternatives are concerned. We understand that your Administration is involved very deeply in trying to help us to save that airport in providing the funds and providing the resolution of the problem which is required, an environmental impact assessment.

All I want to do is to personally, on behalf of the people in the San Fernando Valley, in my district, thank you for your involvement and your support. We understand Elliot Richardson is involved, among others.

Thank you.

THE PRESIDENT: Thank you very much. I am very personally conscious of the importance of that airport. I have flown in there a few times over the years when I have had the privilege of visiting California. The Secretary of Commerce, the head of the FAA and the Secretary of Transportation are all very cognizant not only of the importance of that airport to this area but to the State, and I can assure you that they will make a maximum effort to come to the right decision, which I hope obviously is one that will satisfy the needs of the people of this area.

QUESTION: Mr. President, do you have a time frame established for returning to a balanced budget?

MORE

THE PRESIDENT: Let me repeat the question in case some didn't hear.

The question is, do I have a timetable for returning to a balanced budget? The answer is categorically yes.

In the State of the Union message that I gave to the Congress in January of this year, in the budget that I submitted to the Congress in January of this year, and the economic program that was likewise submitted, we pointed out that if we cut the rate of growth of Federal spending from 11 percent to 5-1/2 percent, and if we gave the \$28 billion tax reduction that I proposed -- which means that you would have, for every dollar you cut in Federal spending, you could have a dollar reduction in Federal taxes -- we could have by the budget that I submitted -- or would submit, I should say -- in January of 1978, a balanced budget.

Now we have run into a problem, but it is not insoluble. I recommended a budget for the current fiscal year of \$395 billion. The Congress has exceeded that by their resolution by approximately \$18 billion. That is more, obviously, than I think the Federal Government should spend.

But I believe with a new and better Congress -- and I hope we get one -- we can make some adjustments that in my opinion will make up for the extravagance of this past Congress. In other words, we have two more budget cycles where I think we can put the lid on, keep the spending under control and still achieve our balanced budget that would be submitted in January of 1978.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I would like to ask you what is your feeling on the taxation of church-owned property, not the church itself but on parochial schools?

THE PRESIDENT: As I indicated in my remarks, Mr. Carter -- in an interview he gave to a magazine called Liberty, which is a magazine published by the Seventh Day Adventist faith -- said he was in favor of taxing all church property other than the church itself.

I categorically say that that is a wrong approach, because in effect, in many cases, you would be taxing your hospitals, orphanages and other such operations that churches undertake.

As far as tax provisions to give nonpublic schools an opportunity to get more financing from individuals who send their children to nonpublic schools, I have long advocated, endorsed and supported a change in the Internal Revenue legislation that would permit either a tax exemption or a tax deduction for those who, as a matter of choice, send their children to nonpublic schools.

MORE

I am a personal product of public schools -- elementary, secondary and higher education -- except I went to Yale Law School, which is not a public institution, but from kindergarten through college I was a product of public education.

I believe in it. But I also believe -- and believe very strongly -- that the competition of nonpublic schools to public schools is good for education, the education of our children, and if you don't have that competition I think the public schools would get in a monopoly situation.

I don't like monopolies, period. So, I think we have to give some tax relief to those individuals who as a matter of choice want to send their children to nonpublic schools, whether they are Lutheran, Catholic, Christian Science or Jewish or whatever the sponsorship. The best way to do it is to give some tax relief to those who make that choice.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, I am a registered Democrat.

THE PRESIDENT: It is nice to see you, sir.
(Laughter)

QUESTION: You are going to see more than just myself. The question I wanted to ask, in the interim while you are trying to get the Federal Government out of our business here locally, what can you do to help us cut the red tape and what is happening regarding the red tape for revenue sharing matters and so forth?

THE PRESIDENT: Let me respond this way. When I became President on August 9, 1974, one of the first things I found was that the previous Administration had projected for the then current fiscal year an increase of 40,000 Government employees, Federal employees. I made an order almost the first day I took office: We are not going to continue that authorization for an increase of some 40,000. We were able to make it stick, and actually in the two years that I have been President, we have reduced Federal civilian employment by 11,000. I think that is some progress.

Now, in addition, we have in the last 12 months on an order by me to the Office of Management and Budget, reduced the so-called paperwork, forms, et cetera, by 12 percent in the Federal establishment. Let me give you one specific illustration. In 1974 Congress passed what was called the Community Development Act, which would replace the seven categorical programs for urban renewal, model cities, et cetera, and made it one single block grant approach.

Let me illustrate what that can do. Under the old program for the applications to proceed from the city to the regional office to the Federal office, it took 31 months. Now, I am sure there are some city officials here who can confirm that was about the time it took. Under the present time it takes three months. Furthermore, those applications under those old seven categorical grant programs, they were 1800 pages. Today they are 25 pages.

The net result is we have reduced the processing time and we have reduced the paperwork from the point of view of city managers and others. We are going to keep on that kind of pressure in order to make the Government more responsive and responsible.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, would your new Administration be interested in, and amenable to, tax credit and tax incentives, maybe, to put small minority businessmen on a par with their majority counterparts?

THE PRESIDENT: What we have recommended is that there be tax incentives for any businessman who either moves the plant into the inner city or expands and modernizes his business within the inner city, where unemployment is 7 percent or higher, if I recall the precise figure.

That, to me, would be an incentive and a very substantial part to the black businessman who wants to give jobs in the inner city to the unemployed, particularly the disadvantaged and the blacks within the city.

I would have to look into whether it is constitutional to give a tax incentive to a particular race or color or religion under the Constitution. I just would have to give that some thought, but I do believe that the program we have recommended would be a stimulant in the direction in which you think it would be wise.

I would have to, in all honesty--rather than give an answer that I might have to change a week from now--take the thoughtful and, I think, responsible course. I will let you know, but I know that the program we have proposed would be very helpful to the inner city where unemployment among the youth, particularly the minority groups, is much too high. If we could have that kind of a program, I think it would be a substantial solution to the problem that you raised.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I am with Hydraulic Research Textron in Valencia. Mr. Carter keeps evading the questions asked by the panel that probe his weaknesses. Why aren't you forcing him to answer the questions directly?

THE PRESIDENT: There is no question that in, for example, his three-minute discussion on foreign policy raised a lot of rhetorical partisan issues and in the two minutes of rebuttal, if you are going to make a forthright, accurate answer and you don't have time to answer all of the, I think, purely partisan charges that he makes.

But, then we do find, even when you say he is totally inaccurate -- as I said that he had advocated a \$15 billion reduction in the defense budget -- he denied it, and if you read the Los Angeles Times this morning, he had made that statement in an interview with a Los Angeles Times reporter.

MORE

I think it was in the late winter or early spring of 1975. It was quoted in the paper. It was reaffirmed by the reporter that talked to him. I happen to believe that newspaper account of what he said rather than a denial, which I don't believe was the fact. So, even when you pin him down he varies, I think, from an accurate answer. I could have used stronger language, but --

QUESTION: Mr. President, I am Commissioner of Airports of LAX and several others. In August of this year, Secretary Coleman made a recommendation to OMB relative to noise abatement programs as it affects retrofit and the phasing out of the aircraft.

Are you going to be prepared to give us an answer prior to November 2 as to what we can expect on noise abatement in LAX?

THE PRESIDENT: I have spent a great deal of time with Secretary Coleman in the last month on just that question, and I have also spent a good bit of time with others within the Administration. And let me give you some idea of what the problem is as well as what the solution might be.

I don't want to preempt precisely what we are going to do. But the problem is that there are about 25 airports in this country where there is a noise problem. It involves roughly 6 million people who live adjacent to or within the area of those airports. The noise standards that were established by FAA, as I recall about two years ago, required that all new aircraft that are going to use those, or any airports in this country, must meet those standards.

Under that kind of a program, as I recall, it will take 8 to 10 years to go through the whole cycle of abandoning those present planes that don't meet the standards and replacing them with planes that do meet the standards. I am very concerned that we have not been tougher in this regard.

Now when you say that, in effect you are saying that today we are going to impose on all aircraft who use our many, many airports in this country the same standards, the new ones as well as those that are unable to meet the problem, which, if you did it today, would force the aircraft industry to replace, as I recall, roughly two-thirds of their present fleet.

Now the commercial airliners say that under their restrictions imposed on their ticket cost they cannot go into a program that permits them immediately to buy the aircraft that would meet this problem. They say that the CAB won't give them enough price relief.

So the answer is one of two approaches -- either we get the regulatory reform that I recommended to the Congress which would force the CAB to permit certain price adjustments in their fares without going through a lengthy process before the CAB and, if they got that relief, if Congress stood up and passed the regulatory reform that I recommended, then the CAB and the industry itself, would have the capability of meeting the problems that they face in financing the procurement of the two-thirds of the planes that don't meet the noise standards.

MORE

Now, the other option. At the present time, there is an 8 percent Federal tax on commercial plane tickets. That money goes into an aircraft, into an airport trust fund. That trust fund presently has a surplus.

There is a suggestion that that be reduced from 8 percent to 6 percent, and that a financing plan be worked out that would take that 2 percent and permit the airlines to immediately be a beneficiary of that so that they could buy more modern aircraft more quickly. It is very complicated but it is a solution.

So, when you come down to it we are in the process of making a final decision as to whether we should -- well, the alternatives are Congress must pass the regulatory reform that gives the industry itself an opportunity to meet the problem or, if Congress will sit on its hands, as it has in other regulatory reform proposals, if they won't take the one option, then I think the other option is a necessity because I am not going to tolerate an 8-to 10-year program of trying to solve the noise problem at airports, the 26 -- Los Angeles, La Guardia, Kennedy, O'Hare, and the others.

It is not right to the 6 million people when we have a better answer, either regulatory reform on the one hand or a financing program as I have suggested on the other.

QUESTION: Mr. President, I am a reservist with the Strategic Air Command. I can tell the B-52s will not go another ten years. When are we going to get the B-1?

THE PRESIDENT: I made a speech on that point yesterday out at the Rockwell plant, and I made precisely the point you are talking about. The B-52s today are an integral part of our three-pronged strategic programs for the defense of this country.

We need high-performance, long-range aircraft. We need our land-based ballistic missile systems. We need our submarine-launched ballistic missile systems.

We are improving our land-based programs with the MARK-III, and we are moving into the MX missile development. We are building the Trident submarine to replace the present nuclear-powered ballistic missile submarine. But, we cannot permit the 25-year-old B-52s to continue for another 10 or 15 years.

As I said yesterday, I am not going to permit pilots to fly in aircraft which is older than the pilots themselves. And that is what you do if you go on with the B-52. The B-1 has met every test, not only as to performance but as to cost. And I am very much opposed to those who want to cancel it or delay it and, unfortunately, Mr. Carter, in the form that he espouses, either wants to delay it or cancel it.

I think we owe something to the young people who are called upon to fly those aircraft to give them the best equipment that this country can buy.

MORE

QUESTION: Mr. President, by the way, I support you all the way. We fill the galleys that go in your commercial airlines.

I personally am more concerned about the minority expression in the Eastern European countries over the Communist rule than I am in what is going on in Rhodesia and South Africa. Can we get Kissinger to go over there and start doing work along the lines which you are talking about here today?

THE PRESIDENT: The question raised is about the status of Eastern European countries.

This Administration does not concede that there should be Soviet domination of the Eastern European countries. It has been alleged by some that I was not as precise as I should have been the other day. (Laughter)

But, let me explain what I really meant. I was in Poland a year ago, and I had the opportunity to talk with a number of citizens of Poland, and believe me, they are courageous, they are strong people. They don't believe that they are going to be forever dominated -- if they are -- by the Soviet Union. They believe in the independence of that great country, and so do I, and we are going to make certain to the best of our ability that any allegation of domination is not a fact.

I went to Poland, I went to Yugoslavia, I went to Rumania to emphasize that the United States of America believes in freedom, independence of all Eastern European countries, and that is what I believe in and that is what this Government stands for.

QUESTION: On your desk is a piece of legislation by Congressman Corman dealing with the extending of the Federal unemployment insurance program. Question: Are you going to sign it or veto it?

THE PRESIDENT: I have always felt, Pete -- and I am sure you would agree from your long experience in Government -- that you should read the fine print, particularly anything coming from this Congress. (Laughter)

I think this Administration's record is one of compassion in this area. When we were faced with the worst recession in 40 years, I not only recommended but signed legislation to extend the unemployment compensation from 26 weeks to 67 weeks and to broaden the qualifications so that more people who had not previously been covered would be covered.

MORE

Now, as long as we have the problem we have -- even though it is getting less severe -- this Administration will show the same compassion, and if it is necessary to sign that legislation, with the brief description you gave of it -- (Laughter)

QUESTION: I didn't want to give you the wrong impression, Mr. President.

THE PRESIDENT: I will repeat what I said. I am going to take a good look at it because that fine print sometimes does not always reflect what the headlines show in the newspapers, so when it comes to the desk, we will take a good look and if we think it is needed, we will do it. If not, we will take other action.

Thank you all very, very much.

END (AT 9:40 A.M. PDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 9, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Dallas, Texas)

THE WHITE HOUSE
QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH THE PRESIDENT

LOVE FIELD

9:50 A.M. CDT

QUESTION: Mr. Carter said yesterday that he wants you to give the American public some more facts about that IRS report concerning your campaign funds in 1972. He says we need to know more about that.

THE PRESIDENT: All of those were thoroughly investigated by the FBI, by the IRS and by two committees of the Congress, and they gave me an absolute clean bill of health.

I suggest that people who throw stones shouldn't live in glass houses.

Thank you very much.

END (AT 9:51 A.M. CDT)



OCTOBER 9, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Dallas, Texas)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
TEXAS STATE FAIR

HALL OF STATE BUILDING

12:37 P.M. CDT

Governor Briscoe, Mrs. Briscoe, Governor Connally and Mrs. Connally, Mayor Folsom, Wayne Gallagher, distinguished guests, ladies and gentlemen:

It is always great to be back in Texas, and especially in Dallas, and I thank you.

I am deeply honored to have the privilege of opening your world-famous State Fair. John Connally has just given me a preview of the livestock barns. John is an expert on cattle, swine and sheep, just like he is an expert on national security and Government from Austin to Washington, D. C., and thank you very much, John. There is a lot left to see, but I have learned one thing: When Texans talk about the fine things you produce in Texas, whether it is cattle or cotton, spaceships or sheep, pecans or petroleum, you are really not bragging, you are really just being modest. Even your peanuts taste better to me. (Laughter)

I am told you produce pretty good football teams. Good luck this afternoon. Nobody wants to stand or sit in the sun on a beautiful football Saturday in October and listen to a long Presidential address. I will tell you what. When we have the Ford-Dole inauguration down in Washington next January, you all come.

Let me take just a minute to thank you for your Texas hospitality and heartwarming welcome. I wasn't surprised -- I have been here before, it is always great. But it is wonderful to be among Americans who are just born friendly and hospitable.

Texans are born patriotic, also. I first got to know a great deal about Texans when I was, of all places, in the middle of the Pacific. In that war, America's survival and the fate of freedom in the world were in the steady hands of great Texans and great Americans like Chester Nimitz and Dwight D. Eisenhower.

MORE



The Texans that I knew personally on the ship which I served had the same high caliber of character. On our carrier, we not only had plenty of native Texans but a lot of men who trained here in the State of Texas and are probably Texans now. We did everything on that ship except fly the Lone Star battle flag.

When I first went to Congress I learned the ropes from legislative giants like Mr. Sam Rayburn and Lyndon Johnson. I made good friends like George Mahon, George Bush, John Tower and Tiger Teague, among others, from your great State.

What always impressed me the most was the way Texans put their country above their political party when America's fundamental interests were at stake. I saw them time and again rally around the President, whoever he might be, when he was dealing in the high stakes of peace and war.

The corroboration and support that Speaker Sam Rayburn and Senator Lyndon Johnson gave to President Eisenhower when he was Commander-in-Chief became my example when President Johnson faced those same tough calls on foreign policy and national security, and although we had our differences, Lyndon Johnson never distorted the truth when discussing the tough issues affecting America's strength.

In the coming weeks and future years, I really hope that this bipartisan tradition of responsibility and unity beyond the water's edge can survive in American politics. It is an important part of our national strength, as Texans taught me.

You never heard a Texan tell the world our country is not strong any more. You never heard a Texan proclaim that America is not respected any more. You never heard a Texan allege that the American people have lost their pride in America's strength and its moral integrity.

It isn't only the eyes of Texas that are upon us. The eyes of the whole world are on the United States of America this year, not just for the Fourth of July when we celebrated a glorious 200th anniversary, but also on November 2.

We are on display as much as all the entries in this great Texas State Fair. We have been the world champion of liberty and self-government for the last 200 years.

We are proud of our trophies. We are proud of our material strength and even more of America's moral strength. We are respected for all of these and many other things. Let's get our third century off to a good start skipping over the little things but standing together tall and strong on the big things that affect us at home and abroad -- big things like peace through strength, peace with freedom. That is the spirit that made Texas great, that made America great. That is the spirit we can show the world in 1976.

Thank you very much.

END (AT 12:41 P.M. CDT)

FOR IMMEDIATE RELEASE

OCTOBER 9, 1976

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Dallas, Texas)

THE WHITE HOUSE

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION
WITH THE PRESIDENT

THE APPAREL MART

6:17 P.M. CDT

QUESTION: Hi, Mr. President. What kind of day has it been for you?

THE PRESIDENT: It has been a tremendous day in Texas. I don't think we could have had a better day. The response from literally thousands and thousands of people in Texas has been very, very encouraging -- the State Fair, the football game and the wonderful rally here. We are very, very encouraged about Texas, and we are delighted to be here.

QUESTION: Mr. President, how do you assess your chances in Texas in November?

THE PRESIDENT: Well, we are an underdog, but I think we are going to surprise some people.

It is real nice to see you all.

THE PRESS: Thank you.

END (AT 6:18 P.M. CDT)

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY
(Dallas, Texas)

THE WHITE HOUSE

REMARKS OF THE PRESIDENT
AT THE
PRESIDENT FORD COMMITTEE RECEPTION
THE APPAREL MART

5:55 P.M. CDT

Thank you very, very much, Bill, and let me express from the bottom of my heart my gratitude and appreciation for all of you 1,500 to 2,000 wonderful Dallas County, Tarrant County Texas workers for the Ford-Dole ticket.

We arrived this morning, and let me say to all of the wonderful people of the Lone Star State that we have had, I think, one of the finest days in this campaign, one of the finest days in my two years and plus of the Presidency. I can't express my gratitude deeply enough. It has been a super day -- the State Fair, a great football game and then this great rally.

I would like to make three points, three points that I think are principal and crucial in this campaign.

Number one, trust; number two, the national security of the United States; and number three, taxes.

Some may have seen the debate last Wednesday. It was 90 minutes. I hold in my hands here an eight-page document that shows that Jimmy Carter in 90 minutes made 14 distortions, misrepresentations or inaccuracies. If my mathematics is right -- don't some Professor cross me up (Laughter) -- that is about one inaccuracy, distortion, misrepresentation or untruth each six minutes, and that is too darn many for a President of the United States.

He made a few others in the first debate, and let me remind you of one. The Governor says he is going to come in and reorganize the Federal Government. I think the Federal Government has to be tightened up, to be more responsible and more responsible to the American citizen.

But I don't think I trust turning that job over to Jimmy Carter, based on his record and more.

MORE

The record shows that in the four years that he was the Governor of the great State of Georgia, employees went up 25 percent, the cost of Government went up over 50 percent, and when he left the State of Georgia the bonded indebtedness was \$200 million more than when he came in. That is a lot of difference.

With that kind of a record, just imagine what he would do with the Federal Government.

Let's take one other totally inaccurate statement. I said last Wednesday that he had advocated a \$15 billion reduction in the Defense Department. He denied it. The record shows that in a meeting in Savannah, Georgia-- it shows that when he was interviewed in Los Angeles-- on two occasions he said in print, quoted, that he had advocated a \$15 billion reduction in the Defense Department. That is a matter of fact, and his denial is a total untruth, period.

Now let's talk about what he wants to do to the Defense Department. He wants to reduce it \$15 billion. That was a year ago. He now wants to reduce it 9 to 7 or 7 to 5. I really don't think he understands what the Defense Department is all about, except he wants to either cancel or delay the B-1 bomber.

Let me just take that as an illustration to show how irresponsible his ideas are on what we need to protect the peace and to keep the United States number one. The B-1 -- it is a replacement for the B-52 bomber. The B-52s are about 20 years old. Before the B-1s come in in any sufficient number, it will take another four to five years.

Jimmy Carter wants to cancel or delay the B-1, which means that the young men -- the pilots, the co-pilots and the crew -- if Jimmy Carter wins and he cancels the B-1, our young pilots and crews will be flying aircraft older than they are. That is not the way to run the Defense Department.

You can depend on this: Jerry Ford won't send an American pilot in combat in an aircraft older than he is. We want the most modern weapons. We want the best trained crew. We want the best leadership, and under our Administration we have it and we will keep it that way.

A \$5 a \$7 or a \$9 or \$15 billion cut in the Defense Department will gut our defense strength. We won't stand for it, and we are going to win on it.

Now let's take the third issue. This last January I recommended to the Congress of the United States that we ought to have a \$28 billion limitation reduction in the rate of growth of Federal spending, and in return we ought to have a \$28 billion tax cut.

MORE

For every dollar that we save in spending we should have a dollar reduction in Federal taxes. Jimmy Carter, what does he want? He talks in platitudes, he talks in inconsistent positions, flip-flops one day, from one position to another.

Let me say this very seriously: The best tax reform that I know is tax reduction for the American taxpayer.

The middle income taxpayers in this country that are the strength of America are the people that have gotten shortchanged in the last ten or 15 years in our tax legislation. They are the people that pay the taxes, obey the laws, give us the strength and the inspiration in this great country. They have been shortchanged, short shrift.

The best way I know to give them the kind of a fair tax break is to increase the personal exemption from \$750 per person to \$1,000. That is what we ought to get, and that is what we will get.

Let me make one other observation. I think everybody in this great gathering this afternoon, if they look back over the great, great Presidents of the United States they would say that Teddy Roosevelt was pretty high on the list; Teddy Roosevelt, one of the Rough Riders, one of the individuals who really did what he said he was going to do.

Teddy Roosevelt made a tremendous comment that I think is very apropos to the circumstances today. Teddy Roosevelt said, "We should speak softly and carry a big stick." If you look at the record of Jimmy Carter, what he wants to do to our Defense Department, what he wants to do to weaken the national security of the United States in the next ten years -- Jimmy Carter, he wants to talk loud and carry a fly swatter. (Laughter)

In Kansas City I said that we would not concede a single State, we would not concede a single vote, we were going to campaign from the snowy banks of Minnesota to the sandy plains of Georgia. We are doing it, and when I see this tremendous crowd, when I hear about the wonderful effort that you make in the Dallas area, when I see how enthusiastic you are, when I know of the record that you have made in the past, let me say the momentum is with us. We are going to carry Texas and win in November.

END

(AT 6:07 P.M. CDT)