

**The original documents are located in Box C41, folder “Presidential Handwriting, 6/3/1976 (1)” of the Presidential Handwriting File 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. Gerald Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

---

INTERVIEW WITH  
OHIO NEWSPAPERS

Thursday, June 3, 1976

11:00 A. M.

THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN....

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

Post Summit Communiqué

Growing interdependence

In past met in periods  
of crisis

R II try to anticipate  
problems. Anticipate problems.

Not go from crisis  
to crisis.

Before fact, rather  
than after.

Balanced recovery / growth  
permanence.  
faster than anticipated

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

Rh - over - states  
make a statement &  
back away.  
TVA / Panama /  
Rhodesia.

of course  
take to / Last resort / take other  
interests.  
protect  
American  
lives

THE PRESIDENT HAS SIGNED...

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION \*  
FOR OHIO NEWSPAPERS

Thursday, June 3, 1976  
11:00 a.m. (60 minutes)  
State Dining Room

From: Ron Nessen *RHN*  
Margita White

I. PURPOSE

To answer questions from Ohio newspaper executives and reporters.

II. BACKGROUND, PARTICIPANTS AND PRESS PLAN

- A. Background: Ohio is one of the most media saturated states in the Union. The constraints on your travel have made it impossible to accept the large number of requests you have received from all segments of the Ohio media. Therefore, invitations were extended for separate sessions in the White House for newspapers, radio and television.

This program is for newspapers only. Editors of the more than 90 dailies and a dozen weeklies (selected by the Ohio Press Association) were invited to attend or send a representative.

Following the Q&A session with you and time for filing and individual luncheon plans, the Ohio newspaper representatives will attend an afternoon briefing by Don Rumsfeld and Alan Greenspan.

- B. Participants: The attendance list is attached at Tab A.

Staff Participants: Ron Nessen and Margita White.

- C. Press Plan: There will be open and full coverage for the participants. A transcript will be made available later upon request. Photographs will be taken by the participants, the wire service photographers and the White House photographer.

### III. TALKING POINTS

- A. The participants will be having coffee in the State Dining Room as you arrive to mingle informally for 10-15 minutes prior to the Q&A session.
- B. You will open the Q&A session by moving to the podium at 11:15 a.m.
- C. No opening statement is necessary. However, you may wish to say something along the following lines:

Welcome to the White House. I wish time might have permitted me to travel more extensively in Ohio and to respond individually to each of the many interview requests for the Ohio media. Since the responsibilities of the Presidency have required that I spend most of my time here in Washington and that I confine mostly to weekends my travel to the primary states, I have not had the opportunity to travel to Ohio. I am looking forward to a visit this weekend but there will be little time for interviews. Therefore I am gratified that so many of you have taken the time and trouble to join me here today.

- D. The Q&A session will conclude when one of the newsmen says "Thank you Mr. President" at 11:55 a.m. Time allows for you to mingle for 5 minutes as you depart.
- E. An Ohio briefing book has been prepared for you.
- F. This interview will immediately follow your announcement of the Puerto Rican Economic Summit meeting. You probably will want to make reference to that in your brief opening statement.



Mr. William T. Amos  
President, Publisher & Executive  
Editorial Director  
Sidney News  
Sidney, Ohio

Mrs. Mary E. Behrens  
Editor  
Marysville Journal-Tribune  
Marysville, Ohio

Mr. Winfield E. Behrens  
Publisher  
Marysville Journal-Tribune  
Marysville, Ohio

Mr. James Blount  
Editor  
Hamilton Journal-News  
Hamilton, Ohio

Mr. Vernon Bowling  
Editor  
Tipp City Herald  
Tipp City, Ohio

Mr. Bob Boyd  
Washington Correspondent  
Akron Beacon Journal  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Maynard A. Buck, Jr.  
Editor  
Harrison News Herald  
Cadiz, Ohio



Mr. F. Douglas Cajacob  
Photographer  
Wapakoneta News  
Wapakoneta, Ohio

Mr. Monroe Courtright  
Editor  
Public Opinion  
Westerville, Ohio

Mr. Robert Crater  
Washington Correspondent  
Scripps-Howard (Columbus Citizen-  
Journal)  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. James E. Davis  
Editor  
Times-Reporter  
New Philadelphia, Ohio

Mr. Raymond E. Dix  
President, Publisher & Senior Editor  
Wooster Record  
Wooster, Ohio

Ms. Angela Dodson  
Washington Correspondent  
Gannett (Fremont News-Messenger)  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. H. Luther Emery  
Editor  
Massillon Independent  
Massillon, Ohio

Mr. Charles W. Flora  
Washington Correspondent  
Scripps-Howard (Columbus Citizen-  
Journal)  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Walter S. Goshorn  
President and Editor  
Galion Inquirer  
Galion, Ohio

Mr. Ken C. Gove  
Publisher and Editor  
Shelby Globe  
Shelby, Ohio

Mr. Harry Horvitz  
Publisher  
Horvitz Newspapers  
Valley View, Ohio

Mr. Arthur D. Hudnutt  
President and Editor  
Elyria Chronicle-Telegram  
Elyria, Ohio

Mr. Bernard Judy  
Editor  
Toledo Blade  
Toledo, Ohio

Mr. Elbert W. Lampson  
Editor  
Jefferson Gazette  
Jefferson, Ohio

Mr. Richard J. Maloy  
Washington Correspondent  
Thomson Newspapers (Lancaster  
Eagle-Gazette)  
Washington, D. C.

Ms. Ann Williamson Rhyan  
Troy News  
Troy, Ohio

Mr. William B. Rogers  
Editor  
Newark Advocate  
Newark, Ohio

Mr. Arnold S. Rosenfeld  
Editor  
Dayton News  
Dayton, Ohio

Mr. Thomas J. Scheiber  
City Editor  
Tiffin Advertiser-Tribune  
Tiffin, Ohio

Mr. LaVerne R. Shaul  
Publisher and General Manager  
Wapakoneta News  
Wapakoneta, Ohio

Mr. Richard G. Thomas  
Ohio News Service  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Thomas Vail  
President, Publisher and Editor  
Cleveland Plain Dealer  
Cleveland, Ohio

Mr. Lewis A. Von Bergen  
UPI  
Washington, D. C.

Ms. Betty Ann Williams  
AP  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Steve Wolfrom  
Editor  
Fostoria Review-Times  
Fostoria, Ohio

Mr. George Embrey  
Columbus Dispatch  
Columbus, Ohio

Mr. Dave Kraslow  
Cox Newspapers  
Washington, DC

Ms. Susan Mathis

Mr. Loris C. Troyer  
Executive Editor  
Record-Courier  
Ravenne, Ohio

Mr. Warren Wheat  
Cincinnati Inquirer  
Cincinnati, Ohio

## REAGAN ON TROOPS TO RHODESIA

Remarks made at speech to Sacramento Press Club

June 2, 1976

### THE PRESIDENT HAS SEEN...

Reagan said if he is elected President he might send American troops to Rhodesia "in the interest of peace and avoiding bloodshed" if the Rhodesian government asked for help.

He said he does not believe an actual commitment of American troops would be necessary to preserve the peace during a transition of power to the black majority in the white-ruled African nation.

He said a treaty or promise of U.S. help might be enough to restore peace in the African nation:

"Whether it would be enough to have simply a show of strength or whether you have to go in with occupation forces or not, I don't know."

But he said he would be willing to send American troops

"if the government there said that a token show is necessary."

Asked if he would go beyond sending a token force to Rhodesia, Reagan replied:

"I don't think you'd have to." But he added, "If we had made such an arrangement, such a pledge, I certainly would."

NOTE: Another account of the above quote is:

"Well, if we made such an arrangement that made such a pledge, I assume we would."

Reagan also said:

"I do not believe this would be out of line with the policy we followed in several other areas, and the policy that we followed in the Middle East. And certainly it never involved us in war in the Middle East, nor do I believe it would involve us in war there (Rhodesia)."

In speech in Visalia - June 2 :

He believes Americans should "offer our services to mediate and help arrive at a settlement...and see there's no bloodshed and violence

while the transition is made" to majority rule in Rhodesia.

Jim Lake (Reagan's Press Secretary) said the Visalia remarks referred only to diplomatic moves, not troops.

The Today Show this morning reported:

"Ronald Reagan said the statement he made yesterday should not be interpreted as meaning that he would go to war over Rhodesia. The original statement was that if he is elected President he might send troops to Rhodesia if the Rhodesians requested them to keep the peace.

An aide said Reagan feels it would be better to send a UN force instead of Americans."

R A

PK-REAGAN 6-3

BY ROBERT B. GUNNISON

SAN FRANCISCO (UPI) -- RONALD REAGAN SAYS HE WANTS TO DISPEL ANY NOTION THAT HE WOULD GO TO WAR OVER RHODESIA.

CAMPAIGNING FOR THE JUNE 8 CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN PRESIDENTIAL PRIMARY, REAGAN WEDNESDAY TOLD A SACRAMENTO AUDIENCE HE WOULD BE WILLING TO SEND U.S. TROOPS TO THE TROUBLED AFRICAN NATION "IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE AND AVOIDING BLOODSHED."

THE FORMER GOVERNOR SAID A TREATY, OR "THE PROMISE" OF AMERICAN HELP, MIGHT BE ENOUGH TO TRIGGER FORMATION OF A GOVERNMENT COMPRISING BLACK NATIONALIST GUERRILLAS AND THE WHITE MINORITY.

REAGAN SAID, HOWEVER, HE MIGHT DISPATCH SOMETHING BEYOND A "TOKEN FORCE" IF NECESSARY TO MAINTAIN PEACE. HE COMPARED THE SITUATION TO THE PEACE-KEEPING FORCES SENT TO THE MIDDLE EAST.

MINUTES AFTER HE MADE THE REMARK, HE TOLD A STATE SENATOR THAT REPORTERS WOULD INTERPRET THE STATEMENT TO MEAN HE "HAD DECLARED WAR ON RHODESIA."

LATER, AT A FUND RAISING SUPPER IN CUPERTINO, REAGAN STARTED HIS BRIEF REMARKS TO ABOUT 200 PERSONS BY SAYING: "IT ISN'T TRUE. I'M NOT GOING TO DECLARE WAR ON RHODESIA.

"I MADE THE MISTAKE OF SPEAKING TO THE PRESS CLUB OVER IN SACRAMENTO. YOU HAVE TO BE CAREFUL ABOUT WHAT YOU SAY."

DECLARING HE FAVORED DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY RULE IN RHODESIA, REAGAN TOLD THE PRESS CLUB THE CURRENT STRIFE WAS "NOT A RACIAL PROBLEM." HE SAID THE UNITED STATES AND GREAT BRITAIN TOGETHER SHOULD GUARANTEE PEACE DURING NEGOTIATIONS.

HE WAS ASKED HOW HE WOULD SUPPORT THE GUARANTEES -- WITH AN OCCUPATION FORCE, TROOPS OR OBSERVERS.

"YOU WOULD HAVE TO BE COMPLETELY INVOLVED WITH THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT AND FIND OUT WHETHER THAT WOULD BE NECESSARY," HE REPLIED. "IT MIGHT SIMPLY BE THAT THE PROMISE, THE TREATY OR AGREEMENT, WOULD PREVENT THE OTHER FROM HAPPENING ...

"BUT WHETHER IT WOULD BE ENOUGH TO HAVE SIMPLY THE SHOW OF STRENGTH -- THE PROMISE THAT WE WOULD -- OR WHETHER YOU'D HAVE TO GO IN WITH OCCUPATION FORCES, I DON'T KNOW."

ASKED IF HE MEANT HE WOULD CONSIDER DISPATCHING TROOPS TO AFRICA, REAGAN INDICATED HE WOULD, PROVIDED THE RHODESIAN GOVERNMENT BELIEVED A "TOKEN SHOW" WOULD HELP.

WOULD HE GO BEYOND A TOKEN SHOW?

"I DON'T THINK YOU'D HAVE TO."

BUT WHAT IF YOU HAD TO?

"WELL, IF WE MADE SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT THAT MADE SUCH A PLEDGE, I ASSUME WE WOULD."

UPI 06-03 10:18 RED

Washington Star  
June 3

## Reagan Willing To Send Troops To Rhodesia

SACRAMENTO (AP) — Ronald Reagan says that if he is elected president he may send American troops to Rhodesia to preserve the peace if the Rhodesian government asked for help.

But the former California governor said he doesn't believe an actual commitment of American troops would be necessary during a transition of power to the black majority in the white-ruled African nation.

Reagan also outlined a platform opposing school busing and flatly rejected a vice presidential nomination if President Ford defeats him for the Republican nomination for the presidency.

REAGAN SAID he believes the United States should have taken a more active role in preventing bloodshed in Rhodesia and that perhaps the United States still could play a peace-keeping role there.

See REAGAN, A-9

## REAGAN

Continued From A-1

"Whether it would be enough to have simply a show of strength, or whether you have to go in with occupation forces or not, I don't know," Reagan said.

But he said he would be willing to send American troops "if the government there said that a token show . . . is necessary."

Asked if he would go beyond sending a token force to Rhodesia, Reagan replied, "I don't think you'd have to."

He added, "If we had made such an arrangement, such a pledge, I certainly would."

"I do not believe this would be out of line with the policy we followed in several other areas, and the policy that we followed in the Middle East. And certainly it never involved us in war in the Middle East, nor do I believe it would involve us in war there (Rhodesia)," Reagan said.

REAGAN SAID Tuesday in Visalia that he believes Americans should "offer our services to mediate and help arrive at a settlement . . . and see that there's no bloodshed and violence while the transition is

made" to majority rule in Rhodesia.

But Reagan's press secretary, Jim Lake, said Reagan's Visalia remarks referred only to diplomatic moves, not troops.

Yesterday was Reagan's second day of campaigning in California's rich agricultural heartland in his campaign against Ford. There are 167 delegates at stake in Tuesday's winner-take-all Republican primary.

In a speech earlier in the day Reagan outlined his most detailed position to date on busing.

"As President, I would propose to Congress legislation . . . that would eliminate forced busing," he said.

"SHOULD THAT prove inadequate, then I would propose a constitutional amendment as follows: No state nor the federal government shall refuse admission to a public institution to any person, otherwise qualified, solely on account of race, color, ethnic origin, sex or creed."

Reagan previously said he would support an anti-busing constitutional amendment as a last resort, and repeatedly has described busing as "a social experiment that has failed, with our children as guinea pigs."



June 3, 1971

# Reagan bares plan against busing

By BRUCE WINTERS  
Sun Staff Correspondent

Sacramento, Calif. — The White House of Ronald Reagan would propose a constitutional amendment if necessary to end forced busing and order the federal bureaucracy "to get off the back" of local school systems, the candidate said yesterday.

[Mr. Reagan also said yesterday that if he is elected president he might send American troops to Rhodesia to preserve the peace if the Rhodesian government asked for help, the Associated Press reported. He said he does not believe an actual commitment of American troops would be necessary to preserve the peace during a transition of power to the black majority in the white-ruled African nation.]

["Whether it would be enough to have simply a show of strength, or whether you have to go in with occupation forces or not, I don't know," Mr. Reagan said.]

[But he said he would be willing to send American troops "if the government there said that a token show . . . is necessary."]

[Asked if he would go beyond sending a token force to Rhodesia. See REAGAN, A12, Col. 5]

## Reagan would oppose forced busing

REAGAN, from A1

sia, Reagan, replied, "I don't think you'd have to." But, he added, "If we had made such an arrangement, such a pledge, I certainly would.]

Campaigning through Northern California, Mr. Reagan presented those ideas to the Sacramento Press Club in a single, detailed package for the first time since he began campaigning actively for the Republican presidential nomination.

Until now, his weightiest statement on education involved an oft-repeated one-liner: "Maybe if we get Washington out of the classroom, we can get God back in."

Likewise, he has opposed busing solely to achieve racial

balance in classrooms, calling it "a social experiment that has failed."

But yesterday, reading from an eight-page text rather than winging through a standard stump speech, he made what his traveling staff referred to as "a major statement" on the federal role in education.

The amendment, Mr. Reagan said, would be offered only if Congress failed to draft legislation that would forbid forced busing.

In that event, he would propose the following amendment: "No state nor the federal government shall refuse admission to a public institution to any person, otherwise qualified, solely on account of race, color, ethnic origin, sex or creed."

To help students enroll in the schools of their choices, the federal government "might" adopt a system of vouchers or tax credits to ease whatever financial burdens would fall upon local authorities.

"While racial segregation simply has no place in American public schools, neither has forced busing," Mr. Reagan said. "It has wrought too much damage already."

The candidate asked rhetorically: "Is it only coincidence that achievement levels in the public schools were falling—as measured by test scores—exactly in the years when compulsory busing was fanning controversy in so many communities, cities and districts throughout the land?"

He added: "If I am elected president, it would be my intention to issue strict instructions to the Department of Health, Education and Welfare, and to other federal departments, to get off the back of state and local school systems, to leave the setting of policies and the administration of school affairs to local boards of education."

The nation's school systems, he said, were spending more tax dollars and teaching less than ever before. "If money alone could improve education," the candidate added, "the skills and knowledge of the students throughout America should, by now, have reached dizzying genius-like heights." The opposite has occurred, Mr. Reagan said.

UP-217

(POLITICS)

(BY LEWIS LORD)

WASHINGTON (UPI)--JIMMY CARTER, WHO HAS PREDICTED A FIRST BALLOT VICTORY AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, NOW SAYS A SECOND BALLOT WIN IS MORE PROBABLE.

"I FEEL MORE CONFIDENT OF A SECOND BALLOT VICTORY," THE DEMOCRATIC FRONTRUNNER SAID WEDNESDAY AS HE WRAPPED UP HIS CAMPAIGN FOR NEXT TUESDAY'S CALIFORNIA PRIMARY.

CARTER SAID DELEGATES PLEDGED TO GEORGE WALLACE WILL SHIFT TO HIS COLUMN IF THERE IS A SECOND BALLOT, GIVING HIM THE NOMINATION.

IN THE RACE FOR THE GOP PRESIDENTIAL NOMINATION, RONALD REAGAN, ALSO CONCENTRATING HIS EFFORTS IN CALIFORNIA, SAID HE WOULD BE WILLING TO SEND AMERICAN FORCES TO RHODESIA "IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE AND AVOIDING BLOODSHED."

REAGAN TOLD THE SACRAMENTO PRESS CLUB A TREATY OR PROMISE OF U.S. HELP MIGHT BE ENOUGH TO RESTORE PEACE IN THE AFRICAN NATION. ASKED IF MORE U.S. FORCES WOULD BE SENT IF A TOKEN FORCE WERE INADEQUATE, REAGAN SAID: "WELL, IF WE MADE SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT THAT MADE SUCH A PLEDGE, I ASSUME WE WOULD."

PRESIDENT FORD ANNOUNCED PLANS FOR HIS FINAL PRIMARY CAMPAIGN TRIP. HE WILL CAMPAIGN SUNDAY IN NEW JERSEY AND OHIO, THEN MAKE AN EIGHT-CITY OHIO MOTORCADE MONDAY.

UPI 26-23 29:42 AED

R A

PH-POLITICS SKED 6-3

PICTURE

BY LEWIS LORD

UNITED PRESS INTERNATIONAL

JIMMY CARTER, WHO HAS PREDICTED A FIRST BALLOT VICTORY AT THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION, NOW SAYS A SECOND BALLOT WIN IS MORE PROBABLE.

"I FEEL MORE CONFIDENT OF A SECOND BALLOT VICTORY," THE DEMOCRATIC FRONTRUNNER SAID WEDNESDAY AS HE WRAPPED UP HIS CAMPAIGN FOR THE CALIFORNIA PRIMARY IN NEXT WEEK'S "SUPER TUESDAY."

CARTER SAID DELEGATES PLEDGED TO ALABAMA GOV. GEORGE WALLACE WILL SHIFT TO HIS COLUMN IF THERE IS A SECOND BALLOT, GIVING HIM THE NOMINATION.

TUESDAY'S FINAL THREE PRIMARIES OF THE YEAR -- IN CALIFORNIA, OHIO AND NEW JERSEY -- WILL BE CRUCIAL AND COULD DECIDE BOTH THE DEMOCRATIC AND REPUBLICAN NOMINATIONS.

FRANK CHURCH SUGGESTED MORRIS UDALL, WHO HAS PLACED SECOND IN EIGHT PRIMARIES BUT NEVER FIRST, DROP OUT OF THE OHIO RACE TO GIVE HIM A CLEAR SHOT AT CARTER.

"IF I COULDN'T WIN, I WOULD STOP RUNNING," SAID CHURCH, WHOSE VICTORY IN MONTANA THIS WEEK WAS HIS FOURTH IN FIVE PRIMARIES.

UDALL, WHO LAST WEEK URGED CHURCH TO STAY OUT OF OHIO, SAID HE HAS MORE DELEGATES THAN ANYONE BUT CARTER AND WON'T QUIT.

"I THINK THE RACE IN OHIO IS BETWEEN ME AND CARTER," UDALL SAID. "I'M IN IT ALL THE WAY."

CALIFORNIA GOV. EDMUND BROWN JR. CLAIMED HE FINISHED FIRST IN THIS WEEK'S RHODE ISLAND PRIMARY AS A RESULT OF AN UNCOMMITTED SLATE EMERGING ONE PERCENTAGE POINT AHEAD OF CARTER.

THE SEVEN UNCOMMITTED RHODE ISLAND DELEGATES ALL HAD EXPRESSED A PREFERENCE FOR BROWN AND STATE DEMOCRATIC CHAIRMAN CHARLES REILLY SAID THEY ARE "MORALLY OBLIGATED" TO BACK THE CALIFORNIA GOVERNOR.

BROWN SAID THE RHODE ISLAND RESULTS DEMONSTRATED THAT "JIMMY CARTER HAS YET TO PROVE HIMSELF THE FRONTRUNNER."

CARTER, WHO WON THIS WEEK'S SOUTH DAKOTA PRIMARY AND FINISHED SECOND IN RHODE ISLAND AND MONTANA, DESCRIBED BROWN'S COMMENT AS "A LITTLE BIT ILLOGICAL."

"I'D SAY SOMEONE WHO HAS MORE THAN A THOUSAND DELEGATES IS AHEAD OF SOMEONE WHO HAS 25," CARTER SAID IN SAN FRANCISCO. "BUT THAT'S JUST MY TWISTED LOGIC. MAYBE THAT WOULDN'T STAND UP UNDER THE ZEN BUDDHIST ANALYSIS."

RONALD REAGAN, CONCENTRATING HIS EFFORTS ON CALIFORNIA'S WINNER-TAKE-ALL REPUBLICAN PRIMARY, SAID HE WOULD BE WILLING TO SEND AMERICAN FORCES TO RHODESIA "IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE AND AVOIDING BLOODSHED."

REAGAN TOLD THE SACRAMENTO PRESS CLUB A TREATY OR PROMISE OF U.S. HELP MIGHT BE ENOUGH TO RESTORE PEACE IN THE AFRICAN NATION. ASKED IF MORE U.S. FORCES WOULD BE SENT IF A TOKEN FORCE WERE INADEQUATE, REAGAN SAID: "WELL, IF WE MADE SUCH AN ARRANGEMENT THAT MADE SUCH A PLEDGE, I ASSUME WE WOULD."

PRESIDENT FORD ANNOUNCED PLANS FOR HIS FINAL PRIMARY CAMPAIGN TRIP. HE WILL CAMPAIGN SUNDAY IN NEW JERSEY AND OHIO, THEN MAKE AN EIGHT-CITY OHIO MOTORCADE MONDAY.

UPI 06-03 03:11 AED

a724

s a eevbyluiv

BC-Reagan Roundtable, Adv 06 - 5 Takes, 490-2,330

\$ADV 06

For Release Sun, June 6

By WALTER R. MEARS

and

DOUG WILLIS

Associated Press Writers

LOS ANGELES AP - Ronald Reagan contends that U.S. defenses have slipped to a point at which the Soviet Union can be "more truculent and aggressive" with conventional arms and might survive American retaliation in a nuclear war.

In an interview with The Associated Press, the Republican presidential challenger said the U.S. defense budget should be whatever it takes to maintain national security, but said he could not set a figure.

Reagan said he had confidence in the budget favored by former Secretary of Defense James R. Schlesinger, who advocated about \$104 billion in defense spending this year. That is about \$3 billion over President Ford's budget.

Reagan also said he still wants to shift programs that represent about a quarter of the \$396-billion federal budget to state and local governments, along with tax sources to finance them. But he said he had no estimate of how much the net tax saving would be.

He said there is concern in Congress that the administration "might by some kind of executive order" make U.S. concessions in Panama without congressional approval.

Reagan has said that as President, he would not permit negotiations with Panama predicated on a yielding of U.S. sovereignty over the canal and its zone. He has avoided saying that he would simply break off negotiations.

Insisting that the United States should not give up control of the Canal Zone, Reagan said only in "the era of science fiction" can he envision a time when the Panama Canal will not be vital to U.S. interests.

Here is a partial transcript of the interview, conducted aboard Reagan's chartered jet as he campaigned for Tuesday's California presidential primary:

Q. Gov. Reagan, you say the United States has slipped to second place in military strength. Does this mean in your view that the Soviet Union could now defeat the U.S. in a full scale war?

A: I don't believe . . . that the Soviet Union would have the margin of superiority to attack. But I think the great danger is that the Soviet Union is in the position of being more truculent and aggressive with the use of conventional arms, knowing that there is virtually no way we can prevent this, such as in Angola. All we could do was talk.

Q: You mean that you think this creates a new danger of brush-fire type wars?

A: That's right, up to and including. I think, what the commander of NATO warned about, Alexander Haig, that the imbalance there was so great that we were on the edge of disaster. Now suppose the move should come by the Soviet Union in western Europe and the NATO alliance can't stop them . . . The only recourse left to us would be the one thing that none of us wants at all, the nuclear button. The day we push the nuclear button we know that we do not have the nuclear superiority we once had, we don't even have parity.

MORE

2242pED 06-02

BC-Reagan Roundtable, Adv 06 - 1st add, 470

\$ADV 06

For Release Sun, June 6

LOS ANGELES: that parity.

Q: But you do believe that we still have second strike capability?

A: Not really. We've ignored some very significant factors, one of them being their civil defense plan. There are estimates . . . that they could take a second strike and suffer probably fewer casualties than they did in World War II. Russian casualties during World War II were estimated at 20 million .

Q: So what does this add up to? Does this mean that you're concerned about being in a massive retaliation position, or about the United States being unable to retaliate?

A: I am concerned that we must have a defensive posture so strong that they can't be tempted into doing this. Now this does not mean, . . . that I would have us have tank for tank and gun for gun and man for man. Not at all. Our ability has lain in technology and in qualitative superiority. We have weapons systems which have not been developed, for example the cruise missile, probably the most promising . . . a weapons system in which we're years ahead of them in development. This would alter their whole plan if suddenly we were on the scene with a new weapons system. . .

Q: The administration's defense budget this year is 14 per cent higher than last year, about \$101 billion. The projections in Ford's budget would have it go up by about \$10 billion a year over the next four years. How much more do you think should be spent?

A: Well, in defense spending I believe that you are guided by necessity. It isn't a matter of opinion, of choosing to have this priority or that priority. You have to spend what is necessary to maintain national security.

Q: Can you say what is necessary in your view?

A: No, although I do believe that I would have confidence in Dr. Schlesinger's figures when he was there. Now I've never challenged that Mr. Ford has not asked for more armaments, for more defense spending than Congress has been willing to give. But . . . he places his faith and confidence in his long time buddies in the Congress and they turn him down. And I have said that leadership today, I believe, calls for going to the American people and telling them the truth.

Q: . . . You've made that point repeatedly . . . Ford says that he's been sustained in 42 vetoes that have saved \$13 billion. What could you do differently?

A: Well, let's take that picture of defense. Here is his own secretary of defense caught between not wanting to reduce the political chances of the President but at the same time trying to persuade the Congress . . . that we need more defense strength. And so he can't say, he won't say we're No. 2, but he won't say we're No. 1. Mr. Ford at the same time . . . is saying to the American people we're the most powerful nation on earth. You can't have it both ways . . . What is wrong with the President of the United States saying to the people of the United States here is the danger and it is your danger, not just mine . . .

More

2252pED 06-02



a726

s a eevbylvx

BC-Reagan Roundtable, Adv 06 - 2nd add, 470

\$ADV 06

For Release Sun, June 6

LOS ANGELES: just mine. . .

Q: Ford has called Congress irresponsible . . . and has been very critical of the Congress for overspending . . .

A: Well, he's vetoed some spending bills and I think this is understandable. Good Lord, he's boasting about \$13 billion, I vetoed \$16 billion worth at a state level. State Finance Director Roy Bell says Reagan vetoed nearly \$2.3 billion in spending bills during his eight years as California governor. . . . Probably the greatest triumph we had were the welfare reforms in California. Now the opposition was so great there that when I asked the legislature as governor for permission to come before a joint session and present the proposal for reform, they refused . . . So I went up and down the state presenting them to the people. And the result was that in about two months the leadership of the Democratic legislature came in to see me and their expression was 'Stop those cards and letters.'

Q: Is this what you would do from the White House?

A: Yes, and I think it's long overdue.

Q: You've said that any President would have to say that he'd go to war if necessary to defend the Panama Canal. What about situations short of loss of the canal, a situation in which we would still have use of the canal . . . but Panama would control it. Where do you draw the line?

A: Well I think the safest line, here is one of the four great waterways of the world, strategic waterways. And in a time of emergency or war, an enemy that could close those four waterways could shut down the industry of the United States . . . Now one of the reasons for our having sovereignty in the canal zone is because we realized that this great and important waterway was being built across a tiny country which could not possibly be expected to preserve or defend the canal . . . The thing is that sovereignty then gives us this power and ability, there is a deterrent factor against someone trying to take it if it belongs to the United States.

Q: Then in your view the zone and the canal are inseparable issues? The administration position is that we negotiate on the zone and then somewhere down the road consider . . . the canal.

A: But you have a treaty now, what they're talking about is a treaty which would call for a period in which you'd turn over the canal. How do you negotiate such a treaty when you don't even know what kind of government there will be in Panama? We're negotiating with a fellow that took over by military force and threw out the elected government of the country.

Q: Is there a point foreseeable at which we won't need the canal?

A: Well, now we get into the era of science fiction. No one can ever say that something is impossible . . . Suppose down the road someplace surface travel of ships literally became minute or non-existent because of some new development . . . out of our space travel, something developed in rocket travel . . . Then, of course, a canal wouldn't be necessary.

MORE

2301pED 06-02

a727

s a eevbyleev

BC-Reagan Roundtable, Adv 06 - 3rd add, 470

\$ADV 06

For Release Sun, June 6

LOS ANGELES: necessary. . .

Q: You want a balanced federal budget, but you also want an increase in defense spending and you've advocated several tax cuts . . . How can you balance the budget and at the same time increase defense spending and cut taxes?

A: How did we save \$2 billion on welfare and increase the welfare grants by 43 per cent in California? And we saved the taxpayers \$2 billion . . .

Welfare grants were increased and the caseload declined under Reagan reforms. The claim of a \$2-billion saving is based on an estimate of what welfare would have cost Californians in state, federal and local taxes without the reforms, according to a Reagan aide. State welfare spending went from \$450 million to \$968 million annually during the Reagan administration, and federal matching funds increased about as much. Exact comparisons are impossible because of a shift of programs for the aged, blind and disabled from federal to state jurisdiction . . .

Congressman Phil Crane R-Ill. has written a booklet on saving \$56 billion in federal spending and yet adding a couple of billion dollars for research and development for the Pentagon . . . Now I'm not going to say that I agree with every point . . . But he also includes, and I would too, the Pentagon itself as an area of savings. You have to assume that the same kind of bureaucratic fat exists in the Pentagon as in any other government agency . . .

Q: The transfer program, to which you still refer without the ill-fated \$90 billion figure, how big a share of the federal budget do you now envision transferring back to the states? You've mentioned welfare and other programs that you want to switch.

A: Well, what I had to do, the \$90 billion figure, which I think got distorted, was an illustration of the size of those half-dozen programs to the federal government . . .

Q: Well, that was about a quarter of the budget, a little less. Is that still the range of transfer that you have in mind?

A: Yes. But I also . . . made it plain that this would not be a net saving because obviously if you're going to continue those programs some of that spending is going to be there. What I pointed out was that with that much in just that transfer alone, that first you'd lose the portion of that . . . Washington administrative overhead, it would be gone. Second, I believe from our own experience with welfare that there is then an additional slice because they would be run more efficiently and effectively at the state and local level than they're being run in what is bad administration . . .

Q: Can you quantify that . . . How much do you think that you can save if you are able to transfer about a quarter of the federal budget back to the states?

A: That I couldn't quantify because I don't know at the moment, I would not have available to me the figures on what is the administrative overhead, what share of HEW would become unnecessary.

MORE

2310PED 06-02

a315

s a zyvzvtywif

BC-Reagan Roundtable, Adv 06 - 4th add, 440

\$ADV 06

Repeating for all needing

For Release Sun, June 6

LOS ANGELES: unnecessary. . .

Q: You've also said you think there are a number of federal programs that should be canceled outright. Could you give me some examples?

A: Of course there's Phil Crane's book, but as I say, I can't go by that completely, but I think when you look at it, yes, we're in an emergency situation with our country now going into debt at a rate of about \$100 billion a year . . . You have to treat this as an emergency situation just as a family whose breadwinner suddenly has had a big cut in income and the family's got to say what can we do without. Now maybe some of the things you do without are not foolish or useless but maybe some of them you have to say, well, they're a low priority, they're not as important as food on the table. . .

For example, I think you'd have to look at the arts program . . . Now this wouldn't be a big saving, it isn't a big program, but here's an example.

Q: The program for the arts, I believe, is about \$180 million . . .

A: Yes.

Q: That doesn't get you very far toward dealing with a \$70 billion deficit.

A: No, as I said, this is one of the smaller ones . . .

Q: Are there any big ones?

A: Sure. I think there are. I think a lot of that big chunk would come in this transfer back to local government . . . Look at 74,000 regulators now, federal regulators, enforcing federal regulations. It is estimated that the administrative expense of those alone . . . is \$3 billion . . .

President Ford has proposed to Congress an easing of federal regulations of industry and business over the next four years, with specific steps yet to be outlined. Ford said there are 80 agencies and about 100,000 federal employees involved in regulatory programs. The current administration budget for the 24 major regulatory agencies is \$3.8 billion . . .

Q: Who are the regulators that you would eliminate?

A. The regulation that we have to have is where government protects us from each other. For example, we have anti-monopoly laws . . .

Q: What about food stamps? Is that something you think we can eliminate?

A: This is something that should be transferred. Right now it's run at the state level or administered at the state level but totally under the authority of the federal government.

Q: And these transfers would be with earmarking of a portion of the federal income tax to the states and localities?

A: Whether that or whether other taxes . . . Whether it's a particular tax, a whole tax, certainly I do not mean to dump it on the states.

End ADV Sun June 6, Sent June 2

End Repeat

2343pED 06-02