

The original documents are located in Box 5, folder “Reagan, Ronald” of the A. James Reichley Files 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 Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

Some items in this folder were not digitized because it contains copyrighted materials. Please contact the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library for access to these materials.



R. Reagan

CANDIDATES ON THE ISSUES: REAGAN

By Godfrey Sperling Jr.
Staff correspondent of
The Christian Science Monitor

Oklahoma City

Ronald Reagan, asserting that "this country is hungry for a spiritual revival," says that as president he would "take advantage of every opportunity to stress moral values."

However, asked about the possibility that Democrat Jimmy Carter might be making prayer an issue, Mr. Reagan said, "I myself don't think we ought to make God an endorser in this campaign." He himself placed "great reliance" on prayer, he said.

Mr. Reagan gave these views during a lengthy interview with the Monitor aboard his plane recently, en route from Detroit to Oklahoma City. The interview was part of a Monitor effort to probe the specific campaign '76 stands on the issues of the three main contenders: Mr. Reagan, President Ford; and Mr. Carter.

Analyses of Mr. Ford's and Mr. Carter's stands will appear on these pages soon.

The interview came during a night flight on a small campaign jet, after a long day which had included a luncheon speech and several local TV interviews. Mr. Reagan spoke freely after a quick chicken dinner, never groping for answers. He was friendly, but maintained a degree of reserve. Except for the deep lines on his face, he has the look of a much younger man.

Among Mr. Reagan's points:

- He opposes national health insurance and calls "government medicine spending more expensive" and "less efficient" than private medical practice.
- He would add 5 to 15 years to the sentence of anyone with a gun in his possession while committing a crime, and make the sentence mandatory, without probation.
- He would "turn the industry loose" to produce the energy the country needs, and strike a balance between man and his environment which would recognize that "people are ecology, too."
- On foreign policy, he would oppose concessions to Moscow without proper concessions in return, keep up U.S. ties with Taiwan while using China as a "deterrent" against the Soviet Union, seek to replace Soviet with American influence in Arab states, refuse to deal with Cuba's Fidel Castro, and refuse to "negotiate away" the Panama Canal.

The interview follows:

Are you disturbed by the moral climate in the United States?

Oh yes, I think almost everyone is. I think what we have seen is an era of permissiveness. But I also think we have seen a kind of humanist philosophy that has been impressed particularly upon our children, a questioning of all moral values, all the traditional values.

Would you or could you do anything to improve this climate?

The office of the presidency does have a moral suasion. I believe that by setting a tone at that position, by doing whatever you can to counter this humanist philosophy and to reawaken an interest in traditional values upon which this country was founded — yes, I think a president can do something.

Do you do this by, perhaps, turning the presidency into what Teddy Roosevelt once called a "bully pulpit"?

I think you take advantage of every opportunity to stress those moral values. I think this country is hungry for a spiritual revival.

Jimmy Carter is bringing religion, certainly the subject of prayer, into this election. Do you think it belongs there?

Well, it has always been difficult for me to volunteer this. I have never hesitated to answer questions about my own faith, my own belief, my own reliance on prayer.

Is there a possibility that the candidates could be running against each other on which is more prayerful?

I don't think there should be such a contest. . . . I myself don't think that we ought to make God an endorser in this campaign. . . . It would be difficult for me to simply volunteer what my faith is. I have never hesitated to answer when asked, and, frankly, I place a great reliance on prayer.

Where do you stand on national health insurance?

I think any comparison of our pluralistic system in America compared to those countries such as England, Sweden, that have put in national health insurance reveals that government medicine is more expensive, government medicine is less efficient, and we have, I believe, the finest health care to be found any place in the world and we should think twice before we throw that system away.

How would you handle inflation? Unemployment?

Inflation and jobs go hand in hand. I believe that our problem has been [that] for too many years we treated the

Reagan Challenged Over Governorship

Presidential Drive Facing Questions Regarding Claims Made Elsewhere

BY KENNETH REICH
Times Political Writer

SACRAMENTO—As Ronald Reagan's campaign party arrived in Fresno this week, reporters were handed a press release from the President Ford Committee in which state Sen. Howard Way (R-Exeter) assailed Reagan for allegedly misrepresenting his record as governor on welfare reform.

"It was then that we instituted the reforms and it was in the next three years that we saved the taxpayers \$2 billion, that we increased the grants and that we reduced the rolls by more than 300,000 people."

In answer to a similar question in Sacramento Wednesday, Reagan said the welfare rolls had been mounting by 40,000 a month in the first years of his administration.

The Way statement continued that the California Employment Development Department, in a recent report, said that Reagan's Community Work Experience Program had "failed to achieve any of its objectives."

Way pointed out that Reagan had declared—in nationally and regionally televised speeches—that the work experience program "is an answer to much of the welfare problem in the nation" and said the program had "put able-bodied welfare recipients to work at useful community projects in return for the welfare grants."

But, he noted, the employment department found that during 1974, the program's peak year, only 2.6% of the 182,735 available welfare recipients were provided with

California
Supplement

R.
Reagan



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

F-Reagan



a725

s a eevbylwyf
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 zyvzvtwyf

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

