The original documents are located in Box 5, folder "Reagan, Ronald" of the A. James Reichley Files at the Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.

Election: News

F 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

Christian Science Monitor, 6/3/76 (Cont.)

symptoms and not the disease. It is the government deficit spending which causes inflation, which in turn causes the recurrent recessions and the unemployment.

What would you do to reduce big government?

My own belief has been that there are several major areas, major programs, that the federal government is attempting to run, which it was never intended to run and was never constructed to run. And those programs, plus the resources to finance them, should be turned back to states and, as far as possible, to local governments for authority and administration.

The spending crisis in the big cities?

Much of that has been forced on the big cities by the federal government with programs, social reforms, all on a sharing basis. To get the federal funds the cities need to go along with the programs, they vastly increase their staffing, the size of their city governments, even far more than the federal government because now the federal government is transfering the employing of extra help to the local levels and at the same time, using this as justification, the federal government has preempted the bulk of the taxing sources in the country. I believe with turning back these programs I mentioned to the state and local government the federal government should turn back resources to pay for them. And I think this could solve the city problem.

How about fighting crime?

That, basically, of course, is at the state and local level. The bulk of our criminal law is state law and law enforcement is for the most part at the local level. The federal government, in appointing of judges, and wherever it can be of assistance it should, but here I believe the main answer lies at the state and local level.

A related question – how about gun control?

The administration bill at present is another one of those attempts which I believe would only result in making it difficult if not impossible for the law-abiding to get a gun but it wouldn't do anything to keep the criminal from getting one. I believe what we did in California makes more sense. We have passed a law that says if a criminal had a gun in his possession when he committed a crime, add 5 to 15 years to his prison sentence. The second law says no judge can turn a gun-carrying criminal, if he is convicted, back on the street on probation. He has to serve a mandatory prison sentence.

In this post-Watergate climate, what would you do to improve the ethics of government?

Will Rogers once said that those in public office are no better and no worse than those who send them there. Maybe what we're talking about goes back to the original question. Maybe if there has been an ethical decline in public life or in public office, it is a reflection of, again, this eroding moral standard maybe in all of our society. But it is a reflection.

What to do, I think, is again – it's an overall thing, I think it begins in the family. I think certainly it begins in our schools. I think in some of our higher educational institutions where they espouse the situational ethic whereby the ethic fits the situation – all of this has to be changed. We have to recognize that the moral standards that have grown up down through 6,000 years of civilization should not be cast aside simply because they are old. They have been tested by time. And it begins with every individual watching his own particular efforts. It isn't any good for the fellow to sneer at politicians if at the same time he is running a fast deal in his own existence.

The issue of abortion?

I believe that interrupting a pregnancy is the taking of a human life and that can only be done in self-defense.

Energy? Environment? How would you handle them?

I think we have two groups of [environmental] extremists. There are, of course, those people on the one side who would pave the country over in the name of progress. There is an extremist group on the other extreme that wouldn't let you build a house unless it looked like a bird's nest. Now I think there has to be common sense in between that recognizes the people are ecology, too.

With regard to energy, we have deteriorated in our ability to provide energy sources for ourselves in the three years since the Arab embargo. Today we are producing less than we were three years ago, and we're importing more than half of our consumption. I think it is time for us to turn the industry loose and I would suggest we begin by closing out June 30, when its original term is up, the Federal Energy Agency, and that we should repeal the energy legislation that was signed into law last December and turn the industry loose in the free market system to produce the energy we need.

The FBI and the CIA: Have the recent congressional probes been a good thing?

They've been overdone. I was on the presidential commission on the CIA. We found there had been some misdeeds. We found they were scattered over 28 years, and we found almost without exception that every one of them had been corrected internally by the CIA before there had ever been an investigation. But I think the congressional committee investigations have painted a distorted picture. They have shaken the confidence of the people in two organizations that have served this country very well, and they have reduced our ability at law enforcement and at counterintelligence.

On farm policy, where do you stand on the encouragement of trade abroad, and the question of subsidies?

The government was wrong last year after it had urged the farmers to plant, to harvest, and to sell in the open market, to change the rules in the middle of the game. Slapping an embargo on the grain sales and when they finally lifted it the farmers had lost $2.5 billion in sales and the price had been reduced. I think that with the farm economy we have, which is the greatest in the world and which probably has improved its productivity more than any industry we know – I think they should be freed on the open market to produce and to sell on the open market in a hungry world to the best that they could do.

Should subsidies gradually be reduced?

I trust in the marketplace, but I recognize that you can't suddenly pull the rug from under industries that for 40 years have been geared to certain government supports and so forth. Believing in the marketplace, I would like to see wherever possible. and with cooperation with the agricultural industry itself, a gradual elimination of these and a gradual turning to the free marketplace.

Where do you stand on defense spending?

Defense spending is something I don't believe is very much subject to argument or opinion. I think you have to spend. That is dictated by necessity. You have to spend what is necessary to ensure that no other nation acquires the strength to challenge you and violate the peace.

What is your attitude on how the U.S. should deal with the Soviet Union?

Detente, which started out worthily and with a good purpose, has become a one-way street. I think the Soviet Union has become more truculent, more aggressive in the world. And we have been responding with preemptive concessions without getting anything in return. I think it is time for us to rebuild our strength and at the same time make detente if it is to exist a two-way street by telling the Russians that is the only way we will observe it.

Relations with China?

China is a deterrent. Our relationship with mainland China has been a deterrent and a help, not only to them because of their sharing of the border with the Soviet Union and the fear that exists between the two countries of each other, but I think that it serves our purpose. I don't believe, however, that in pursuing that relationship we should be persuaded to drop any of our longtime friends or allies like Taiwan. I think we should say to the mainland Chinese that they accept us and our friendship with the knowledge and understanding that we will not, in return for that, throw any allies aside or break any of our commitments to our allies.

Should the U.S. keep its troops there?

Well, if there is a need and a desire. I wouldn't remove them if in any way it was an indication to the Republic of China that we were any less determined to maintain our relationship with them and the terms of our mutual agreements.

How about our relationships toward Cuba?

I think Mr. Castro has a long way to go before we go back to that policy which was started by this administration last May of warming up and leading to a recognition of Cuba. Here is a man who has been exporting revolution. He's made no move whatsoever to ever reinstitute payment for properties he seized not only from our people but from his own people – no civil liberties for his people. I would think if he does some of those things, that he extends a hand and wants agreement with us, then I would predicate it on Cuba not being a base for Soviet military power and Soviet submarines, etc.

Now Panama.

The only reason that has been given so far by the administration for the almost secret negotiations they've been conducting for two years to give that canal away and then present the Amrican people with a fait accompli is that we have been threatened with violence by the dictator of Panama. I think for the United States to set such a precedent to tear up a treaty that has been in existence for almost three quarters of a century, a treaty which they have observed to their benefit and ours, in which we guarantee their independence in perpetuity, which guarantees that is sovereign United States territory – I do not believe that we should be negotiating that away, and certainly not under the conditions of a threat of violence.

Bringing about peace in the Mideast?

Well, I think that whatever you may think about him, that Richard Nixon had a policy that was designed to have a practical result and this was, when he began, to replace the Soviet influence with the Arab states with an American influence. And I think it proved with Egypt's response that some of the Arab states would rather have us as an ally and friend than the Soviet Union. This enabled us for the first time to persuade the Israelis and the Arabs to sit at a table together to start to work out their problems. This is the policy that I think should be reinstituted. I say reinstituted because while we may seem to be trying to carry that on we've lost the confidence of both Israel and the Arab nations. They no longer feel confident that they can trust us.

Christian Science Monitor, 6/3/76

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.

Way said that the claims Reagan has made, while campaigning for President, that he reduced California's welfare rolls and saved taxpayers $1 billion were "totally misleading" and that his proud comments about a Community Work Experience Program he instituted were not only unmerited but that the program had been officially rated "an abject failure."

When Reagan arrived at Visalia, his next stop, and was asked about Way's charges, he had a far different interpretation of what the pertinent facts were and what they meant. But he did concede that taking his eight years as governor overall, the welfare rolls did go up.

Traveling on to Sacramento Wednesday, Reagan encountered hard questioning on his record as governor—and whether he has been representing it accurately—from a group of television interviewers.

Reagan answered gamely but he was on the defensive for much of the 30-minute interview.

The issue of Reagan's record as governor is showing signs of catching on just a little in the primary campaign, but the Ford people have not capitalized on it as much as some of the President's own campaigners wanted. And it is probablY too late for it to have much effect on the vote in Tuesday's California primary.

Nonetheless, both the Ford campaign and interviewers are beginning to examine what Reagan has been saying in his out-of-state campaign about his accomplishments as governor as compared with what those accomplishments were.

The Way episode and Wednesday's television questioning in Sacramento are illustrative.

"During the eight years of Reagan's governorship," said Way in the press release, "Welfare rolls for families nearly doubled, from 729,357 to 1,384,000 recipients. Instead of saving taxpayers $1 billion as he claims, Reagan's policies cost them an additional $100 million."

Accordingly, he said, Reagan's claims of reducing the welfare rolls by 400,000 were "totally misleading."

Asked about it in Visalia, Reaganu made this response:

"The senator is distorting the figures and the senator knows better.

"Yes, if you take the entire eight years, there's no question (the rolls increased). The first four years we were here (in the governor's office) we did everything we could to try and get a handle on welfare and we were bound in by the program as it was, and everything we tried to do we were told reasons why it couldn't be done.

"Finally, after attempt after attempt had failed, this was when we had our task force to try and bring us a plan. By this time, the caseload was increasing 30,000 people a month.

"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 job assignments and that during that year, in all, there were 2.75 million welfare recipients in the state.

The department's report, Way continued, said the program had achieved none of its objectives. He noted that the Legislature voted to abolish it in 1974, but the governor vetoed the bill, and that finally the program expired.

Asked in Visalia about the adverse report, Reagan replied:

"I saw that report, sent to me by the present administrator. I wrote back and told him that I had had a study and had studied it myself and it was a pretty good example of bureaucracy making things come out the way they wanted them to . . . It was a report designed to justify the action that they took in dropping the program."

Reagan said that the Work Experience Program was only "part of a number of programs" he adopted to ease the welfare load and "put people back into private enterprise jobs.

"And with that at the other end of the line, as you might say, the stick at the end of the line, that if they didn't accept these opportunities up here they were compelled to go into this program and work in return for just their welfare grant, and it was then that the upturn came and in the last year even with the recession on, with unemployment increasing, in 1973 and '74 it was then that we put 75,000 of those people into private enterprise jobs."

In Sacramento Wednesday, Reagan was asked what he had done as governor that he thought would last.

He named welfare reforms and property tax relief, the last of which was provided by increasing the state sales tax.

In his out-of-state campaigning, Reagan has frequently been talking about $5.7 billion in tax rebates he claims to have provided the people of California, without, however, mentioning in most speeches the three tax increases that marked his terms in office.

Asked at the television station whether in fact Gov. Brown had not done a better job of "cutting, trimming and squeezing" government than he had, Reagan replied, "Not really.

"He's better at talking about it," the former governor said.

Told that Brown had pared the state work force, which had increased during Reagan's administration, Reagan said that, under him, the state's population had been growing far more rapidly and that some increases were necessary.

Questioned about the scrapping of some of his welfare reforms under the Brown administration, Reagan blamed "the bureaucracy" for "going back to the old ways.

"Government is not riding herd the way we were," he said ruefully.

California Supplement

Pr Reagan

L.A. Times
6/3/76

F-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 be 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

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 eevbylvyx
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 employes 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