

**The original documents are located in Box 26, folder “PL (Political Affairs)/Reagan” of the Barry N. Roth 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 Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

file  
PL Ford

MEMORANDUM

February 2, 1976

TO: Bo Callaway  
Bob Mosbacher  
Stu Spencer  
Bob Odell  
Bob Moot

FROM: Bob Visser *BV*

RE: Reagan Report to January 10, 1976

Attached please find the summary pages of the Report for Receipts and Expenditures for Citizens for Reagan. We have the complete copy available in our office.

cc: Fred Slight  
Skip Watts  
Ed Terrell



SUMMARY PAGE

Name of Committee CITIZENS FOR REAGAN

REPORT COVERING PERIOD FROM October 1, 1975 THRU December 31, 1975

	Column A - This period	Column B - Calendar year to date
<b>SECTION A-RECEIPTS:</b>		
<b>Part 1. Individual contributions:</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*) .....	\$ 523,393.19	
b. Unitemized. ....	\$ 869,501.52	
Total individual contributions	\$ 1,392,894.71	\$ 1,788,637.58
<b>Part 2. Sales and collections:</b>		
Itemized (use schedule B and as necessary schedule A*) .....	\$ 719.50	\$ 719.50
<b>Part 3. Loans received:</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*) .....	\$ -0-	
b. Unitemized .....	\$ 1.00	
Total loans received	\$ 1.00	\$ 1.00
<b>Part 4. Other receipts (refunds, rebates, interest, etc.):</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule A*) .....	\$ 22,969.00	
b. Unitemized .....	\$ 2,023.71	
Total other receipts	\$ 24,992.71	\$ 25,652.50
<b>Part 5. Transfers in:</b>		
Itemize all (use schedule A*) .....	\$ 110,500.00	\$ 110,500.00
TOTAL RECEIPTS	\$ 1,529,107.92	\$ 1,925,570.58
<b>SECTION B-EXPENDITURES:</b>		
<b>Part 6. Void: Use Part 9.</b>		
<b>Part 7. Expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses:</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*) .....	\$ 138,474.24	
b. Unitemized. ....	\$ 2,386.28	
Total expenditures for personal services, salaries, and reimbursed expenses	\$ 140,860.52	\$ 161,133.24
<b>Part 8. Loans made:</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule D*) .....	\$ None	
b. Unitemized .....	\$ None	
Total loans made	\$ None	\$ None
<b>Part 9. Media and other expenses:</b>		
a. Itemized (use schedule C*) .....	\$ 953,879.89	
b. Unitemized .....	\$ 5,713.61	
Total other expenditures	\$ 959,593.50	\$ 1,234,170.36
<b>Part 10. Transfers out:</b>		
a. transfers out .....	110,500.00	
Itemize all (use schedule D*) . b. in kind contributions .....	\$ 2,023.71	\$ 113,100.50
TOTAL EXPENDITURES	\$ 1,212,977.73	\$ 1,508,847.10
<b>SECTION C-CASH BALANCES:</b>		
Cash on hand at beginning of reporting period .....	\$ 100,593.29	
Add total receipts (section A above) .....	\$ 1,529,107.92	
Subtotal .....	\$ 1,629,701.21	
Subtract total expenditures (section B above) .....	\$ 1,212,977.73	
Cash on hand at close of reporting period .....	\$ 416,723.48	
<b>SECTION D-DEBTS AND OBLIGATIONS:</b>		
Part 11. Debts and obligations owed to the committee (use schedule E*) .....	\$ 6,914.00	
Part 12. Debts and obligations owed by the committee (use schedule E*) .....	\$ 223,388.17	

\*Schedules are to be used only when itemization is required. (See each Schedule for instructions.) When itemization is unnecessary for a given Part, the total of any amounts for that Part is to be entered as a lump sum on the "Unitemized" line of the appropriate Part of the Summary Report. The word "None" should be entered on any line of the Summary Report when no amount is being reported.



PL

Ronald Reagan

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013

February 11, 1976

Mr. & Mrs. Edward F. Fry  
5315 First St. N.W.  
Washington, D. C. 20011

Dear Mr. & Mrs. Fry:

I asked Congressman Vander Jagt, Chairman of the National Republican Congressional Committee if I could write to you today about a serious and urgent matter.

Frankly, the Republican Party needs your renewed financial support in the 1976 Congressional elections as never before.

Make no mistake about it. Liberal Democratic candidates and their political allies such as the AFL-CIO's COPE, are already amassing a huge war chest in D. C. and across the nation for their drive to maintain their 2 to 1 control of Congress.

Union reports filed in Washington show big labor has already raised over \$4,000,000 in ready cash. When their "official" election fundraising drive begins later this year, they expect to amass 29 millions of additional dollars. Most of which will be used against conservative Republican candidates.

I don't believe we can break this liberal Democratic stranglehold unless you help the Committee in it's effort to elect responsible candidates who stand up for fiscal sanity, the free market system and a strong U. S. military defense.

As you know, Democrats have controlled Congress lock, stock, and barrel for 40 of the past 44 years. There isn't one penny spent by your government that hasn't been mandated by the Democrat majority. No bureaucrat has been hired, no rule or regulation has been issued without approval by the Democrat majority in Congress.

They have caused galloping inflation which wipes out your savings and your buying power. They have enthusiastically voted for every spending bill that has produced the highest Federal budget deficits in our history.

In 1975, the Democrats introduced bills to nationalize our oil industry, to allocate our energy supply and to sharply reduce our military defenses that, in my opinion, would jeopardize the very safety of this country.

Mr. & Mrs. Edward F. Fry

In order to return control of Congress to the Republicans, the Congressional Committee has established a comprehensive program and launched a special emergency fund drive.

The immediate need for funds is critical because the Committee must raise a minimum of \$750,000 in early money to make cash contributions to candidates and fund political action programs Republican candidates need for victory in 1976.

This emergency fund, if raised, will be used to defeat entrenched Democrats in Congress and to elect and reelect Republicans who will support the programs designed to stop inflation and recession.

I know from talking with hundreds of Republicans at meetings across the country, that the Committee's support is invaluable. There are many Republicans sitting in Congress today who owe their election to the efforts of this important and hard-hitting Committee.

It's time for a fundamental change in Washington that can only come from a Republican Congress.

Thanks to the Democrats, welfare, like government spending, has gotten out of hand; programs such as food stamps have become a national disgrace; a bloated government bureaucracy, with its endless rules and regulations, harasses our citizens and threatens to bury business in a sea of red tape.


The situation in Washington is critical. But no change can, or will, be made without your financial help and support.

I hope, therefore, you will respond today to my special appeal by sending a contribution for as much as \$25 or more.

If the Committee can reach this goal, it will help us defeat entrenched liberal Democrats and elect Republicans who will oppose the shocking abuses I have mentioned.

If you want to help offset union domination of the upcoming Congressional election, I strongly urge you to support the Committee's fund-raising effort.

Sincerely,



Ronald W. Reagan

P.S.

At my request Congressman Vander Jagt enclosed a contribution form and a reply envelope for your use, Mr. & Mrs. Fry. I have asked him to give me a list of donors who respond and I certainly hope your name is on this list.





**FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF:**

*Ronald Reagan*

**EMERGENCY CAMPAIGN FUND  
Box 2837  
Washington, D.C. 20013**

C02G





I want to help . . .

OCCUPATION

STREET ADDRESS

CITY

STATE

ZIP

NAME

LEON

232  212  210

★ ★ ★  
A Personal Reply to  
Gov. Ronald Reagan

Dear Governor Reagan:

I want to help break the liberal Democrat stranglehold on Congress and offset union domination of the upcoming Congressional elections. To meet the immediate requirement for critically needed early money in the Congressional elections, I am enclosing my contribution of:

\$ \_\_\_\_\_       \$100       \$75       \$50

\$25       \$15       \$10

CHECK ATTACHED     BILL ME \$ \_\_\_\_\_     QUARTERLY     OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

**Please make checks payable to the Emergency Campaign Fund.**

FROM:

Mr.  
Mrs.  
Miss  
Ms.

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLEASE PRINT YOUR NAME HERE

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLEASE PRINT YOUR ADDRESS HERE

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLEASE PRINT YOUR CITY OR POST OFFICE

\_\_\_\_\_  
STATE

\_\_\_\_\_  
ZIP CODE

\_\_\_\_\_  
OCCUPATION

\_\_\_\_\_  
PLACE OF BUSINESS

Your personal letter of acknowledgment (a valid tax-deductible receipt) will be sent by return mail. Please indicate changes of address necessary. Thank you!

**Please return your check to Gov. Reagan in the enclosed postage-paid envelope.**

Corporate contributions are prohibited by law.

"A copy of our report is filed with the Federal Election Commission and is available for purchase from the Federal Election Commission, Washington, D.C." Absolutely no taxpayers' funds have been used in the preparation or mailing of this correspondence.

National Republican Congressional Committee • U.S. House of Representatives  
Box 2837 • Washington, D.C. 20013  
Guy A. Vander Jagt, M.C., Chairman • George Olmsted, Treasurer




THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

Barry

You wanted to see this.

Trudy

*Ronald Reagan*  
BOX 2837  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20013



SERVING AMERICA

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE



adrian weiss productions

186 North Canon Drive, Beverly Hills, California 90210  
(213) 274-9991 Cable: Weisspict

May 5, 1976

The President of the United States  
White House  
Washington, D.C.

Dear Mr. President:


I would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank you for waiving your rights to equal time under Section 315 of the Communications Act, relative to the broadcasting of the Ronald Reagan films entitled "CATTLE QUEEN OF MONTANA" and "TENNESSEE'S PARTNER".

Your decision has reassured my faith in the American way . . . . . that of a third party's right to use his privately owned property without political involvement and consideration of the constitutional question of deprivation of property without due process of law, with resulting loss of revenues without compensation to such third party.

For your perusal, I have enclosed a copy of the Metropolitan News (a daily legal newspaper in Los Angeles) article pertaining to the waiver you extended to us.

Sincerely,

ADRIAN WEISS PRODUCTIONS



Adrian Weiss

AW/k  
Enclosure



# opolitan News

DAILY LEGAL NEWSPAPER

205 SO. BROADWAY  
LOS ANGELES  
CALIFORNIA 90012

•  
ALL  
DEPARTMENTS:  
628-4384

geles, California ★ Tuesday, April 27, 1976

12 Pages — 15¢ Per Copy

## ★ Waiver

(Continued from Page 1)

the FCC will now become academic on these two films since President Ford has consented to grant the waiver applied for, on these two pictures only, the only ones applied for.

It therefore follows that these two pictures are the only ones of Reagan's old movies that can

## President Waives Right to Equal Time From Showing of 2 Old Ronald Reagan Films

By a Press Correspondent

A precedental interpretation being deprived of the use of his of the Equal Time Provision property without due process of



PL/7nd

April 16, 1976

ACTION

MEMORANDUM FOR THE PRESIDENT

FROM: PHILIP W. BUCHEN  
SUBJECT: Request for Equal Time Waiver

Adrian Weiss Productions has requested that you waive your rights under Section 315 of the Communications Act to permit the television broadcast of two of Ronald Reagan's old movies -- "Cattle Queen of Montana" and "Tennessee's Partner."

Recommendation

Stu Spencer, Bob Visser and I recommend that you sign the attached waiver.

PWB:BNR:ns



*file w/ yellow*

THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

April 20, 1976

Dear Mr. Weiss:

It is my understanding that Adrian Weiss Productions has requested that I waive my rights for equal time under Section 315 of the Communications Act so that it may broadcast a number of Mr. Ronald Reagan's old films. This waiver would eliminate any claim for equal time that might arise from the showing of "Cattle Queen of Montana" and "Tennessee's Partner".

Since the nature and context of these two films do not relate to or affect the political process, I am willing to grant such waiver of my rights to equal time provided under Section 315 of the Communications Act.

Sincerely,

*Gerald R. Ford*

Mr. Adrian Weiss  
Adrian Weiss Productions  
186 North Canon Drive  
Beverly Hills, California 90210






# President Ford Committee

1828 L STREET, N.W., SUITE 250, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036 (202) 457-6400

April 15, 1976

## MEMORANDUM

TO: Philip Buchen  
Legal Counsel

FROM: Tim Ryan 

RE: Request for Waiver -- Adrian Weiss Productions

After conversations with Stu Spencer of this office and Mr. Adrian Weiss, we agree with your decision to recommend a waiver of "equal time" under Section 315 of the Communications Act for the two Reagan films noted on the draft letter to the President. If you have any comments or changes, please contact us.

T.T.R.



DRAFT OF LETTER TO  
ADRIAN WEISS PRODUCTIONS

Mr. Adrian Weiss  
Adrian Weiss Productions  
186 North Canon Drive  
Beverly Hills, California 90210

Dear Mr. Weiss:

It is my understanding that Adrian Weiss Productions has requested that I waive my rights for equal time under Section 315 of the Communications Act so that it may broadcast a number of Mr. Ronald Reagan's old films. This waiver would eliminate any claim for equal time that might arise from the showing of "Cattle Queen of Montana" and "Tennessee's Partner".

Since the nature and context of these two films do not relate to or affect the political process, I am willing to grant such waiver of my rights to equal time provided under Section 315 of the Communications Act.

Sincerely,

Gerald R. Ford



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

March 30, 1976

*1/10  
photo  
Bd*

Dear Bob:

As I discussed with you over the telephone, Adrian Weiss Productions would like to receive a waiver from President Ford of his rights under Section 315 of the Communications Act. The purpose of this waiver is to eliminate any claim to equal time on the part of the President that might arise from the use of broadcast facilities to show two of Ronald Reagan's old movies which are owned by Adrian Weiss Productions.

Enclosed are copies of letters received from the Productions firm. The information sheet describing the two pictures was not enclosed, but I learned by telephone that the titles of the two films are:


"Cattle Queen of Montana"  
"Tennessee's Partner"

I assume the titles say enough about the nature of the films. I would think it appropriate to grant the requested waiver, but I think this is a matter for the President Ford Committee to dispose of by an appropriate recommendation to the President and, if a waiver is recommended, a form of letter for the President to sign.

Enclosed also is a copy of a 1966 Federal Communication Commission's letter which deals with the subject of Section 315 waivers.

I believe Mr. Weiss would appreciate a prompt response from you.

Sincerely,



Philip W. Buchen  
Counsel to the President

Mr. Robert Visser  
General Counsel  
President Ford Committee  
1828 L Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Enclosures



*The National Broadcasting Company Presents*



# MEET THE PRESS

*America's Press Conference of the Air*

*Guest: SENATOR PAUL D. LAXALT, (R., Nev.)  
National Chairman, Citizens for Reagan*

VOLUME 20

SUNDAY, MAY 16, 1976

NUMBER 20

*Merkle Press Inc.*

*Printers and Periodical Publishers*

*Subsidiary of Pubco Corporation  
Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

25 cents per copy



*Panel:* TOM PETTIT, *NBC News*  
GEORGE F. WILL, *Syndicated columnist*  
LOU CANNON, *The Washington Post*

*Moderator:* BILL MONROE

*Executive Producer:* BILL MONROE

*Producer:* BETTY COLE DUKERT

*Permission is hereby granted to news media and  
magazines to reproduce in whole or in part. Credit  
to NBC's MEET THE PRESS will be appreciated.*



## MEET THE PRESS

---

**MR. MONROE:** Our guest today on MEET THE PRESS is Senator Paul Laxalt, Republican of Nevada. Senator Laxalt is the former Governor of Nevada and is currently National Chairman of Citizens for Reagan. A lawyer, he is serving his first term in the Senate.

We will have the first questions now from Tom Pettit of NBC News.

**MR. PETTIT:** Senator Laxalt, as a man with some interest in and experience in gambling, would you bet money that Ford is washed up right now?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** No, I don't think so at this point. I still think we have a lot of question marks, and I harken back to the Florida primary when a lot of people washed the Reagan candidacy out. In our case I am increasingly and continually concerned about resurrections, and I think this is the year of political surprises.

**MR. PETTIT:** You are afraid the President will be resurrected in Michigan?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** It could happen. We don't have any signs of that as yet. Everything looks good in Michigan. I can't believe that we are going to win the state, but it could happen.

**MR. PETTIT:** That is kind of the party line though, isn't it; you are just fooling us when you say you don't expect to win?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** No, no, that is not the party line. We are campaigning in a state where we have an incumbent President who is a resident of that state and has been for a long while, and I think that we would be less than realistic if we got into a state of euphoria and thought we were going to win Michigan. I don't think we are going to win it.


**MR. PETTIT:** What if you win it? Would you like that?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** It would be a tremendous development.

**MR. PETTIT:** Would that wash up Ford?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think it would cause serious difficulties for his campaign, unquestionably.

(Announcements)



**MR. WILL:** Senator, President Ford now has the worst record in intra-party competition of any incumbent President since Taft in 1912. Why is the President so weak?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think part of the problem is he is not perceived as a legitimate incumbent. That is part of it. Secondly, I think that he has in Ronald Reagan probably one of the strongest competitors anyone could possibly have in a primary. It is a combination of those factors, and I think it is becoming increasingly apparent as this campaign goes on that the real strength of the Reagan candidacy is Ronald Reagan.

**MR. WILL:** Ronald Reagan decided to run against Ford when the Ford presidency was barely a year old. Was there something that Ford could have done which would have either stopped Reagan from making that decision to run or that would have taken the steam out of a Reagan candidacy very early?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think at least a couple of things come to mind. I think the designation of Nelson Rockefeller as Vice President didn't gladden the hearts of conservatives. I think that had he vetoed the tax bill last year that that would have made a great deal of difference and, in the judgment I think of many, many Republicans, would have militated against the Reagan candidacy.

**MR. WILL:** Reagan really has begun to succeed with foreign policy issues to a degree, surprising to many people. Is it possible that if President Ford had fired Kissinger instead of Schlesinger, or fired Kissinger as well as Schlesinger, that this would have taken the steam out of a Reagan candidacy?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think it would have made a great deal of difference. It is increasingly apparent, as we progress with this campaign, that Henry Kissinger is a strong issue as far as the Reagan candidacy is concerned. Each time that the Governor makes reference to the fact that he would not reappoint him or keep him on, that it meets with strong applause, and I rather think, looking back, that in the area of foreign policy, if Jim Schlesinger had been retained and Henry Kissinger had been let out, it would have made a world of difference in this campaign.

**MR. CANNON:** Senator, there are a lot of people out in your home state who think you might have made it to the Senate a lot sooner, in 1964 to be exact, except for the Barry Goldwater presidential candidacy.

As I remember, you lost by 41 votes and Senator Goldwater lost something like 60-40 percent.

Doesn't the Republican Party face very much the same kind of a problem this year, no matter who wins the nomination? How are you going to put the party back together again for the fall election?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't perceive this year as being the least bit the same as the conditions in '64 from several standpoints.

First of all, we don't have a Lyndon Johnson who is the beneficiary of the Kennedy myth in the picture.

I think the people generally are far more conservative in their political outlooks than they were in '64. In '64 there still was a feeling that Washington could solve most of the problems in this country.

There isn't the strong divisive type of feeling between the competing factions, as we saw in '64 as between the Goldwater and the Rockefeller people. Uniformly around the country I find now that Ford people think well of Ronald Reagan and Ronald Reagan's people think well of Gerald Ford. They simply feel there are two strong candidates and they hope to produce the strongest one of the two.

Combined with that, is the fact that we see every week more and more evidence that the Reagan candidacy is appealing to many conservative Democrats and independents throughout the country, and I personally think that this year we have an entirely different ballgame than we had in '64.

**MR. CANNON:** In the Texas campaign, Senator, there were some very strong words on both sides. It seems to me as the primaries have heated up it has become more divisive. You yourself have said as much at one point.

Isn't it going to be necessary, if Reagan were the nominee, to try to put the party back together again by getting a Vice President, let's say, a runningmate who would be acceptable to the other side of the party?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Perhaps. I think there is going to be every need, of course, to put the party back together again, but that presupposes that the party is split. I have noticed in these various states that just about the time that the situation in a given primary state becomes difficult we have an election, and it cools off. I don't find any nationwide party divisiveness as such.

**MR. CANNON:** Do you think Reagan can win a general election against Jimmy Carter?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't think there is any question about it. I think that we are finding here—and it is not a matter of just semantics—we are finding in this country a re-emergence of a new majority. We are finding that conservatives throughout this country are going to marshal together and present, I think, a formidable political challenge, and comes the general election, personally I think that Ronald Reagan has the potential of putting together the same basic elements against Jimmy Carter that Richard Nixon did in 1972.

**MR. MONROE:** Senator, some people think that Governor

Reagan is engaged in some demagoguery on the Panama Canal issue.

For example, is he not overdoing it when he talks of the United States owning the Panama Canal? Considering, for example, that William Howard Taft said in 1905 that the treaty did not give us outright ownership of that zone?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** There is every indication to the contrary, starting with the Treaty itself. The fact is that we took over that Canal at the time the French were not able to complete it. We negotiated with Colombia, insofar as the rights to the ground were concerned. We bought out the private landowners on a fee simple basis. We went ahead and developed the Canal.

We have had ruling after ruling on every official level indicating that we have sovereignty in the Canal. The Supreme Court of the United States ruled that we had sovereignty in the Canal. So what we are talking of basically in Panama, we are talking about possibly being coerced out of our own property by the Panamanian people and particularly by the dictator there. So I view this to be a very, very strong issue, and certainly the American people do.

We didn't initiate this issue. This issue came in the question and answer sessions that we had in all those primary states, and I found that to my great satisfaction the American people are far ahead of Washington in describing and defining this type of issue.

**MR. MONROE:** Isn't the kind of control we are now exercising over the Canal a sort of relic of colonialism, when you consider that the United States apparently had some hand in prompting the revolt of the Panamanians from Colombia and then signed this treaty with them, according to historians, at a time when Panama more or less was forced to sign the treaty, because they had nobody else to protect them against Colombia after that war and considering the fact that all Latin American countries will be terribly hostile to us if we persist in maintaining complete control over that Canal Zone?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Let me answer your question in reverse order.

I see no evidence of the Latin American countries being disturbed about this. I think this is rhetoric. I don't think any of them have that kind of interest. Colonialism implies, to me at least, exploitation, and if there is a country that hasn't been exploited at all in this situation, it is Panama. We have done tremendous things for the Panamanian economy ever since we built that Canal, and I don't know of anybody who has profited more from the situation than the Panamanians themselves.

At the present time it is contemplated that eventually we will even build a third canal there, which would result in an outlay, an addition to the Panamanian economy, of over \$1 billion, and

so the Panamanians aren't hurt, and I get back to step one: That Canal is ours. It is sovereign United States territory, and I think it would be exceedingly harmful to this country to give it up.

**MR. MONROE:** What about the practicality of Governor Reagan's position in terms of not negotiating any lessening of control over a period of decades in connection with that Canal, considering the fact that the value of the Canal is declining. Big ships, both commercial and military, can't get through it any longer, and the Panamanians are considered by experts quite able to sabotage that Canal if they want to and put it out of business if we don't bend some.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I can't believe that the threat of sabotage should cause us to give up the Canal. After all, we had security measures there in that Canal in World War II and Korea that were entirely satisfactory. That to me doesn't pose any particular threat whatsoever.

Governor Reagan has not advocated going to war over the Canal at all. He simply indicated that the matter of sovereignty, of title, is not negotiable, and that comes straight from the record. It comes from statements that have been made by prominent public figures in this country for a long time, including the President, including Barry Goldwater, and so over the years it has been uniformly felt here with the exception of the State Department, which has been playing its own game in this thing, it has been uniformly felt that we had sovereign rights in the Panama Canal.

**MR. PETTIT:** I am a little confused by that. If the Canal is sovereign and you believe the Canal is sovereign, would you, say, advocate statehood for the Canal Zone?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Oh, I don't think it is the type of situation which would call for—

**MR. PETTIT:** Advocating full citizenship?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** No, I don't think so.

**MR. PETTIT:** Then how can you say it is sovereign?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Well, it is sovereign from the standpoint that from the first time that we went in there we were treated as a sovereign. We were given title to the property in fee simple, and we have since that time performed all the attributes of sovereignty.

**MR. PETTIT:** But you don't advocate giving the people who live there the same rights that people who live in the States do—

**SENATOR LAXALT:** They have basically at the present time some of the same rights as people in the States do. They have rights to citizenship under their special act. But the fact is, we



have within their country our property which distinguishes it as far as I am concerned.

**MR. PETTIT:** Why is Senator Goldwater avoiding Ronald Reagan like the plague? I mean, he was Mr. Conservative. Reagan learned at his feet. It is like Socrates calling Plato a bum not to endorse him.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't know that Senator Goldwater has been avoiding Mr. Reagan like the plague.

**MR. PETTIT:** Where has he been with him?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think he has been with him to the extent that there has been no endorsement, and from the beginning Barry Goldwater has indicated to me, as well as others, that in this race he is between a rock and a hard place, which he is.

On the one hand, he owes an allegiance, he thinks, to an incumbent President who has been a friend of his for a long while.

On the other hand, there is nobody who helped Barry Goldwater more in 1964 than Ronald Reagan, so it is a very difficult position for him, and the only difference I have been able to discern so far has been on the Panamanian issue.

**MR. PETTIT:** Otherwise Ronald Reagan is just like Goldwater?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** In what respect?

**MR. PETTIT:** You just said that the only difference is on the Canal Zone.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** The only difference between the two that I perceive in this particular election has been over the Panama Canal issue.

**MR. PETTIT:** Then in this election the two of them are alike?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think basically their approach is alike, yes.

**MR. WILL:** Senator, June 8th is the date of the last three primaries. How many delegates will Ronald Reagan have committed to him publicly on that day?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** After the California primaries? It depends entirely on what happens in Michigan. We have already experienced unpredictable results as a result of the momentum of the Texas primary. If Michigan should come to us, I don't think we could predict at all what is going to happen in some of these other primary states. Assuming that Michigan goes to the President and assuming that California stays with Ronald Reagan, I would assume that Governor Reagan and the Presi-

dent probably will come into the convention with delegates around 950 each.

**MR. WILL:** That is about 200 short of the needed total to nominate. Doesn't the President have an enormous advantage with all his powers and prerequisites and plums in dickering in a convention? How do you propose to fight an incumbent President in bargaining?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I like to think that the delegates who attend Kansas City and who are looking for a nominee are not going to be susceptible to goodies. I like to think that when they come to Kansas City they are going to be thinking in terms of the interests of the party and the country, and, very frankly, I think their principal consideration will be one of electability. They are going to take a look at these two candidates and say to themselves: Which of these two will make the strongest candidate in a general election, and it is my view that when they make that determination, at that time in August it will be Ronald Reagan.

**MR. WILL:** The Democrats already will have chosen their nominee, and it looks at this point as though it may very well be Jimmy Carter, and it looks as though he may very well be a very strong candidate in the South. Might it not make sense then for the Republican Party to pick a candidate who might run tougher in the north and in the east than Ronald Reagan who, of course, didn't even run in the New York and Pennsylvania primaries?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Possibly, but I think that when you are looking at Carter, his principal strength, as I have been able to discern it, is the fact that he is non-Washington. That is the thrust of the Carter candidacy, and to me a Carter-Ford race would be a difficult one, extremely difficult for the Republicans because you would have Carter, who is non-Washington, running against the establishment. In that type of scenario, it is my view Ronald Reagan would be a far stronger candidate against a Jimmy Carter than Gerald Ford.

**MR. CANNON:** Doesn't a Carter candidacy also blunt Ronald Reagan's main point? He has been talking against Washington. He has been giving, as you know, that same speech for many years. How is that speech going to help him against Jimmy Carter?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think that the speech, as you call it—perhaps it gets a little boring to the people who hear it often, but I don't think that it is the least bit boring for people who are exposed to it for the first time.

It is my view that as the Carter candidacy progresses and as he is made to take positions on issues, that it is going to be demonstrated that he is of rather liberal persuasion. By the time

this general election comes along I think you will find that Ronald Reagan will be running basically as the conservative and Jimmy Carter will be running basically as a liberal.

**MR. CANNON:** You and other spokesmen for Reagan have consistently said that you think the former Governor would run a better race against Carter than Ford would.

What evidence is there of this? All of the polls that I have seen show Carter winning, and they don't show Reagan doing any better. Is there any objective evidence that Reagan would in fact do better?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Yes. I think the best objective evidence is the results of the primaries so far. As I have indicated here, the strength of Jimmy Carter and Ronald Reagan, I think, principally is that they are non-Washington. The polls at this point, Mr. Cannon, don't mean anything. I have never seen a year where polls have less validity than they do this year.

As an example, in Nebraska, our surveys indicated a couple of weeks before that election that we were down 15 to 20 points, and yet we won that election by ten points. That means that there was a swing in that state of 25 to 30 points, which leads me to the conclusion that any early polls trying to describe the relative strengths of a Reagan or a Carter or a Ford are almost meaningless at this point.

**MR. CANNON:** Why, if Ronald Reagan is as acceptable as you clearly think he is, have so few Republican Congressmen—I think there are three Senators and maybe half a dozen House members who have backed him—why doesn't he have any more support than that?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** He is not part of the "buddy" system, that is all. It is not complicated. He is not part of the Washington establishment, and when he announced his candidacy we found the great majority, the vast majority of the people in the House and the Senate were with the President because they have known him over the years, and many of them felt, perhaps with justification, that they should continue to support an incumbent President.

But Ronald Reagan is not a member of the club, and that to me presents the greatest strength that he has in this candidacy because when he comes to this town as President he is not going to owe any obligations in either the House or the Senate, and he is going to be able to call the shots as he sees them. I have a suspicion if he has the type of hostility and obstruction that other Presidents have seen in Congress that he will do as he did in California and go over their heads to the people, and you are going to see some congressional changes made very quickly up here.

**MR. MONROE:** Senator Laxalt, Eileen Shanahan reports in The New York Times that Governor Reagan almost certainly paid

no federal income tax in 1970, this, after an examination of the limited material he publicized about his own tax returns. Also that he paid very light income taxes in subsequent years compared with the size of his income.

There is no indication here that anything illegal was done. Apparently it was entirely legal.

On the other hand, isn't it a political drawback for the Governor to be shown to have made this kind of use of the tax laws, to pay little or no taxes on his income?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't know the details concerning that except that I know it was rather strongly discussed in the State of California when it arose, and apparently it arose through some business losses that the Governor had incurred, and through some shelters too.

I don't know that a Governor, any other public official, has to be treated on any other different basis than any other taxpayer. The fact that he had business losses and paid a lesser tax, to me, doesn't present a problem.

**MR. MONROE:** Wouldn't he be stronger as a presidential candidate, in the climate of these times, to make public the full details of his recent tax records, the way President Ford has done, so that everybody would know exactly what the tax situation was in regard to Governor Reagan?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** It was my impression that within the last few weeks that a general disclosure concerning his tax records has been made and is available.

**MR. MONROE:** I think it was made available in much less detail than the information that came from President Ford.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** That I am not privy to comment on, really. That is a matter he would have to decide, I guess, with his accountants. But it is my understanding that he has made a disclosure which would be adequate, I think, by most standards.

**MR. MONROE:** Would you like to see Governor Reagan as a political matter make this kind of material available in the same full detail that we have gotten from President Ford?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I think it is the year of disclosure, and it is simply a question of whether or not he has made the type of disclosure that would meet that standard, and it is my impression that he has.

**MR. MONROE:** We have about two minutes.

**MR. PETTIT:** I hate to burden you with the Canal Zone, but the candidate has made a major issue of it, of course. Does he believe that residents of the Canal Zone have the right to self-government?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't know that I have ever heard him comment on that.

**MR. PETTIT:** Do you?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I do.

**MR. PETTIT:** That they should have self-government?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** Yes.

**MR. PETTIT:** What form would that take?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** What form would it take?

**MR. PETTIT:** Yes.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't understand. Do you mean different than what they presently have? I would like to see them have more democratic rule within Panama.

**MR. PETTIT:** I am talking about the Zone.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** You are talking about the Zone, itself?

**MR. PETTIT:** Yes. Is there any local government in the Zone?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** At the present time?

**MR. PETTIT:** Yes.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I am not that familiar with the form of government in Panama to comment on it, personally.

**MR. PETTIT:** I am not talking about Panama, I am talking about the Panama Canal Zone.

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I am not that familiar with the type of government that you have in the Zone, and if I tried to answer that question I would be bluffing, and I don't think I should.

**MR. PETTIT:** Does the candidate know?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I assume he does, yes.

**MR. WILL:** Does the Reagan campaign plan to insist in some way or another that Secretary Kissinger's domestic speaking trips within the United States be charged against President Ford's campaign expenditures?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** It hasn't been discussed.

**MR. WILL:** What if he plans to go to California prior to the California primary?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I don't know how that should be treated. It is increasingly apparent that the charging of expenses under this new law is extremely difficult to calculate, and I am coming fast to the impression that we have created a monster in this new

campaign law for reasons such as this. How do you charge this type of expense? It probably should be charged, but I don't know how to do it as a practical matter.

**MR. CANNON:** You have got the only state where all three Democrats, Church, Brown and Carter, are on the ballot. Who is going to win in Nevada?

**SENATOR LAXALT:** I understand that Governor Brown is running very well there, and that is principally because he is a neighboring governor.

**MR. MONROE:** Thank you, Senator Laxalt, for being with us today on MEET THE PRESS.



*The Proceedings of*

## MEET THE PRESS

as broadcast nationwide by the National Broadcasting Company, Inc., and printed and made available to the public to further interest in impartial discussions of questions affecting the public welfare. Transcripts may be obtained by sending a stamped, self-addressed envelope and twenty-five cents for each copy to:

*Merkle Press Inc. Box 2111, Washington, D. C. 20013*

*Subsidiary of Pubco Corporation*

*MEET THE PRESS is telecast every Sunday over the NBC Television Network. This program originated from NBC in Washington, D.C.*

Television Broadcast 12:30-1:00 P.M. EDT



# REAGAN CALIFORNIA FUND

---

A Project of:  
Young America's Campaign Committee

Dear Friend:

Your assistance on a most urgent project could mean the difference between victory and defeat for Ronald Reagan in the June 8th primary in California--the most important primary of the campaign.

That is why I am writing to you today.

Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan are in a virtual dead heat for convention delegates coming into the California primary. The winner of the California primary will take an extra 167 delegates to the convention.

These 167 delegates will mean the margin of victory for the Republican presidential nominee. More delegates are at stake in California than New Hampshire, Florida, Vermont, and North Carolina combined!

Ronald Reagan's stunning defeat of Gerald Ford in the North Carolina primary was a result of his aggressive media campaign in that state prior to the voting.

That is why the Reagan California Fund has been established by the Young America's Campaign Committee. We intend to place spot radio advertisements throughout California a week prior to the primary.

We have entered into an agreement with the nation's top producer of radio advertisements.

Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., the star of the television series The FBI, has agreed to do the narration for the ads.

They will be targeted in communities across California with the precision that was apparent in the media blitz that brought Ronald Reagan victory in North Carolina.

Production costs, distribution fees, etc., will be \$25,000 and that amount is needed at once. Unless we receive that amount by May 25, 1976, the ads by Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., cannot be run.

These ads are the most economical and effective method for reaching the millions of California voters. Ronald Reagan's chances of victory in California will be severely set back without them. As a result, his chances for the Republican nomination could be lost.

That is why it is vital that you send what you can today. Please send at least \$20 today. If you cannot send \$20, we will be grateful for whatever you can contribute. But we must have whatever your generous contribution by May 25.



It is important to consider what Ronald Reagan's defeat could mean for the Republican Party.

Consider the record of the Ford administration and the possibility of its continuing should Ronald Reagan lose the California primary:

1. There would be more appointments of left-liberals into the administration such as Charles Goodell and Nelson Rockefeller.
2. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger would remain, throughout Ford's term, continuing the policy of one-way-street detente.
3. The United States would continue its second-rate military posture and perhaps slip to third rate or fourth rate.
4. The United States would continue its policy of surrender of American possessions such as the Panama Canal Zone.
5. Deficit spending would continue unabated, without a voice of leadership coming from the White House.


Before you decide how much to give, I should explain that the Reagan California Fund is an independent organization, entirely separate from the Citizens for Reagan campaign committee.

Because it is an independent committee, the Reagan California Fund may solicit funds from individuals beyond the \$1000 limit. Thus, if you have already contributed the maximum \$1000 to the official Citizens for Reagan campaign committee, you may contribute up to an additional \$24,000 to the Reagan California Fund.

In addition, while the official Reagan effort in California is limited in what it can spend on behalf of Ronald Reagan, our committee can wage an all-out effort to win in California without government-enforced spending restrictions.

If any contribution could tip the scale for a Reagan victory, your contribution to the Reagan California Fund could be it. Please be generous, and soon. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Ron Robinson, National Chairman  
Reagan California Fund



Did you receive more than one copy of this appeal?  
Please accept our apology if you did. We try to eliminate duplications, but they sometimes do occur. If you do receive a duplicate copy please help us spread the word by passing it along to a friend. Thank you. We appreciate your understanding and cooperation.

*Make necessary corrections in address shown below*

RF10  
ONE PERCENT FUND  
1255 NEW HAMPSHIRE AVE  
WASHINGTON DC 20036

**BUSINESS REPLY MAIL**

No Postage Stamp Necessary if Mailed in the United States

**POSTAGE WILL BE PAID BY:**


Young America's Campaign Committee  
919-18th Street, N.W., Suite 800  
Washington, D.C. 20006

**FIRST CLASS**

Permit No.

70140

Washington, D.C.



Please make necessary changes if label attached  
to reverse side is incorrect.

**The REAGAN CALIFORNIA FUND** is an independent committee unrestricted by the \$1000 individual limitation. Thus, even though you already may have contributed \$1000, you may still contribute as much as \$24,000 to the Reagan California Fund.

**Please note: Individual political donations are tax-deductible up to a total of \$100 per year.**

I agree that vital radio ads for Ronald Reagan in California can make the difference in the campaign. My check to help with those ads is enclosed:

\$5,000    \$1,000    \$500    \$250    \$100    \$50    \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Other

*(Make all checks payable to: Young America's Campaign Committee and return in this prepaid envelope)*

A federal statute requires us to request the following information from you:

OCCUPATION \_\_\_\_\_

BUSINESS ADDRESS \_\_\_\_\_

CITY \_\_\_\_\_ STATE \_\_\_\_\_ ZIP \_\_\_\_\_

A copy of our report (Young America's Campaign Committee) will be filed with the **Federal Election Commission** and will be available for purchase from that office in Washington, D.C.

THE REAGAN CALIFORNIA FUND OF YOUNG AMERICA'S CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE IS NOT AUTHORIZED BY RONALD REAGAN & RONALD REAGAN IS NOT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE.



# YOUNG AMERICA'S CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Air Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Radio Spot Number \_\_\_\_\_ #2  
Title \_\_\_\_\_ 60 SECONDS  
Narrator \_\_\_\_\_ EFREM ZIMBALIST, JR.

60 SECOND RADIO SPOT

I, LIKE YOU, AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THIS COUNTRY. I, LIKE YOU, HAD HOPED THAT AFTER WATERGATE GERALD FORD WOULD LEAD US AWAY FROM DEFICIT SPENDING, APPEASEMENT ABROAD, AND MILITARY WEAKNESS. I HAVE CONCLUDED HE HAS NOT DONE THIS. INSTEAD HE HAS FIRED A SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WHO DISAGREED WITH KISSINGER'S DETENTE, ACCEPTED AMERICA'S STATUS AS THE SECOND STRONGEST NATION IN THE WORLD, IS ACQUIESCING IN THE GIVE-AWAY OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE, AND HAS PRESIDED OVER \$100 BILLION IN DEFICITS IN JUST TWO YEARS. RONALD REAGAN IS MY CHOICE FOR PRESIDENT BECAUSE HE PROMISES A NEW SECRETARY OF STATE, THE RESTORATION OF AMERICAN MILITARY SUPERIORITY, NO GIVE-AWAYS OF AMERICAN TERRITORY SUCH AS THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE TO LEFTIST DICTATORS, AND, HE PROMISES A BALANCED BUDGET. IF YOU BELIEVE AS I DO THAT STRONG LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED IN THE WHITE HOUSE AS WE ENTER OUR TWO-HUNDREDTH YEAR, THEN I URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR RONALD REAGAN IN THE REPUBLICAN PRIMARY. THIS IS EFREM ZIMBALIST, JR. THANK YOU FOR LISTENING.

END                      END                      END                      END                      END                      END

*This is a sample transcript of the radio ads planned for California one week before the Primary*



CLEARY, GOTTLIEB, STEEN & HAMILTON

1250 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N. W.

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20036

Barry Roth, Esq.  
The White House

By Hand:  
17th St. door,  
EOB mailroom

ALSO  
AND  
ST  
THE  
WASH  
ON

1976 MAR 19 PM 1 39

Cooper



FEDERAL ELECTION COMMISSION

1325 K STREET N.W.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20463

February 23, 1976

OC 1975-121

Ronald Robinson, Chairman  
Young America's Campaign Committee  
919 18th Street, Suite 800  
Washington, D. C. 20006

Dear Mr. Robinson:

This responds further to your letter of November 25, 1975, requesting an advisory opinion, on whether the Young America's Campaign Committee (YACC), may approve a project entitled "Citizens Against Kennedy." The project is designed to raise funds through mailings, and advertisements placed in newspapers throughout the country, for the purpose of adversely influencing any presidential ambitions Senator Kennedy may entertain. You state that the project has neither sought nor obtained the consent or approval of any person seeking nomination or election to the Office of President or Vice President of the United States, and ask whether the contribution and independent expenditure limitations under the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended (the Act), are applicable.

The Supreme Court recently held in Buckley v. Valeo, 44 U.S.L.W. 4127 (S.C. January 30, 1976), that the Commission as constituted could not be given statutory authority to issue advisory opinions. Although this part of the Court's judgment was stayed for 30 days, the Commission has determined that it will not issue further advisory opinions under 2 U.S.C. §437f during the stay period. Thus, this letter should be regarded as an opinion of counsel, rather than an advisory opinion.

Regarding independent expenditure limitations, the Court held in Buckley, inter alia, that §608(e) of Title 18, United State Code, is unconstitutional. Thus, the YACC, may make unlimited expenditures on behalf of the "Citizens Against Kennedy" project from funds contributed to the Committee. Of course, since YACC is a "political committee"




under the Act, these independent expenditures will have to be reported. See 2 U.S.C. §434.

The Supreme Court opinion did, however, lay down a test for what constitutes an independent expenditure and what would be considered a contribution in kind to a candidate and therefore subject to the limits of 18 U.S.C. §608(b). See Buckley, supra, fn. 53 at pp. 40-41 of the Slip Opinion. Under that test, inter alia, cooperation with or consent of any candidate (not just the candidate or persons mentioned in the project) would make the cost of the project a contribution in kind to the candidate whose cooperation or consent was obtained and therefore subject to the limits of 18 U.S.C. §608(b).

With regard to contribution limitations, I am of the opinion that only the \$25,000 aggregate calendar year limit on individuals under 18 U.S.C. §608(b)(3) is applicable since the money received is intended to influence the course of a Federal election. Thus, an individual could contribute as much as \$25,000 to the YACC for the described project, provided he or she made no other contributions with respect to the 1976 elections.

The foregoing constitutes an opinion of counsel which the Commission has noted without objection.

Sincerely yours,

  
John G. Murphy, Jr.  
General Counsel



THE WHITE HOUSE  
WASHINGTON

May 25, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: BARRY ROTH  
FROM: DAVE GERGEN  
SUBJECT: Reagan Solicitation

Two friends of mine have recently received the attached solicitation from the Reagan California Fund. The letter says the Fund is an independent committee and because of that status, a donor who has already given \$1000 directly to Ronald Reagan can now give an additional \$24,000 to the Fund.

I am informed that the size of the requested contribution appears to be in violation of the law. Can this be quickly checked?

Many thanks.

5/25/76

Dave -

I've been working with Vasser on this for a week or so. It is clear that the maximum contribution they can receive under the new law (effective date: May 11) is \$5,000. Vasser is arguing to FEC that limit for a named candidate should be \$1,000 even if it is an unauthorized committee. Bob will probably lose on this point, but it is worth a try.

Barry



# REAGAN CALIFORNIA FUND

A Project of:  
Young America's Campaign Committee



Dear Friend:

Your assistance on a most urgent project could mean the difference between victory and defeat for Ronald Reagan in the June 8th primary in California--the most important primary of the campaign.

That is why I am writing to you today.

Gerald Ford and Ronald Reagan are in a virtual dead heat for convention delegates coming into the California primary. The winner of the California primary will take an extra 167 delegates to the convention.

These 167 delegates will mean the margin of victory for the Republican presidential nominee. More delegates are at stake in California than New Hampshire, Florida, Vermont, and North Carolina combined!

Ronald Reagan's stunning defeat of Gerald Ford in the North Carolina primary was a result of his aggressive media campaign in that state prior to the voting.

That is why the Reagan California Fund has been established by the Young America's Campaign Committee. We intend to place spot radio advertisements throughout California a week prior to the primary.

We have entered into an agreement with the nation's top producer of radio advertisements.

Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., the star of the television series The FBI, has agreed to do the narration for the ads.

They will be targeted in communities across California with the precision that was apparent in the media blitz that brought Ronald Reagan victory in North Carolina.

Production costs, distribution fees, etc., will be \$25,000 and that amount is needed at once. Unless we receive that amount by May 25, 1976, the ads by Efrem Zimbalist, Jr., cannot be run.

These ads are the most economical and effective method for reaching the millions of California voters. Ronald Reagan's chances of victory in California will be severely set back without them. As a result, his chances for the Republican nomination could be lost.

That is why it is vital that you send what you can today. Please send at least \$20 today. If you cannot send \$20, we will be grateful for whatever you can contribute. But we must have whatever your generous contribution by May 25.

It is important to consider what Ronald Reagan's defeat could mean for the Republican Party.

Consider the record of the Ford administration and the possibility of its continuing should Ronald Reagan lose the California primary:

1. There would be more appointments of left-liberals into the administration such as Charles Goodell and Nelson Rockefeller.
2. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger would remain, throughout Ford's term, continuing the policy of one-way-street detente.
3. The United States would continue its second-rate military posture and perhaps slip to third rate or fourth rate.
4. The United States would continue its policy of surrender of American possessions such as the Panama Canal Zone.
5. Deficit spending would continue unabated, without a voice of leadership coming from the White House.


Before you decide how much to give, I should explain that the Reagan California Fund is an independent organization, entirely separate from the Citizens for Reagan campaign committee.

Because it is an independent committee, the Reagan California Fund may solicit funds from individuals beyond the \$1000 limit. Thus, if you have already contributed the maximum \$1000 to the official Citizens for Reagan campaign committee, you may contribute up to an additional \$24,000 to the Reagan California Fund.

In addition, while the official Reagan effort in California is limited in what it can spend on behalf of Ronald Reagan, our committee can wage an all-out effort to win in California without government-enforced spending restrictions.

If any contribution could tip the scale for a Reagan victory, your contribution to the Reagan California Fund could be it. Please be generous, and soon. Thank you.

Sincerely,



Ron Robinson, National Chairman  
Reagan California Fund



# YOUNG AMERICA'S CAMPAIGN COMMITTEE

Air Date \_\_\_\_\_  
Radio Spot Number \_\_\_\_\_ #2  
Title \_\_\_\_\_ 60 SECONDS  
Narrator \_\_\_\_\_ EFREM ZIMBALIST, JR.

60 SECOND RADIO SPOT

I, LIKE YOU, AM CONCERNED ABOUT THE FUTURE OF THIS COUNTRY. I, LIKE YOU, HAD HOPED THAT AFTER WATERGATE GERALD FORD WOULD LEAD US AWAY FROM DEFICIT SPENDING, APPEASEMENT ABROAD, AND MILITARY WEAKNESS. I HAVE CONCLUDED HE HAS NOT DONE THIS. INSTEAD HE HAS FIRED A SECRETARY OF DEFENSE WHO DISAGREED WITH KISSINGER'S DETENTE, ACCEPTED AMERICA'S STATUS AS THE SECOND STRONGEST NATION IN THE WORLD, IS ACQUIESCING IN THE GIVE-AWAY OF THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE, AND HAS PRESIDED OVER \$100 BILLION IN DEFICITS IN JUST TWO YEARS. RONALD REAGAN IS MY CHOICE FOR PRESIDENT BECAUSE HE PROMISES A NEW SECRETARY OF STATE, THE RESTORATION OF AMERICAN MILITARY SUPERIORITY, NO GIVE-AWAYS OF AMERICAN TERRITORY SUCH AS THE PANAMA CANAL ZONE TO LEFTIST DICTATORS, AND, HE PROMISES A BALANCED BUDGET. IF YOU BELIEVE AS I DO THAT STRONG LEADERSHIP IS NEEDED IN THE WHITE HOUSE AS WE ENTER OUR TWO-HUNDREDTH YEAR, THEN I URGE YOU TO VOTE FOR RONALD REAGAN IN THE REPUBLICAN PRIMARY. THIS IS EFREM ZIMBALIST, JR. THANK YOU FOR LISTENING.

END

END

END

END

END

END

*This is a sample transcript of the radio ads planned for California one week before the Primary*





*PL/ Reagan*

THE WHITE HOUSE

WASHINGTON

May 28, 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: DAVE GERGEN

FROM: BARRY ROTH *BR*

Referencing our conversations concerning contributions to political committees making independent expenditures in support of Ronald Reagan, the FEC is issuing today a general statement of policy in this regard. The FEC policy permits an individual to give \$1,000 to Reagan or his authorized committee (Citizens for Reagan) and up to \$5,000 to any unauthorized committee, as long as the individual does not give to that committee with knowledge that the money will in turn be contributed to the candidate. Such contributions to candidates and political committees remain subject to the \$25,000 annual limit on political contributions.

For your information, Bob Visser had argued the position with the FEC staff that an individual who had contributed \$1,000 to a candidate or his authorized committees could not contribute at all to a committee making independent expenditures, or else could only contribute up to \$1,000 to each such unauthorized committee. However, the FEC's position is the better interpretation of the law.

This policy does not appear to affect independent expenditures made by an individual or group of individuals, e.g., fifteen persons join together and pay for a political advertisement in a newspaper. In such cases, the individual has a direct control over the expenditure, which he surrenders when he contributes to a political committee. To the extent an individual's expenditures exceed \$100 per calendar year on behalf of a clearly identifiable candidate, the individual must file expenditure reports with the FEC.



With respect to the independent Reagan California Fund that we discussed, they are being contacted by the FEC to insure that they do not cash any checks in excess of \$5,000 which were received after May 11, and instead that they return the checks to the contributors. Bob Visser will follow up with the FEC compliance personnel to make sure this is being done.

cc: Philip W. Buchen  
Edward Schmults

