## The original documents are located in Box 67, folder "Issues and Answers, 11/30/1975 -Ronald Reagan" of the Ron Nessen 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 Gerald R. Ford donated to the United States of America his copyrights in all of his unpublished writings in National Archives collections.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.

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC NEWS RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS' ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 50, 1975

GUEST:

B

RONALD REAGAN - Former Governor of California and Candidate for the Presidency

INTERVIEWED BY:

BOB CLARK - ABC News Issuea and Answers Chief Correspondent

FRANDK REYNOLDS - ABC News Correspondent

This is a rush transcript for the press. Any questions regarding accuracy should be referred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS ANNOUNCER: Former Governor of California and candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, here are the issues:

1

2

pauls.

Will your challenge to President Ford destroy Republican
 chances of holding on to the White House?

How do you propose to reduce the power of the federal
government without substantially increasing local and state
taxes?

9 If you were President, would you go to China to advance 10 detente?

MR. CLARK: Governor, your challenge to President Ford has been greeted with alarm by some liberals and moderates within your party. Senator Percy says your nomination would wreck the party, and Senator Mathias is talking about starting a third party.

the site site

17 Do you have a plan to make peace with the liberals, to 18 keep them under the Republican banner and under your banner 19 if you win the nomination?

20 MR. MEAGAN: Well, Bob, I have always disagreed with 21 those Republicans or those outside of the party who insist 22 on hyphenating Republicans, giving them saliva tests and 23 classifying them into narrow brackets as to where they stand 24 philosophically. I think all of us must have certain basic 25 agreements or we wouldn't be in the Republican Party.

I think they are wrong, and I think what they are ignoring is a record of eight years that stands up there for anyone to look at, the record of my administration in Sacramento, California.

57

2

E.

85

6

7

8

9

80

82

12

33

10

15

16

87

12

19

20

21

22

演奏

28

25

They can look at that record, and I doubt if they can classify that into the narrow categories that they are viewing with alarm. So I hope that by our practice of the 11th Commandment, which was given birth in California, that their fears will be eased.

MR. CLARK: Do you mean by this, Governor, that you don't think it is necessary for you to offer any special olive branch to the liberals? You think they simply have to look at your record? Is that your view?

MR. REAGAN: I think they barked rather early, and maybe if they will sit down in good faith and have a discussion -which I would be very happy to have with them -- they would find out that their fears are groundless.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, one of the reasons, I suppose the major reason why liberals express misgivings about you is because of some of the things that you have said and the programs you have offered.

For example, your proposal to cut federal spending by consequent \$90 billion, with a / reduction in federal income taxes of about 23 percent, that you propose to give so many of these programs now funded in part or in whole by the

federal government back to the states. Is there anybody 2 else that you can think of in the Republican Party that really 3 believes that kind of a program?

Que.

MR. REAGAN: Well, yes, as a matter of fact, it has been 高 Republican philosophy for quite some years, and many times in 5 the platform, that there was an overcentralization of govern-Si. ment under Democratic regimes and over these last 40 years 3 of Democratic control of the House and Senate, and that the 8 Republican Party was pledged to government at the levels near-9 est the people. I think that is standard Republican philosophy. 10

Now, my so-called cut of \$90 billion with the total based 99 on the '76 budget projection, it was based on the amount of \$2 money that is invested in programs that properly, regardless 18 of the money, properly belong at the state and local level. 勇病 And my own experience in California indicates that this is 15 so, and I think that most people today believe that. I think 16 many of our ills would disappear if some program such as welfare 17 and education were turned back to the states where they properly 18 belong. 19

MR. REYNOLDS: What would that do to the states them-20 selves in terms of their own financing? For example, take 21 the state of New Hampshire. You will be interested in New 22 Hampshire before very long. New Hampshire now gets, on the 23 subject of welfare you would propose to return all welfare 24 obligations back to the states. Well, the federal government 28

pays 62 percent of the New Hampshire's total welfare expenditures. That means New Hampshire has to either assume that or cut it down.

-

2

3

MR. REAGAN: This is true, and I made the point this B would not be a net gain, but if these programs were turned 35 back --- let me say, also, not an instantaneous 3 cancellation of Federal government, and hopefully somebody 7 picks it up. I think you would have to have an orderly phas-2 ing of these programs to local government or state government. Q I think state governments at the same time when this happens 20 should be reviewing whether they should indeed pass the 11 program on to their local communities. Then I think that 82 you would have to have taxes increased at state and local 13 levels to offset this, or to maintain some of these programs. 3A Some programs undoubtedly would be dropped, because the federal 255 government has many programs. You know there is nothing that 208 is closer to eternal life than a government program once started \$7 at the federal level. But the thing is, what we learned in 18 California with our own welfare reforms is, not only can they 19 be better administered, they can be more economically adminis-20 tered. Now, if the federal government stopped preempting so 21 much of the tax dollar, taking all the sources of taxation 22 at the federal level, leaving local and state governments 23 strapped as to where they are to get the money they need, 24 if this was reduced at the federal level there would be leeway 25

for the states and local governments to take these over. They would also be run at a much lower cost. The administrative overhead of running any program at the federal level is much greater than it is at any other level of government.

(internal

2

3

B

5

S

7

8

9

10

11

12

18

2.6

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dis.

6

MR. CLARK: Governor Reagan, as I am sure you are aware, New Hampshire is quite proud of the fact it is the only state in the country that has neither state sales mr state income taxes. Campaigning in New Hampshire on a program to turn back responsibility for numerous federal programs to the state, in candor wouldn't you have to tell the people of New Hampshire that you are going to have to increase your tax burden and that probably means either a sales tax or a state income tax? MR. REAGAN: But isn't this a proper decision for the people of the state to make?

and

范

3

4

E

e

2

7

MR. CLARK: But isn't this going to be forced on them if they are forced to take back these federal responsibilities?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, how they were to administer them, whether they would administer them is properly a decision to be made at the state level in these particular programs.

Let's emphasize I made it very plain in the same address
in which I outlined this overall plan, I made it very plain
that there are functions that are properly federal, properly
belong to the national government and should stay there. This
doesn't mean they can't be improved. It doesn't mean they can't
be made more efficient. I am sure they can be.

But, as you have just said, the federal government is --14 your situation with regard to states -- now, in California we 15 have an income tax too, but we realize we are limited in that 16 income tax because the federal government is in there first 17 and that is the most elastic tax, that is the one that 18 grows with the economy the most, and the federal government has 19 pre-empted it to such an extent that local and state governments 20 are hard put to find legitimate sources for taxation. 28

MR. CLARK: Governor, that raises an interesting point. You have lost a celebrated item here in California, proposition one where you attempted to put a limit on the amount of state taxes that should be collected and paid the taxes to the total

8

2

8

5

6

8

1

10

22

12

13

80

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

23

2

personal income in the state.

If you become President, would you try to do the same thing with federal taxes? Would you think of some outer limit that might be placed on federal income taxes? 惑

MR. REAGAN: As a matter of fact, it is not just income taxes; it is all taxes. The percentage of the earned dollar that government takes is too high. That all governments take is too high.

It is one of the things that is holding down our economy. We lost in California on that. We would take more than a half hour if I tried to explain it in full. Frankly, we were just out-muscled. The big lie defeated us and we didn't have the muscle to overcome it, but 69 per cent of the people who voted against that program had been deceived into believing they were voting against a tax increase.

MR. CLARK: If you become President, might you think in terms of a proposition one on the federal level?

MR. REAGAN: Well, you take your problem to Congress but that is already there. There is legislation that has been introduced in Congress by a group of congressmen who saw this California experiment and believed ---

MR. CLARK: Would you support it, though?

MR. REAGAN: I certainly would.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, before we leave this whole area,

what would your program, if fully implemented, do to the poorer states?

All states are not equal. California seems to be in pretty good shape, but what about Arkansas and Mississippi and some of these other states who don't have --

9

MR. REAGAN: It is true, there are states that get more from the federal government than they return to the federal government. They are low-taxed states. They are not burdened with heavy taxation, but let me ask you something: One of those high tax-paying states, so-called wealthy states, is New York.

Is New York, today, in a position to solve its own problems and at the same time send money to some other states? MR. REYNOLDS: Is New York in a position to assume all of the programs that you would give back to New York, all Welfare costs, all aid to education and everything else?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, because many of these programs, you see, are -- the manner in which the federal government insists on their implementation is excessive, and the rules and regulations force upon states and cities like New York things that administratively they would not do if they had the leeway to do it.

Now, let's point out another thing. If Welfare were returned to the state level, a state could have a limitation, or a residency requirement in order to get welfare, which they

3

0.0

2

A

5

R

19

8

G

10

11

\$2

13

18

15

16

\$7

12

19

20

21

22

23

22

always had, until the federal government was involved to such an extent that the Supreme Court ruled that, no, you could move anywhere in the United States you wanted and instantly be eligible for Welfare in whatever state you chose.

0.0

2

33

4

17

2

19

13

9.40

15

16

22

22

2.5

25

Now, states like New York and California that have tried 52 to do more than other states, that had higher Welfare payments, 6 found themselves with an in-migration from these other states. But if you returned this to the states and the federal government was not involved, a state like New York that was burdened 9 with this great in-migration could have had a rule that said 10 "Oh, no, you have to live here a year before you are eligible for Welfare." 12

MR. REYNOLDS: Now that you have raised the topic, suppose we ask you, what do you think of the way the President has handled the New York situation? Are you in agreement with him as far as New York's finances are concerned?

MR. REAGAN: I am worried about a precedent being establish-17 ed that might be passed on, or that might lead to other cities 13 saying, "Well, we can be careless with our bonding and we can 19 float more bonds than our credit requires and count on the 20 federal government to bail us out." 21

I do recognize that the President has placed this on New York, reversing the trend that led to their problem. There is no question but that the victims in New York are the three million working tax-paying citizens, working in the private sector who must put up all the money that pays for everything

else; who for some 20-odd years have had their political leaders deceive them as to the practices they were following to the place that New York now has a per capita cost for basic services that is more than twice that of all the other big cities in the United States.

1

2

3

18

57

0

100

8

8

90

11

12

13

勇道

13

16

3%

18

19

20

21

うり

23

2A

25

de

MR. CLARK: We would like to get a specific answer on New York. If you were President do you think you would have made the offer that President Ford has made to make direct federal loans to New York City to help get it out of its financial crisis?

MR. REAGAN: I wish I could give you an answer to that. As I say, I am worried about the precedent.

On the other hand, I don't want to see those three million working citizens I have mentioned victimized with creditors holding the bag and with bondholders in the same position.

I haven't had an opportunity to study all the ramifications. I heard the President make his statement. It sounded like a practical plan. I have the concern that I have mentioned. I frankly want to give this more study before I tell you that is the solution that I would pick.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

MR. CLARK: Governor, as you know, Vice President Rockefeller hasn't quite taken himself out of the 1976 picture. He has declined to say flatly thathe will not be a candidate for the Republican nomination.

12 -Do you view him as a rival for the nomination? 2 MR. REAGAN: No. I am aware of his position and it is 3 similar to a position he has taken in previous national elections and that is a decision for him to make. 2 I have said that I will not be surprised if, now that I 55 have declared, if others do not follow suit and get into the G race. 27 MR. REYNOLDS: Do you expect John Connally to come in? 8 MR. REAGAIN: I don't know. I think that John Connally 9 certainly is available and would not refuse if there was an \$0 indication from enough people that they thought he should make 5 6 a run for it. 12 MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, what is your strategy, to knock 13 the President out in the early primaries, force him to withdraw? 28 MR. REAGAN: My strategy is a little more naive than that. My strategy is to take my case to the people 15 as to what I believe should be done with regard to the problems 16 and what I think the solutions are, what the policy should be, 17 and let the people decide. 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

de

MR. REYNOLDS: The President has indicated no great willingness to debate you. Would you like to debate Mr. Ford, say up there in Manchester?

1

10

2

23

A

3

-7

B

0

800

11

\$2

13

14

15

148

17

名劇

20

20

21

22

23

2A

25

de

MR. REAGAN: Well, I have to say this. I know that the challenge and the rejection of debate is kind of a campaign tactic that is used both ways, in politics. I have to say that I believe the people can find out what you believe, what your principles are, without the two of you appearing simultaneously.

MR. REYNOLDS: You don't think it is easier to choose between the two of you, if they could see you side by side discussing these issues, having a free and frank exchange of views?

MR. REAGAN: Well, is it any different than seeing each candidate frankly express his views and then someone else -and you gentlemen of the press make no -- you leave no stone unturned to pin each one of us down on what the other one has done and what you would do likewise. I am not sure that it is beneficial.

MR. CLARK: Governor, one more question about Vice President Rockefeller. He has refused to say that if you win the nomination he would support you. If by some chance he became the Republican nominee, would you support him?

MR. REAGAN: Well, he is not even a candidate yet. I will wait and answer that when he becomes a candidate.

I think I would be surprised and disappointed if Vice President
Rockefeller took that attitude with regard to a Republican
nominee. I would be surprised, myself. I believe in the
philosophy of the Republican Party. I know that the Vice
President and I differ philosophically on a number of points.
At the same time, we have a most friendly and cordial relationship.

14

8 MR. CLARK: Governor, would you say -- this is a way out 9 of the dilemma we put politicians in on this -- would you simply 10 say you would support the nominee

of the Republican Convention, whoever he may be?

MR. REAGAN: Well, now, that is a hypothetical question. MR. CLARK: Is that hypothetical? There aren't very many candidates.

MR. REAGAN: Wait a minute. You can get into all sorts of things. Would I, when I was a Democrat, would I have stayed with my party in '72 when they chose a man who I thought was so far afield from what the American people wanted, then the answer would be no. So you can't rule that that can't happen to any party as it did to that one. I don't think it could happen to the Republican Party, but you can't make a flat assertion that it won't.

23 MR. REYNOLDS: You are well on your way right now to 24 reviving talk about a third party with you heading a 25 third party possibly?

2

.

12

13

8.8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

MR. REAGAN: No, I rule that out.

MR. CLARK: Neither you nor Vice President Rockefeller will say they will support the nominee of the party. Doesn't this inspire the sort of divisiveness that Republican leaders in both the left and right wings, the liberal and conservative wings, are trying to avoid?

15

MR. REAGAN: No. There are two candidates at the moment for the nomination of the Republican Party - myself and President Ford. If President Ford wins, I will support him.

MR. CLARK: There have been reports when you telephoned President Ford to tell him you were going to challenge him for the nomination he told you, as the report read, that this would cause bitterness and divisiveness within the party and weaken its chances of defeating the Democrats next year. Did the President say this to you?

MR. REAGAN: The President expressed a concern. I made 16 my pledge to him about doing nothing divisive. He made the 17 same pledge to me. He did express a concern that in spite 18 of this, the other people who are involved in campaigns, that 10 the danger was there. Well, I have the experience of a '66 20 campaign in California in which we all did observe the 11th 21 Commandment, and we put the Republican Party back together in 22 this state for the first time in 50 years, that it had been 23 a united party. 24

3

-

2

2

B

5

6

7

8

3

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, do you believe the President's current trip to China -- he is on his way there today -- is worthwhile?

1

2

3

az.

5

6

7

25

MR. REAGAN: Well, he expressed the hope it was to improve chances for peace. In that regard I hope it is successful. Frankly, I have to wonder if it isn't time for China to come visit us.

8 MR. CLARK: Governor, one of the questions that is still 9 h anging over our relations with China is whether we should 10 upgrade our diplomatic relations with China and establish an 11 embassy in Peking. Now, the one could be that this would mean 12 abandoning Taiwan. If you were President, would you take that fur 13 ther step toward closer relationships to China?

MR. REAGAN: Not if it in any way reduced our relationships with Taiwan. Taiwan is an ally. We have a treaty
with Taiwan. I believe Taiwan as a trade partner is an
economic force in the world far in excess of Mainland China. But
while I want better relations on an honest basis with Red
China, as I am sure everyone else does, that this country
not, if it means sacrificing our relationship with Taiwan.

MR. CLARK: Would you, as President, place conditions - over further moves toward detente
with the Russians? Would you want specific
for instance, on the subject of further talks toward mutual
reductions of nuclear arms?

MR. REAGAN: I have criticized detente because I don't

think detente is as much of a two-way street as it was set 1942 out to be, and as it is supposed to be. I believe Russia is 2 spirit, the \$ violating certainly the/intent of detente, with its help to the rebels in Angola and its involvement in the civil war in B Angola. I think that the Soviet Union with its out-spending 55 us in both nuclear and conventional weapons, its rapid build-8 up trying to dtain a superiority, none of this is in the spirit 7 of detente, and I think detente, a worthy idea -- none of 8 us wants confrontation, we want a world that can find areas 9 where we can discuss our problems and talk about them -- I 80 believe the United States, however, should insist that we not 11 give more than we are getting. 82

18 MR. REYNOLDS: Is that what has happened, Governor? Have 14 we given more than we have been getting?

MR. REAGAN: I think we have. As I say, we are not in-15 volved in Angola, we are not involved in Portugal as the Soviet 16 U nion is. We have just had the Congress of the United States 17 I think dangerously reduce our defense budget, but we know 18 that the Russians are outspending us, 60 percent in nuclear 19 weapons, 25 percent in conventional weapons. They have added 20 2,000 pieces of artillery and 1,000 tanks to the forces in 21 Eastern Europe that are opposed to the NATO line. We have added 22 none. I think this is not detente, as I view it. 23

25

20

MR. REYNOLDS: You have said that you believed the Vladivostok Agreement should be renegotiated. How would you persuade the Russians to do this?

2

3

13

- 17

8

201

99

12

13

14

845

16

12

10

80

20

28

22

23

23

25

MR. REAGAN: I think we gave away too much in Vladivostok. SALT I started out on a basis of equality. This is all actually former Secretary Schlesinger was aiming at with the budget he submitted. It was not a superiority but an equality of arms. To maintain a status quo. What was left out in Vladivostok was throw weight. We counted numbers of missiles. Well, if we are going to have "x" number of little rocks and you are going to have "x" number of great big rocks, it is not going to be an even contest if we have to start throwing them at each other.

MR. CLARK: Governor, we wanted to ask you a couple of specific questions.

President Ford is under pressure from conservatives and the oil industry to veto the compromise oil energy package finally being worked out by Congress. If you were President, would you veto this compromise bill?

MR. REAGAN: Yes. In two ways it violates to me everything that we need to do. First of all, it wtakes away any stimulant for the production of new sources of energy in this country, and, second of all, it does away with one important factor in attempting conservation.

Now, there is a need for conservation on the part of the

people, but, reducing the price of gasoline, happy as it would make all of us that have to drive into the gas station and fill up the tank, at the same time we have to recognize it is going to encourage further use of petroleum sources.

19

MR. CLARK: And, Governor, another specific question: Do you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit courts from ordering school busing to achieve racial balance or integration?

MR. REAGAN: Well, before we turn to a constitutional amendment -- I know it is awful easy to look at that as a simple answer to many things, and I don't think the Constitution should deteriorate into involving itself in what should be done by statute and legislation. If that is a last resort, yes, because I am unalterably opposed to forced busing. I don't think it has solved the problem. It has added to the bitterness we were trying to alleviate.

I believe here, in what we talked about earlier, education is one of the areas where I think the federal government should get its nose out. Again, if control of schools was turned back to the local level, then those decisions would be made by the people at the local level in the local school districts and forced busing usually has come from decisions at the federal level.

MR. REYNOLDS: What is your alternative to busing, Governor?

As

1

2

嬴

5

6

9

8

9

10

11

12

12

8.8

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

28

2A

25

MR. REAGAN: I think there are a number of alternatives. I think, for one thing, you start out, if there are schools of unequal quality, if you have schools in a metropolitan area like New York and Los Angeles, where in certain areas they are inferior in facilities and teaching quality to others, you upgrade that. But I think there are things that you can do --

MR. CLARK: Governor, I hate to interrupt you in the middle of an answer as complicated as this one, but we are out of time. Thank you very much for being with us on ISSUES AND ANSWERS.

MR. REAGAN: Thank you.

3

Pure.

24

3

A

Re.

e

2

8

.9

10

3 1

92

13

24

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

dis.

PLEASE CREDIT ANY QUOTES OR EXCERPTS FROM THIS ABC NEWS RADIO AND TELEVISION PROGRAM TO "ABC NEWS' ISSUES AND ANSWERS."

ISSUES AND ANSWERS

SUNDAY, NOVEMBER 30, 1975

GUEST:

de

RONALD REAGAN - Former Governor of California and Candidate for the Presidency

INTERVIEWED BY:

BOB CLARK - ABC News Issuea and Answers Chief Correspondent

FRANDK REYNOLDS - ABC News Correspondent

400 400 618

This is a rush transcript for the press. Any questions regarding accuracy should be referred to ISSUES AND ANSWERS ANNOUNCER: Former Governor of California and candidate for the Republican Presidential nomination, here are the issues:

8

22

3

11

dis.

Will your challenge to President Ford destroy Republican
 chances of holding on to the White House?

How do you propose to reduce the power of the federal
government without substantially increasing local and state
taxes?

9 If you were President, would you go to China to advance
 10 detente?

MR. CLARK: Governor, your challenge to Fresident Ford
has been greeted with alarm by some liberals and moderates
within your party. Senator Percy says your nomination would
wreck the party, and Senator Mathias is talking about starting
a third party.

\* \* \*

17 Do you have a plan to make peace with the liberals, to 18 keep them under the Republican banner and under your banner 19 if you win the nomination?

20 MR. MEAGAN: Well, Bob, I have always disagreed with 21 those Republicans or those outside of the party who insist 22 on hyphenating Republicans, giving them saliva tests and 23 classifying them into narrow brackets as to where they stand 24 philosophically. I think all of us must have certain basic 25 agreements or we wouldn't be in the Republican Party.

I I think they are wrong, and I think what they are ignoring is a record of eight years that stands up there for anyone to look at, the record of my administration in Sacramento, California.

Test.

2

3

B

5

8

7

2

2

10

23

12

93

14

25

16

\$7

88

19

20

21

22

23

24

22

de

They can look at that record, and I doubt if they can classify that into the narrow categories that they are viewing with alarm. So I hope that by our practice of the 11th Commandment, which was given birth in California, that their fears will be eased.

MR. CLARK: Do you mean by this, Governor, that you don't think it is necessary for you to offer any special clive branch to the liberals? You think they simply have to look at your record? Is that your view?

MR. REAGAN: I think they barked rather early, and maybe if they will sit down in good faith and have a discussion -which I would be very happy to have with them -- they would find out that their fears are groundless.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, one of the reasons, I suppose the major reason why liberals express misgivings about you is because of some of the things that you have said and the programs you have offered.

For example, your proposal to cut federal spending by consequent \$90 billion, with a / reduction in federal income taxes of about 23 percent, that you propose to give so many of these programs now funded in part or in whole by the

federal government back to the states. Is there anybody else that you can think of in the Republican Party that really believes that kind of a program?

a

MR. REAGAN: Well, yes, as a matter of fact, it has been Republican philosophy for quite some years, and many times in the platform, that there was an overcentralization of government under Democratic regimes and over these last 40 years of Democratic control of the House and Senate, and that the Republican Party was pledged to government at the levels nearest the people. I think that is standard Republican philosophy.

Now, my so-called cut of \$90 billion with the total based 15 on the '76 budget projection, it was based on the amount of 12 money that is invested in programs that properly, regardless 22 of the money, properly belong at the state and local level. 王鼎 And my own experience in California indicates that this is 15 so, and I think that most people today believe that. I think 16 many of our ills would disappear if some program such as welfare 37 and education were turned back to the states where they properly 82 belong. 19

20 MR. REYNOLDS: What would that do to the states them-21 selves in terms of their own financing? For example, take 22 the state of New Hampshire. You will be interested in New 23 Hampshire before very long. New Hampshire now gets, on the 24 subject of welfare you would propose to return all welfare 25 obligations back to the states. Well, the federal government pays 62 percent of the New Hampshire's total welfare expenditures. That means New Hampshire has to either assume that or cut it down.

5

MR. REAGAN: This is true, and I made the point this would not be a net gain, but if these programs were turned back -- let me say, also, not an instantaneous cancellation of Federal government, and hopefully somebody picks it up. I think you would have to have an orderly phas-8 ing of these programs to local government or state government. (3) I think state governments at the same time when this happens 10 should be reviewing whether they should indeed pass the 88 program on to their local communities. Then I think that 82 you would have to have taxes increased at state and local 13 levels to offset this, or to maintain some of these programs. 14 Some programs undoubtedly would be dropped, because the federal 25 government has many programs. You know there is nothing that 965 is closer to eternal life than a government program once started 17 at the federal level. But the thing is, what we learned in 18 California with our own welfare reforms is, not only can they 10 be better administered, they can be more economically adminis-20 tered. Now, if the federal government stopped preempting so 28 much of the tax dollar, taking all the sources of taxation 22 at the federal level, leaving local and state governments 23 strapped as to where they are to get the money they need, DA if this was reduced at the federal level there would be leeway 25

de

1

2

3

B

12

杰

for the states and local governments to take these over.
They would also be run at a much lower cost. The administrative overhead of running any program at the federal level is
much greater than it is at any other level of government.

MR. CLARK: Governor Reagan, as I am sure you are aware, New Hampshire is quite proud of the fact it is the only state in the country that has neither state sales mr state income taxes. Campaigning in New Hampshire on a program to turn back responsibility for numerous federal programs to the state, in candor wouldn't you have to tell the people of New Hampshire that you are going to have to increase your tax burden and that probably means either a sales tax or a state income tax?

Ø

MR. REAGAN: But isn't this a proper decision for the people of the state to make?

5

2

3

12

R

æ

7

22

23

20

25

7

MR. CLARK: But isn't this going to be forced on them if they are forced to take back these federal responsibilities?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, how they were to administer them, whether they would administer them is properly a decision to be made at the state level in these particular programs.

Let's emphasize I made it very plain in the same address
in which I outlined this overall plan, I made it very plain
there are functions that are properly federal, properly
belong to the national government and should stay there. This
doesn't mean they can't be improved. It doesn't mean they can't
be made more efficient. I am sure they can be.

But, as you have just said, the federal government is --14 your situation with regard to states -- now, in California we 15 have an income tax too, but we realize we are limited in that 18 income tax because the federal government is in there first 17 and that is the most elastic tax, that is the one that 18 grows with the economy the most, and the federal government has 19 pre-empted it to such an extent that local and state governments 20 are hard put to find legitimate sources for taxation. 21

MR. CLARK: Governor, that raises an interesting point. You have lost a celebrated item here in California, proposition one where you attempted to put a limit on the amount of state taxes that should be collected and paid the taxes to the total

2

2

2

B

S

7

23

3

10

22

82

58

20

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

20

25

personal income in the state.

If you become President, would you try to do the same thing with federal taxes? Would you think of some outer limit that might be placed on federal income taxes?

MR. REAGAN: As a matter of fact, it is not just income taxes; it is all taxes. The percentage of the earned dollar that government takes is too high. That all governments take is too high.

It is one of the things that is holding down our economy. We lost in California on that. We would take more than a half hour if I tried to explain it in full. Frankly, we were just out-muscled. The big lie defeated us and we didn't have the muscle to overcome it, but 69 per cent of the people who voted against that program had been deceived into believing they were voting against a tax increase.

MR. CLARK: If you become President, might you think in terms of a proposition one on the federal level?

MR. REAGAN: Well, you take your problem to Congress but that is already there. There is legislation that has been introduced in Congress by a group of congressmen who saw this California experiment and believed --

MR. CLARK: Would you support it, though?

MR. REAGAN: I certainly would.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, before we leave this whole area,

what would your program, if fully implemented, do to the poorer states?

All states are not equal. California seems to be in pretty good shape, but what about Arkansas and Mississippi and some of these other states who don't have --

MR. REAGAN: It is true, there are states that get more from the federal government than they return to the federal government. They are low-taxed states. They are not burdened with heavy taxation, but let me ask you something: One of those high tax-paying states, so-called wealthy states, is New York.

Is New York, today, in a position to solve its own problems and at the same time send money to some other states? MR. REYNOLDS: Is New York in a position to assume all of the programs that you would give back to New York, all Welfare costs, all aid to education and everything else?

MR. REAGAN: Yes, because many of these programs, you see, are -- the manner in which the federal government insists on their implementation is excessive, and the rules and regulations force upon states and cities like New York things that administratively they would not do if they had the leeway to do it.

Now, let's point out another thing. If Welfare were returned to the state level, a state could have a limitation, or a residency requirement in order to get welfare, which they

3

10

2

31

2

100

6

7

R

9

10

11

82

13

14

15

18

17

18

19

20

28

22

23

2.6

宠历

always had, until the federal government was involved to such an extent that the Supreme Court ruled that, no, you could move anywhere in the United States you wanted and instantly be eligible for Welfare in whatever state you chose.

1

22

3

S.

23

6

7

3

Ð

10

2 2

82

13

14

16

16

97

18

13

20

Za

22

23

28

25

do

Now, states like New York and California that have tried to do more than other states, that had higher Welfare payments, found themselves with an in-migration from these other states. But if you returned this to the states and the federal government was not involved, a state like New York that was burdened with this great in-migration could have had a rule that said "Oh, no, you have to live here a year before you are eligible for Welfare."

MR. REYNOLDS: Now that you have raised the topic, suppose we ask you, what do you think of the way the President has handled the New York situation? Are you in agreement with him as far as New York's finances are concerned?

MR. REAGAN: I am worried about a precedent being established that might be passed on, or that might lead to other cities saying, "Well, we can be careless with our bonding and we can float more bonds than our credit requires and count on the federal government to bail us out."

I do recognize that the President has placed this on New York, reversing the trend that led to their problem. There is no question but that the victims in New York are the three million working tax-paying citizens, working in the private sector who must put up all the money that pays for everything

else; who for some 20-odd years have had their political leaders deceive them as to the practices they were following to the place that New York now has a per capita dost for basic services that is more than twice that of all the other big cities in the United States.

31

MR. CLARK: We would like to get a specific answer on New York. If you were President do you think you would have made the offer that President Ford has made to make direct federal loans to New York City to help get it out of its financial crisis?

MR. REAGAN: I wish I could give you an answer to that. As I say, I am worried about the precedent.

On the other hand, I don't want to see those three million working citizens I have mentioned victimized with creditors holding the bag and with bondholders in the same position.

I haven't had an opportunity to study all the ramifications. I heard the President make his statement. It sounded like a practical plan. I have the concern that I have mentioned. I frankly want to give this more study before I tell you that is the solution that I would pick.

\* \* \* \* \* \*

MR. CLARK: Governor, as you know, Vice President Rockefeller hasn't quite taken himself out of the 1976 picture. He has declined to say flatly thathe will not be a candidate for the Republican nomination.

2

63

10

85

92

13

8.6

15

16

17

19

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

2

-

63

15

Do you view him as a rival for the nomination? MR. REAGAN: No. I am aware of his position and it is similar to a position he has taken in previous national elections and that is a decision for him to make.

3

2

3

63

dis

29

20

21

22

23

24

25

5 I have said that I will not be surprised if, now that I 6 have declared, if others do not follow suit and get into the 7 race.

8 MR. REYNOLDS: Do you expect John Connally to come in? 9 MR. REAGAIN: I don't know. I think that John Connally 10 certainly is available and would not refuse if there was an 11 indication from enough people that they thought he should make 12 a run for it.

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, what is your strategy, to knock
the President out in the early primaries, force him to withdraw? MR. REAGAN: My strategy is a little more
naive than that. My strategy is to take my case to the people
as to what I believe should be done with regard to the problems
and what I think the solutions are, what the policy should be,
and let the people decide. MR. REYNOLDS: The President has indicated no great willingness to debate you. Would you like to debate Mr. Ford, say up there in Manchester?

20

2

2

65

R

7

R

1

10

19

12

13

14

雪筠

16

17

18

10

20

21

22

23

24

泡雪

13

MR. REAGAN: Well, I have to say this. I know that the challenge and the rejection of debate is kind of a campaign tactic that is used both ways, in politics. I have to say that I believe the people can find out what you believe, what your principles are, without the two of you appearing simultaneously.

MR. REYNOLDS: You don't think it is easier to choose between the two of you, if they could see you side by side discussing these issues, having a free and frank exchange of views?

MR. REAGAN: Well, is it any different than seeing each candidate frankly express his views and then someone else -and you gentlemen of the press make no -- you leave no stone unturned to pin each one of us down on what the other one has done and what you would do likewise. I am not sure that it is beneficial.

MR. CLARK: Governor, one more question about Vice President Rockefeller. He has refused to say that if you win the nomination he would support you. If by some chance he became the Republican nominee, would you support him?

MR. REAGAN: Well, he is not even a candidate yet. I will wait and answer that when he becomes a candidate. I think I would be surprised and disappointed if Vice President
 Rockefeller took that attitude with regard to a Republican
 nominee. I would be surprised, myself. I believe in the
 philosophy of the Republican Party. I know that the Vice
 President and I differ philosophically on a number of points.
 At the same time, we have a most friendly and cordial rela tionship.

14

8 MR. CLARK: Governor, would you say -- this is a way out 9 of the dilemma we put politicians in on this -- would you simply 10 say you would support the nominee

of the Republican Convention, whoever he may be?

MR. REAGAN: Well, now, that is a hypothetical question.
 MR. CLARK: Is that hypothetical? There aren't very many
 candidates.

MR. REAGAN: Wait a minute. You can get into all sorts of things. Would I, when I was a Democrat, would I have stayed with my party in '72 when they chose a man who I thought was so far afield from what the American people wanted, then the answer would be no. So you can't rule that that can't happen to any party as it did to that one. I don't think it could happen to the Republican Party, but you can't make a flat assertion that it won't.

23 MR. REYNOLDS: You are well on your way right now to 24 reviving talk about a third party with you heading a 25 third party possibly?

24

15

16

37

\$52

19

20

21

22

dis

MR. REAGAN: No, I rule that out.

MR. CLARK: Neither you nor Vice President Rockefeller will say they will support the nominee of the party. Doesn't this inspire the sort of divisiveness that Republican leaders in both the left and right wings, the liberal and conservative wings, are trying to avoid?

MR. REAGAN: No. There are two candidates at the moment for the nomination of the Republican Party - myself and President Ford. If President Ford wins, I will support him.

MR. CLARK: There have been reports when you telephoned President Ford to tell him you were going to challenge him for the nomination he told you, as the report read, that this would cause bitterness and divisiveness within the party and Weaken its chances of defeating the Democrats next year. Did the President say this to you?

MR. REAGAN: The President expressed a concern. I made 16 my pledge to him about doing nothing divisive. He made the 87 same pledge to me. He did express a concern that in spite 18 of this, the other people who are involved in campaigns, that 19 the danger was there. Well, I have the experience of a '66 20 campaign in California in which we all did observe the 11th 21 Commandment, and we put the Republican Party back together in 22 this state for the first time in 50 years, that it had been 23 a united party. 2.2

25

3

140

2

3

a.

5

6

7

12

9

de

MR. REYNOLDS: Governor, do you believe the President's current trip to China -- he is on his way there today -- is worthwhile?

MR. REAGAN: Well, he expressed the hope it was to improve
chances for peace. In that regard I hope it is successful.
Frankly, I have to wonder if it isn't time for China to come
visit us.

8 MR. CLARK: Governor, one of the questions that is still 9 h anging over our relations with China is whether we should 10 upgrade our diplomatic relations with China and establish an 11 embassy in Peking. Now, the one could be that this would mean 12 abandoning Taiwan. If you were President, would you take that fur 13 ther step toward closer relationships to China?

MR. REAGAN: Not if it in any way reduced our relation-1A ships with Taiwan. Taiwan is an ally. We have a treaty 15 with Taiwan. I believe Taiwan as a trade partner is an 16 economic force in the world far in excess of Mainland China. But 17 while I want better relations on an honest basis with Red 22 China, as I am sure everyone else does, that this country 19 not, if it means sacrificing our relationship with Taiwan. 20 MR. CLARK: Would you, as President, place conditions -23 over further moves toward detente with the Russians? Would you want specific 22 for instance, on the subject of further talks toward mutual 23

24 || reductions of nuclear arms?

25

100

2

3

MR. REAGAN: I have criticized detente because I don't

and a think detente is as much of a two-way street as it was set out to be, and as it is supposed to be. I believe Russia is 2 spirit, the 3 violating certainly the/intent of detente, with its help to the rebels in Angola and its involvement in the civil war in 8 Angola. I think that the Soviet Union with its out-spending 55 us in both nuclear and conventional weapons, its rapid build-B up trying to stain a superiority, none of this is in the spirit 7 of detente, and I think detente, a worthy idea -- none of 8 us wants confrontation, we want a world that can find areas 9 where we can discuss our problems and talk about them -- I 10 believe the United States, however, should insist that we not 11 give more than we are getting. \$2

MR. REYNOLDS: Is that what has happened, Governor? Have 13 we given more than we have been getting? 16

MR. REAGAN: I think we have. As I say, we are not involved in Angola, we are not involved in Portugal as the Soviet U nion is. We have just had the Congress of the United States I think dangerously reduce our defense budget, but we know that the Russians are outspending us, 60 percent in nuclear weapons, 25 percent in conventional weapons. They have added 2,000 pieces of artillery and 1,000 tanks to the forces in Eastern Europe that are opposed to the NATO line. We have added 22 none. I think this is not detente, as I view it. 23

25

20

15

18

17

18

19

20

21

MR. REYNOLDS: You have said that you believed the Vladivostok Agreement should be renegotiated. How would you persuade the Russians to do this?

8

5

7

28

10

8.8

32

13

12

25

15

87

18

19

20

23

22

23

24

25

MR. REAGAN: I think we gave away too much in Vladivostok. SALT I started out on a basis of equality. This is all actually former Secretary Schlesinger was aiming at with the budget he submitted. It was not a superiority but an equality of arms. To maintain a status quo. What was left out in Vladivostok was throw weight. We counted numbers of missiles. Well, if we are going to have "x" number of little rocks and you are going to have "x" number of great big rocks, it is not going to be an even contest if we have to start throwing them at each other.

MR. CLARK: Governor, we wanted to ask you a couple of specific questions.

President Ford is under pressure from conservatives and the oil industry to veto the compromise oil energy package finally being worked out by Congress. If you were President, would you veto this compromise bill?

MR. REAGAN: Yes. In two ways it violates to me everything that we need to do. First of all, it wtakes away any stimulant for the production of new sources of energy in this country, and, second of all, it does away with one important factor in attempting conservation.

Now, there is a need for conservation on the part of the

people, but, reducing the price of gasoline, happy as it would make all of us that have to drive into the gas station and fill up the tank, at the same time we have to recognize it is going to encourage further use of petroleum sources.

19

MR. CLARK: And, Governor, another specific question: Do you favor a constitutional amendment to prohibit courts from ordering school busing to achieve racial balance or integration?

MR. REAGAN: Well, before we turn to a constitutional amendment -- I know it is awful easy to look at that as a simple answer to many things, and I don't think the Constitution should deteriorate into involving itself in what should be done by statute and legislation. If that is a last resort, yes, because I am unalterably opposed to forced busing. I don't think it has solved the problem. It has added to the bitterness we were trying to alleviate.

I believe here, in what we talked about earlier, education is one of the areas where I think the federal government should get its nose out. Again, if control of schools was turned back to the local level, then those decisions would be made by the people at the local level in the local school districts and forced busing usually has come from decisions at the federal level.

MR. REYNOLDS: What is your alternative to busing, Governor?

110

3

5

B

.7

2

3

10

100

12

13

18

15

16

87

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

MR. REAGAN: I think there are a number of alternatives. I think, for one thing, you start out, if there are schools of unequal quality, if you have schools in a metropolitan area like New York and Los Angeles, where in certain areas they are inferior in facilities and teaching quality to others, you upgrade that. But I think there are things that you can do ---MR. CLARK: Governor, I hate to interrupt you in the middle of an answer as complicated as this one, but we are out

9 of time. Thank you very much for being with us on ISSUES AND 10 ANSWERS.

MR. REAGAN: Thank you.

\$

Red.

(fs