

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

This is a PDF of a folder from our textual  
collections.

---

Collection: Reagan, Ronald: Gubernatorial Papers,  
1966-74: Press Unit

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –  
04/25/1967, 05/02/1967, 05/09/1967

Box: P01

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/archives/digital-library>

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
inventories visit:

<https://reaganlibrary.gov/document-collection>

Contact a reference archivist at:

[reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

Citation Guidelines: <https://reaganlibrary.gov/citing>

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALL REAGAN

HELD APRIL 25, 1967

Reporter by:

Beverly Toms, CSR

---oOo---

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the Capitol Press Corps for their convenience only. Because of the need to get it to the press as rapidly as possible after the conference, no corrections are made and there is no guarantee of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: We have some visitors. One, first of all, here, our candidate for Assembly in the 46th District special election, Bob Beverley.

MR. BEVERLEY: Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: To inject a partisan note into this. I am not neutral in this election. Where are our other visitors, are they over in the side or something -- oh, they are over here. We also have Stanford Fellows with us today as guests of the Press Conference and they are all working newspaper men and women who are on leave to study at Stanford University, and they are here with the Associate Director of the Fellowship Program, Julius Doshay (phonetics). We are glad to have you aboard.

No prepared statement.

MR. BEHRENS: Governor, before you start, we ask you to stick on one subject till we get finished.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I think Squire has a very good idea. Why don't we take one subject at a time and then you won't have to keep flipping pages for those -- on those notes

Q I'd like to start on an easy subject which probably won't take much time, on the relation to the Consumer Council's office, has public announcement been

made yet as to why the budget was cut so considerably from -- I think it was \$120,000 a year to \$28,000?

A           No, I don't know that any has, but the basis of what we have been learning about the office, whether this one figure -- and also I'll be very frank with you. I myself have been studying this a little more, but not with any idea of going back to the other side. I believe that coming within the Governor's office as we have proposed with the Consumer's Council that there is a function that can be performed and adequately protect the consumer interest without so much duplication and with the office serving in part simply to direct complaints and questions to the proper agencies that can handle the-- the various points that at one time the Consumer Council apparently was trying to handle themselves even though there were other agencies already set up with a comparable function. And I believe on this basis that it doesn't require the budget that we have had in the past or the staff that we have had in the past.

Q           Governor, apparently your office is attempting to work out some sort of compromise in the Medi-Cal program. Just how much money the counties are going to have to pay.

A           In terms of financial Medi-Cal, well, we have been having meetings this morning on this very subject. I don't have all of the details at the moment in my hand, but I can tell you now basically that there is an agreement that we are going to continue, and the \$44,000,000 will be made available, that is in the budget now for the counties will be made available. At the same time-- this is for this coming year. At the same time we are going to embark in the coming year, all of us, on a joint study and a study in depth of this entire program, because the problems that brought about this particular meeting still remain, and there is no question but that there must be some alterations, some changes, made to solve these problems in the program or it just can pile up and

eventually bankrupt all of us.

Q In other words, the State is going to underwrite the increased cost of the Medi-Cal program?

A That's right, for this coming year.

Q If the Senate agrees, of course?

A What?

Q If the Senate agrees with that?

A This goes without saying, but let me say there was pretty general agreement on all of us to this solution.

Q Then there will be no cost to the counties?

A No, it will be as it was proposed in the original budget with the State putting up the forty-four.

Q Governor, do you agree with Spencer Williams, your own Health and Welfare Administrator that saw a little partisan politics in this whole plan over Medi-Cal?

A In the meetings this morning I thought we were down to the nub of agreement, and I thought there was a great deal of agreement. I didn't sense any partisan in that.

Q Did you learn there were some abuses in the program in the counties, they have been loading up their hospitals, putting on new wings, increasing salaries; do you think there are some abuses that should be investigated in the study you want to look at?

A Let me say no, this wasn't the purpose -- the purpose of the study is based on the whole approach, this problem, the Medi-Cal approach. In the meetings there was no discussion of that kind this morning. There was discussion of any -- to put on the counties the responsibility for curtailing the cost.

Q Governor, was this compromise your compromise or your office's compromise, and also was it agreed to by the Counties Supervisors Association?

A It is my understanding since we left in the first meeting this morning that there is now general

agreement on this approach.

Q Governor --

A Jack, you had your hand up here.

Q I was just going to -- there was a similar question, Governor. I was going to ask what you proposed as a compromise, if you proposed anything, or did you sit as a referee?

A Oh, it was a pretty general discussion there and I participated in the discussion. There were actually several alternatives that confronted us and I think that this was one that probably arrived -- or had greatest happiness for all.

Q Governor, how do you make up this money in the budget?

A This was in the budget. This is in the budget already.

Q What if any safeguards were put in for restricting programs, expansion of programs on the county levels, is this part of the --

A I don't think I quite understand.

Q Well, out of the option plan there are no basic restrictions to prevent counties from expanding their Medi-Cal programs. Does this compromise include some -- some method of restricting the --

A No.

Q -- the expansion?

A The compromise for the continuing year, if you call it a compromise -- for the continuing year, we are going to carry on exactly as we did, putting up the money that has been budgeted for the program as has been estimated.

Q Governor, will you veto the present bill if it passes in its present form -- if the Senate passes it in its present form?

A You mean the one of us throwing the burden back on the counties?

Q Yes.

A Well, I am very hopeful that that won't come to be in its present form because I'd have to give a long hard thought to that. I think the big problem here was a kind of a moral one of could you wait this late in the game and then pull the rug out from under -- under the counties. I just don't think it is going to come to that.

Q Senator Howard Way, the Public Senator on the Finance Committee, when that bill was passed, informed it would amount to a bill for over-privileged doctors, in his words. Do you think this is part of the problem, that the doctor's fees have gone sky high in the past?

A No, I think that we have to face that with rising prices in everything there is going to be -- there is going to be an increase in that kind of cost, too. This, too, is a part of the problem that is going to have to be worked out.

Q Is it feasible to try to control the fees which doctors charge?

A Now, this is -- this is something that we will find out when it comes down from the Legislature. This is yet to be resolved, what the -- how the fees are going to be arrived at.

Q Do you anticipate that after the coming fiscal year the counties will have to share in this area of financing that they now are exempt from? I mean after '67-'68.

A Well, again, as I say, I don't know how safe I am. This was -- this was discussed and certainly I haven't -- don't have the financial details because the meetings have continued without me through the day. I do believe that this is very possibly a part of the answer, following this coming year, of a participation that puts the responsibility in the county for controlling the cost. But again I would like to point out

that also inherent in all of this discussion was that the entire problem must be studied during the coming year. So this could bring about changes in anything that was decided for the year after.

Q Governor, is there a possibility that you might approve controls on doctor's fees? Are you open-minded about that?

A I'd rather participate in more discussion first and find out more than I know now about that particular problem.

Q But you wouldn't rule it out at this point?

A I wouldn't rule anything out.

Q Governor, if we are through with that --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Are you through with that?

MR. BEHRENS: All done.

Q In several recent published articles you've been described as a Favorite Son of the West in 1968. I wonder, first of all, if you could tell us if you consider yourself a Favorite Son of the west, and also what does that mean?

A I don't consider myself a Favorite Son of the West, and all of it came out, I suppose, of my provincialism, chauvinism if you will. I have made some statements to the effect that I believe that the growing west, which is still the focal point of a great migration from the east, has not in the past perhaps had a -- a weight in party circles or in national circles comparable to its true importance, and so I've made some statements about hoping that the West would assume a greater responsibility and have a greater voice in policy decisions and commensurate with our growth and our importance to the nation. Now, this is not that I have any -- I'm not advancing myself as a Favorite Son. I'm simply advancing my favorite end of the country, the West, and I think the West should have a great deal more to say than it has.

Q Just one thing, Governor, where does the West



begin?

(Laughter)

A Well -- well, I suppose what I'm talking about actually are the group of about 13 western states out here we normally term the -- for example, the Western Conference of Governors, and so forth. Those are the states I'm thinking of.

Q Doesn't start in Ohio?

A No. As a matter of fact, I was -- being a Midwesterner, I was amazed to come out to find you would call Ohio the east, because back there we always thought it was the midwest.

Q You met with the Governor of Nevada and you are going to meet with the Governor of New Mexico. First of all, why are you making these trips and second of all, are you going to meet with any other governors in the near future?

A I made the trip to meet Governor Laxalt because of the Tahoe problem, and my meeting with the Governor of New Mexico was because that the -- invitation of my fellow regents, they were quite insistent that in these first few months here that this meeting that is scheduled over at Los Alamos and the atomic project that is connected with the University, that I should have a first-hand look at that, and that's why I'm going to New Mexico. And the meeting of the Governor will just simply be in the nature of a courtesy. Then we would both be in the same place, but I'm going there in connection as a Regent of the University.

Q Will there be any other meetings with any other western Governors in the near future?

A Not that I know of, prior to the regular meeting of Western Governors later in the year.

Q Governor, last week-end, you said that you felt the Governors when they get to the Republican National Convention should at least talk to each other or have talked to each other. Did you mean when you said



that, that you felt there ought to be some preconvention formal agreement between the Governors among the Governors for specific issues that you can present a solid front and if you did mean that, would you consider the possibility of yourself heading that sort of informal arrangement?

A           No, and there are some Governors who have -- whether this is a correct assessment or not, there are some Governors who have spoken about the coming conventions as if there is a kind of contest, that the Governors should have more of a voice than the Legislatures, say, of their own party, and I don't go along with that. I think that you get to a convention, that we all have the same stake in it. And no, I'm not in favor of particularly getting together of Governors or any agreements in advance at all. The only agreement that I vote for is the 11th commandment.

Q           Do you agree with the thesis that the best way the West could have a voice next year would be to have a man on the ticket itself?

A           No, I don't necessarily think that follows. It is that the West should use its muscle in helping arrive at whatever is the final decision.

Q           Governor, is the consensus in national magazines, in television documentaries, all aimed at you in your career, whether you like it or not, you are a candidate for the Republican nomination -- this does not mean to suggest you are seeking it, whether you like it or not you are, unless you choose to take a Sherman-esck approach to nominate you won't run. Would you prepare yourself in any way in the next two years in the area of foreign politics, that sort of thing, for the convention?

A           No, and I'm not completely sure that this great consensus of writers and so forth, that says this -- I'm not completely sure that they really are meaning that or that maybe some who have, let's say, a less than

friendly approach to me or my philosophy , think that this is a pretty good thing to keep harping on, that it might prove embarrassing to me to continue to bring this issue up. And I think there is as much of that as there may be of any sincere belief on the part of some that I'm a candidate. I'm not a candidate. I'm Governor of California.

Q Governor, you spoke repeatedly of an open GOP nominating convention. Yet the forces for Richard Nixon are busy locking up delegates. Do you look upon that in disfavor?

A I didn't say what I preferred. I said that I'm convinced in my own mind -- I can be as wrong as anybody in the world -- I'm convinced that this will be a convention in which no one will have sewed things up before they get there. Now, I can be -- as I said, proven wrong in the coming year. It is my own assessment of the picture today that the decision will be made at the convention.

Q Do you prefer that delegates keep open mind rather than committing themselves at this date?

A Well, it is -- as a potential delegate myself, I'm going to keep an open mind. I think it is too early.

Q Would you take the Vice-Presidential nomination?

A No.

(Laughter)

Q Governor Laxalt referred to you as a thoroughbred who would be in the race all the way. He certainly is not unfriendly to you. Did you regard this as endorsement of more than that the West should have a voice in the next convention?

A No, standing up there in the beautiful Tahoe basin as a guest of the Governor of Nevada, I just thought that was western hospitality at its best.

(laughter)

Q Yes, I want to ask you, are you through on this project?

VOICE: One more.

Q Governor, earlier you said that you felt that if this feeling, this concensus of writers, that you were a candidate meant they were less than friendly towards you, do you mean that as you personally or towards your philosophy?

A Maybe to my philosophy. I think there is a certain kind of partisanship, whether I'm not speaking now just party lines, but philosophical partisanship which seems bent on continuing to question my statements about not being a candidate, and I think we have to weigh this, that this is to be done, and it can be an embarrassment, and I'm sure there are some that intend that it should be.

Q Governor, if you don't make any preconvention agreements on issues or candidates among these western Governors, how will you go to the convention in any different shape than these same western states have gone to past conventions? I mean, do you say you want them to use their muscle from this end of the country, how do you do this if you don't organize a little bit first?

A Well, no, I think that when you say any agreements, I think my own philosophy that -- that we realize how early it is and refrain from trading away our muscle or our strength in advance.

Now, this isn't anything I'm going to go out to seek and make an agreement. This is just my own view, what I think would be a good position to take.

Q Is that a Sherman-like statement on the Vice-Presidency, but not a Sherman-like statement on the Presidency?

(Laughter)

A Look, Sherman is the only fellow that ever made a Sherman-like statement, and I figured he played

that part to the hilt and there is no sense in me trying to.

(Laughter.)

Q Governor, you say you are going to Los Alamos to see the atom plant, because you want to get a first-hand look as a Regent. Yet you don't want to visit say, a State Mental hospital or a local clemency or just because you don't feel you are qualified in that field. What is the distinction, are you more of a scientist?

A Well, I think you are trying to compare apples and oranges. Incidentally, speaking of that, I owe the Governor of Pennsylvania a case of oranges. Actually, California comes out the winner. We may have lost the basketball tournament, but we may win a deputy and fan for California oranges.

No, I don't think that they fit the same. I have not been immune to or refrain from looking at institutions of that kind. As a matter of fact, I have been in a number of mental hospitals, not since I've been Governor. This is not a strange picture to me. This -- the thing that we are dealing with is factual information on the part of these institutions, personnel versus patient load, and I might point out that with all of the so-called panic that's being raised by some today that the -- the so-called cutbacks haven't even started yet and yet they are trying to put out wild tales that would imply that already the employees have disappeared and the patients are lacking in care. And I think there has been some fast and loose play with this subject to the detriment of the patients. I think they have been unduly disturbed. I think the employees have been -- their moral has been assailed by those who are simply trying to oppose the implementation of this program.

With regard to the clemency hearings, here again now, maybe it is apples and oranges and prunes. Here's a situation that again, very few Governors have personally

participated in these. They are legal hearings. I am not a lawyer. We have one Governor, my predecessor, who did personally hear them. His two predecessors, one of whom had been a Judge, a good one, they did not personally hear it, and also I'm not doing something that's completely out of line. I'm doing something different than the previous Governor, and somehow I find being different from the previous Governor doesn't upset me at all.

(Laughter.)

Q Governor Knight did preside personally over four or five clemency cases.

A He may have done so, but I have heard that it was not a custom with him. So, maybe -- maybe he did this. Are you saying he did all or that he did --

Q I say four or five prominent cases that I recall.

A There -- I'm sure there could be an instance where he might feel the need to do this and perhaps he having been a Judge did, but I know it was not his general custom.

Q Can you conceive of a case, Governor, where you might hear a case yourself?

A I can conceive of a case in which -- I couldn't give you what would be required to bring that about, but I wouldn't rule out the possibility that our own people might suggest this in some particular case.

Q Governor, on mental health, have you had a chance to read the Commission report on staff and standard?

A No, this is in the hands of our Spencer Williams Department now and I haven't. I'd like to point out with regard to the -- these hearings, this is something that I think we all have to look at. In any area of Government, you can take any department of Government at any time and find that if you pin them down they would say yes, we could use more staff and more money, more power to do things. I'm sure the Highway Department could

tell you that they could double their ability of road making if they had double the crew. This is true of anything. But eventually in the over-all picture, you would have to come to a point in which to do this for one department means taking away from some other important department, and finally you come to a point in which you say whatever the ideal might be, this is the way the pie must be divided because this is all pie there is, and therefore I don't think we should be too misled by statements of people who point out how much more we could do if we had more, if we had more personnel in one department or the other. Because, if you ask those same people, well if this means you must then deny some other State service, what service would you deny, and then you'd be in the same position you are in with regard to this one.

Q Doesn't cutting out the psychiatric technician trainees, as Dr. Lowry has incorporated in his report, in effect cut the pie for future years in this area as well as this one including yourself in which the pie might be larger?

A No, I don't believe so because this so-called training period, and this is a pretty general classification, is not a lengthy thing. It does not go over a great period of time and of course what is involved here is the seniority, and when you are reducing or cutting down some, obviously the newest are the ones that are going to be -- going to be lost.

Q Can we move off this now?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: You are on this subject?

Q Has your staff come to any conclusion on the charge between the staff reporting -- saying that their method for determining level of care is the only method to use, and that your patient -- your present method, the 52 standards of patient-staff ratio is not an accurate or adequate method of determination here?



A           No, let me point out that whatever the ideal might be, in the several years that we have been switching from the institutional care to the -- more of the local care centers there has been this great decline in patient load.    There has not been a comparable decline in employee load.    Now, we are not making this cutback now to put us back to where we were in the ratio at the beginning.    We recognize that we have improved by not cutting employees down as much as the patient load.    We have improved the ratio of employee to patient -- staff-to patient.

          Now, what we are trying to do, though, in this present term is have a cut that is geared to the continuing decline in the patient load so that we will stop at the ratio we had as of January 1st of this year. That if we do not have some cutback, the patient load continues to decline, we are going into an even greater increase and the ratio of staff to patient, we want to hold it at what it has been and what it was as of about January, and we think, granted, that if you know if we could afford to have one employee for every patient, you probably could do a much better job.    Unfortunately, you can't.    We think that this is a ratio that number one puts us out ahead of the rest of the country, keeps us in the position we have been in which has been a very forward position in the care of -- of the mentally retarded, the mentally ill and at the same time again, I say, we have protected by giving to Dr. Lowry the full power to pull the string if at any time we believe this is going to have a harmful effect.    So, I don't know what more we can do.    I believe that we are responsible to the people of California to make this attempt with the safeguard that we have built in, as I say, giving Dr. Lowry this control, so if he determined that the scope method of the California staffing program is a proper one, he could then use that as a basis for



either laying off or not. He would come to us -- come to us and say at present he agrees with what we are -- come to us and say, "I no longer agree."

Q Thank you. Are we off now?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Are we off?

Q One more.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: One more.

Q One of your staff members is quoted as saying that most of the fat has been eliminated by the freeze on hiring. Now, does that mean that there is a possibility that no big cuts will be made on July 1st or June 30th?

A I don't know whether he was speaking about this particular department or not.

Q I think it was Mental Health -- maybe it was mentally retarded.

A Well, actually the mentally retarded, this is one in which I don't think you'll find that there is a comparable cut at all. This program -- you know of course, that at the same time in this whole program there have been on an average of 750 unfilled positions constantly that -- finding personnel for these, so you could have a cut of 750 now on paper that wouldn't change a single thing going on in a hospital. You simply would remove off the list 750 positions that are unfilled, that are normally unfilled throughout the year.

Q Governor, are these 750 positions rotating positions or are they always the same positions? In other words, won't you have some unfilled jobs no matter how many are authorized?

A I honestly couldn't answer that. I haven't gone into which positions those are, but that is roughly about the employment picture of the seeking of employees at any time during the year.

Now, are we off that subject?

Q This is a related question, Governor. On the hiring freeze in general, do you plan to continue indefinitely and fill positions on the basis of emergency? Through Mr. Battaglia?

A No, the whole basis of a hiring freeze is to come down to a position that you finally recognize now as still able to perform the services; no cutback in efficiency of the department, but that you -- the department heads make the judgment that at a certain point; to then go on down below that point would reduce service and efficiency and that's when you stop, at that point.

Q So, would that be determined on an agency -- by agency basis or departmental basis?

A It would have to, because the attrition doesn't take place uniformly over every agency.

Q Governor, do you plan to continue advocating your \$946,000,000 tax program or do you hope to get an enactment of the Veneman or some other program in a modified program?

A I'm going to try for our \$865,000,000 tax program.

(Laughter.)

Q Governor, the Oakland Airport officials have petitioned the Bay Conservation and Development Commission for the right to fill in 875 acres in San Francisco Bay. They repeatedly asked the Commission not to vote on this because it is reported they feel they don't have enough votes. The story now is you are planning to ask Melvin Lane, Morse Erskine, Mrs. Bernice Hubbard May, John Sutter or James Eichler for their resignations and you will replace them. Do you have any such plan?

A This is the first I have heard of that. I don't know. I have never heard of that before.

Q Have you had any discussions with Mr. Luce, Mr. Livermore, Mr. Nora regarding this fill plan?

A No, there may be something of a villain the

State is involved, that awaiting the next cabinet meeting that is to be presented, but so far it hasn't been presented.

Q Generally speaking, how do you feel about the filling of that?

A I was afraid you were going to ask that.

(Laughter)

A This is one of those complicated ones regarding conservation. I don't know the answer. I'm not a scientist or engineer. I do know there is great controversy among the people who -- and all people who are apparently qualified to have answers, and who can't agree on what's happening to the Bay. I know this, that there is risk of the bay. Certainly we should go slow in that regard, because they have changed the character of the Bay a great deal with the fill. I'm not qualified to answer on that. I have done some studying and found myself faced with opposite viewpoints from apparently equally well qualified people.

Q There has been a complaint voiced by the League of Women Voters of the Bay area, Governor, that it is very difficult to meet either you or your staff on this subject. Would you be willing to meet with the League of Ladies on this subject?

A I'm not sure the meeting with the League of Ladies would give me the scientific answer.

(Laughter)

A But I'm not going to back away from any problem that is our responsibility. I assure you of that, and as you know, we have embarked on a -- trying to put together a program that involves treating pollution, air, water and land as one subject, which I think it is. And in that regard, I think we would have an interest in what's going on over there.

Q Governor, Senator Bielsenson's abortion bill comes up to the public hearing this Thursday. I would like to know what your opinion is on the liberalization

of abortion in California and/or the repeal of it.

A I'd rather wait until it comes up for a hearing and I'll hear some of the testimony. We all know what -- not only from an emotional standpoint, this problem is, but here's a problem that has so many facets of consideration -- is not only spiritual, but also legal, that this is going to take -- I'm going to be very interested in all the views and the testimony that is presented.

When I say such facets as legal, when does life begin? What right does the unborn life have? What legal right, and I'm not prepared to answer those now. I have always felt that there is a possibility of some liberalization in this field. I'm not sure that I agree with every part of the present bill, that that would constitute proper liberalization or not, but I'm going to be very interested in the hearings, see what is brought forth in that regard.

Q Would that be in favor of liberalization rather than repeal or consideration of repeal?

A It is not a case of repeal. We are talking about a law on the books now. If you are talking of repeal I suppose you mean you would just be throwing it open with now -- I wouldn't be in favor of just unrestricted license, no.

Q Governor, at the same time what is your feelings about 10 and 11 year old children writing letters in opposition to the abortion bill as directed by their teachers?

A Sometimes I wonder what's going on. I got a packet of letters up there now that's urging me not to sentence the United States to plastic imitation trees in the future, and again --

(Laughter)

I can't believe the kids thought of that one by themselves.

Q You are quoted in the morning paper that the

State agencies have been buying Thunderbirds and Pontiacs with bucket seats in the past. Do you know what State agencies these might have been?

A I understand we found quite a variety of cars that included all of those things on some of the orders when we put the freeze in. I never did ask or inquire as to which agency was particularly guilty or whether it was widespread or not, but these were -- we found -- in other words, we used this as an example of the need that we have for proper economy or the potential for economy, that there is in the more uniform buying, centralized buying on the state level, as well as centralized selling, because as I also pointed out yesterday, we found that there was no State plan for disposing of cars on a mileage or a time basis. As a matter of fact, we have got one that -- over there that is supposed to be assigned to the Governor's residence that we only have to hold onto for a couple of more years and we can sell it as an antique.

Q The auto industry this morning or spokesmen are telling you they are going to have trouble meeting the 1970 standards on engines?

A No, no, they didn't have any trouble at all. They are quite optimistic. We didn't get into any time limits, but I know they were going on to further meetings with regard to more technicalities. I heard it was kind of a general discussion of the areas in which they're moving. They are optimistic. They don't at the moment see the answer to the problem as being another kind of fuel. They believe that the piston engine is going to be here for a long time, but they do believe they are on a course that is going to lead to a vast improvement in this, and one of the things in California that militates against us is our nice temperate climate. You know, the older a car gets the more smog it produces, and unfortunately California has a higher per cent of old cars than any place else, because they don't wear out

as fast without the snow and the cold. To keep up the present weather we can start equipping them with pontoons.

MR. BEHRENS: Anything more fellows?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Thank you.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MAY 2, 1967

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the Capitol press corps for their convenience only. Because of the need to get it to the press as rapidly as possible after the conference, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well. Good morning, and so many bright smiling faces. No announcements, so let's have at it.

Q Governor, why have you denounced the Medi-Cal program as an ill thought out operation, and also accused the Democrats of precipitating this current flop?

A Well, I would have to look at the -- at what stopped it. We had a compromise proposal we worked out to keep this program going for the coming year.

The first part of the question, as to why it was ill thought out legislation, there is no question but when this was put into effect and implemented it was hastily passed even though its legislators were for it, admitted that they didn't have any idea what it was going to cost and just what the ramifications were going to be. They thought the urgency was so great that they rushed ahead with it. Now we find county hospitals throughout the State in many instances only half full. Half of their beds are vacant because of Medi-Cal which made it possible for the medically injured to now go to private hospitals, which they have chosen over and above this. When we took office, millions of dollars piled up in unpaid bills. There were druggists, suppliers and even doctors who were virtually bankrupt because of the backlog of bills that were unpaid by this program. They were as much as two years behind and we have instituted a plan



to get this paid off to alleviate this stress.

Now, there is no question but that Medi-Cal, as I have said, or the Medi-Care program under that clause as has been augmented in a few of the States, could bankrupt the states unless something is done to correct these things. But you don't -- with the program faced with going out of business in the matter of a few days, I didn't feel that it was fair to suddenly pull the rug out from under the people who were now expecting care under this program, receiving care, nursing home care and so forth, and then try hastily to put something together to correct it. That's what's wrong. It was hastily put together.

My idea was that we worked out a compromise and included in our budget the means to carry the program through for the coming year. And during this year there was a complete understanding in my office when we worked out this compromise that we would embark immediately on a bipartisan study as to how for next year we could put the program on a sound basis, and I'm just hard put to explain now how the very people who rushed this through in the face of Republican opposition are now the ones who pulled the rug out from under the program.

And on what I can only -- the only reason that I can possibly see is some kind of a partisan assault that because I was involved on the compromise that this put them in opposition. And the same -- we were trying to take care of the same people that they passed the legislation to take care of. Either they don't care about those people any more or they think they can get along without medical attention.

Q Governor, didn't the compromise change the bill in that it was not allowing the counties to expand beyond the '67 -- or would force the counties to take on more of the costs after the '67-'68 --

A One of the faults of the bill was the freezing of a certain level of expense at the county level, that

from there ... the State had to absorb, and all the increase -- which means the inflationary rise each year in the -- in hospital services, in prices, in salaries and so forth, all of the increase would have -- would have been applied to the State. And it was found -- and this in turn, there was no question this took a responsibility off the counties to try and hold expenses down. So, the compromise was that beginning not this coming year -- this was the hitch, there were people who wanted to -- to cancel this deal out beginning, well, as of now, with the counties and put a cap on to make them more responsible. We compromised by saying that it was too late to do this to the counties who in good faith had expected the arrangement to continue, but that such a cap of 50-50 sharing over and above the present figure would take place the year after next. But, in the meantime, I didn't care very much about that, because in the meantime we were going to spend this year trying to come up with a whole solution to the program.

Q The main obstacle of it was-- was the main obstacle that stopped it in the Assembly that change? In other words, is it your understanding that Unruh wants the bill put back in its original form?

A That, I don't know. I don't know what actually

Q Is he in on the compromise?

A No, this was mainly because this was in the Senate at the time.

Q Was anybody from the Assembly majority in on that compromise?

A I'm trying to recall who all was there now.

MR. BEHRENS: Wasn't--Senator Miller was there.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Senator Miller was there.

Q I say the Assembly majority.

A I can't recall. Senator Veneman was there.

Q Governor, you realize Mr. Duffy also asked for non-concurrence in those amendments. He's certainly on the other side of the fence in the Assembly. He also asked

to take a look at that -- at the entire Medi-Cal program. A week's delay wouldn't make that much difference.

A For Heaven's sake, the program went out of business as of Sunday unless this compromise was approved.

Q Governor, there is another issue that came up in the Senate and that's the fixed fee schedule for doctors. What is your opinion on that? Do you -- are you in favor of a fixed fee schedule?

A Well, am I in favor of a fixed fee schedule? There is an awful lot of the whole concept of this program I'm not in favor of at all. I would frankly -- I would hate to see government impose on the medical profession a fixed fee schedule and yet I can see on the other side if the Government is going to assume this great burden, the government is going to have to have some controls to, as I say, keep from going bankrupt.

But, this is something I would prefer -- and this again is where we try to buy time -- I would prefer to sit down with the medical association and find out what we could achieve cooperatively rather than start imposing orders that set precedents, that could lead to more government control.

Q Governor, the Democrats criticized quite severely in the campaign about your opposition to Medi-Care over the years. Do you think this might be a device to embarrass you in some way and force you to open a position on the Medi-Care program itself?

A Mike you are asking me to read minds. I don't know. I just said that I'm hard put to explain why this action was taken. As you know, I've been away these last few days, and I've had no opportunity to sit down here with Spencer Williams till today and some of our other people and find out all the details and whatever I can find out about this action. My position has always been this, very simply, that no one in this country should be denied medical care because of a lack of funds, and I still hold with that.

We have gotten into trouble in this whole area because of the philosophical objection on the part of the leadership in Washington to the idea of anyone having to state whether he could or could not afford his own medical care, and their way around that was to try and wipe out this need qualification and just apply medical care on a basis that I feel leads eventually toward nationalized health service. And this has been unsuccessful in most of the world where it's been tried. It is a curious thing that in almost every country that has turned to a nationalized health service, the figure roughly runs about the cost -- is five times what the original estimate was on which the program was adopted. And I just don't believe that this country with its great know-how and with the finest medical care than any place in the world could start experimenting with falling in line with other countries that have not been able to -- that I think we can work out our problems to take care of the medically indigent, without imposing this on people who don't need it.

Q Governor, given the Federal Medi-Care program, do you think California would be better off without a Medi-Cal program?

A It was Medi-Cal, it was implementing under -- I'm bad on phone numbers here -- was it Clause 19 or --

VOICE: Title 19.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Title 19.

A (Continuing) There have only been several states who rushed into this without really waiting to find out how it was going to work and in every instance the states are having the same problems that we are having. And this is the one where you'll remember the Federal Government estimated a certain number of hundreds of millions of dollars that they believed it would cost the Federal Government if all of the states took action under 19. And when New York suggested its plan, its plan would have cost the Federal Government for New York alone about

double what the Federal Government had thought it would cost for all the 50 states.

Now, the program here in California is up around nine hundred some million dollars a year, But, as I say, there is something wrong with the program that leaves our county hospitals half vacant.

Now, with us talking of the shortage of hospital space and hospital beds and suddenly you've got a county hospital in -- down in Los Angeles standing there with a great vacancy, we have done something in that bill that's wrong. That hospital should be filled before we started invading the other hospitals that are up to capacity already.

Q Well, what are you going to do in view of that to hold the cost at the current level in the year '68-'69? What are you going to suggest during the study?

A Well, no, we are talking about the '67-'68 year and then in case the study didn't resolve in any change for our protection the compromise was we put in a 50-50 sharing over and above the figure with the counties, beginning with the '68-'69 year. But, it was our understanding and our hope that long before that time we would have come up with a plan -- a plan that would answer all of our objections. But, if no such plan was forthcoming we at least had put into production the counties were responsible for the 50 per cent of any increase which we thought would give them more responsibility then in holding down costs.

Q You say the program went out of business. Are there any bills now that are not being paid or that will not be paid if the bill is on your desk?

A Spencer Williams had told us of certain plans that he had to try and minimize the effects of this, that he could work and the machinery in his department, and I -- as I say, I've just gotten back and I haven't had time to sit down with him and find out now what we are



doing until we get something passed here.

Q Governor, would you veto a bill that had a schedule -- fixed schedule for doctors and hospitals in it?

A Oh, no, I'm not going to commit myself on a bill of that kind. I have to wait to see what -- what came in.

Q Are we through with Medi-Cal now?

A No.

Q On this doctor fee, the fixed doctor fee, I'm not clear on your answer. You said you opposed it but it might be necessary. Does this mean that this might be a necessary evil in the program, the fixing of doctor fees?

A As I said, I could see some -- there is some room for argument here. Philosophically I'm opposed to this invasion of this field. On the other hand, I have to -- I have to admit that the Government is going to get into this as largely as we got into the -- there are certain areas where finally you are just forced to protect the taxpayer and the government as to what they are going to do, but I would rather see if we couldn't work out such a -- a scale on a cooperative basis, a voluntary basis rather than having it imposed, because I just feel every time we impose by law in some of these areas, an area of so-called price fixing and so forth, we set precedents that I don't think are in harmony with the free enterprise system.

Q Governor, when the Medi-Cal bill was approved by the State Senate in '65 it was passed by a vote of 29 to 5. Now, do you think there is any chance that this study you are talking about would roll back or repeal any major sections of Medi-Cal -- of the Medi-Cal Bill?

A Well, I think from the conversations I've had around with legislators on both sides of this issue, there is a pretty general agreement now that we have -- that we put into effect the package that had a lot of short-

comings, and everyone, even the proponents of this measure, know that we have to correct some of these shortcomings. The one -- the very one that I mentioned here, the red tape with regard to paying bills, the vacancies in the county hospitals and so forth. So, I -- I feel there is a very sincere effort on the part of everyone concerned to study this and find out how we can make it workable.

Q But you do intend to keep it going? I mean what you are talking about now wouldn't do away with the program in any --

A Oh, Heavens, I'm not -- I'm the fellow that worked out the compromise or in part, in my office to keep it going for the coming year. I just don't think you can create something of this kind and then pull the rug out from everyone that's geared up to use it.

Q Governor, in the debate on the Senate floor the matter of the empty county hospitals was brought up, but in the final showdown it was narrowed down to one hospital in Los Angeles County. Are there other hospitals that have a lot of empty beds?

A I wasn't here for the debate and as I say, I haven't gotten all of the facts and figures on this. The indication that I had in the office, it is true that the Los Angeles was used as an example, but it was my understanding that this was a problem throughout the State.

Q Governor, you used the word "bankrupt" a few minutes ago. You said this could bankrupt the states, the implementation of Title 19. Now, isn't it true however that apart from the argument as to the split of state and county responsibility for a certain category of patients, that the expenditures have been running just about in line with the appropriations for the Federally aided part of the program?

A No, as a matter of fact, if you'll recall, this was one of the things that through our attempt, the



economy is ~~iff~~-balanced when we discovered a short time ago that we had to come up with \$99,000,000 to augment this program, both for last year, this year and the coming year, that we had not counted on; that they had underestimated the expense of the program. Now, are we -- now can we move --

Q All right, fine. Yesterday the Controller Flournoy said he's opposed to any outright appeal of the Rumford Act. Is this an indication which direction your administration is going to go on this issue?

A No, I'm waiting to see what -- what comes down to the desk. I know that the -- there have been some amendments proposed. Now, whether they have been taken up yet or not, I'm familiar with certain amendments or have been told to, certain amendments that they are looking to the Burns Bill to add to this bill. And I'm watching this. I want to see what-- what happens with it, and -- and this would repeal the features that I think the people voted against in the state. But they are -- it would also add other amendments to the bill, and I would -- I'm waiting for that one. I'd rather not get in now with specifics until I see what's going to come downstairs.

Q Are you saying some of Bagley's amendments may be worked into the Burns bill? Single-family dwellings and single-family --

A I can't -- I can't -- as I try to recall now, the one meeting we had on this, I can't recall whether -- I think some of the amendments would be similar to some of the provisions of his bill.

Q How do you feel about any extension of the State's abortion laws?

A This is one I'll wait to see what happens upstairs in the Legislature. I've -- as I told you last week, I can't tell you I have a hard and fast opinion here. I think there are some -- there are some liberalization that is not only acceptable but would be proper. I

think there are limits beyond which you can't go.

This is the toughest one of all.

Q Would you prefer -- would you prefer that you never had to make that choice?

A Well, it would be awfully easy to run for cover and say that, but it is a problem obviously with as much emotion and as much feeling as there is on both sides about it. It is a problem that's got to be solved and be faced by someone at some time, so I would hope with the utmost of statesmanship upstairs they would arrive at something that would be the proper answer.

Q Governor, there is a proposal now that regarding the Mineral King resort area that the road the State has been asked to build be made into a toll road. How do you feel about the toll road concept for California?

A Well, I only know that I -- I just saw this -- this had been mentioned in the paper. This is one I'd like to look at. I think there are all sorts of ramifications that -- where do you stop once you start? On the other hand, there certainly was an element of common sense in the proposal that this would focus the charge more on those who would be getting the most benefit from the road.

I'd -- I'd rather -- I'd rather put in some study on this first, what outweighs what.

Q Are you familiar with the terms of the Beilenson Abortion Bill, Governor, the details of it?

A Yes.

Q Does that generally fit your thought of what an abortion -- how the abortion laws in California should be changed?

A Now I would -- in the state of the bill right now I would rather not get into a discussion of my own views in some of it. Let me say that I think it contains some of both of what I said, some features there that are within the realm of the corrections that should be

made, but I also think there are some dangers there of opening this up beyond the point of necessity.

Q Is there any possibility of a residency requirement in an abortion bill? Would you favor something like that so California wouldn't be "An abortion center.?"

A I never even thought about that.

Q Have you seen any evidence presented by the attorneys for this man who is to die next week, thinking of a reprieve for him?

A We will have a statement a couple of days on this. We are continuing -- we have resolved a number of points that were at question, but there are still more to be done.

Q Governor, last week Dr. Lowry came out for cuts on mental hospitals as of the level of January 1st and two days later he was overruled by Spencer Williams. How does this fit in with your remarks that Dr. Lowry has the last say?

A No, I tell you there was a mistake there and I was as guilty as Dr. Lowry. I was making a mistake. I thought the date the ratio of employees to -- or staff to a patient had been set as of January, and I found out that I was wrong, that it was set as of the beginning of the fiscal year, and it makes a difference in a certain number of employees. And it was -- it was just actually the mistake and as I say, I was guilty of it, also. The mistake was that we were told that this ratio had been based in the beginning of the year, and I simply accepted January as the beginning of the year, and it was meant to be the beginning of the fiscal year.

Q Who made that decision, Dr. Lowry or Mr. Williams?

A It is my understanding that this was the plan as for the ratio and for the cutbacks that had been decided upon, and it was just somebody went out of there with a mistake. Now, if Dr. Lowry, in addition to the

mistake is slightly concerned that the ratio has been set wrong in that period, then it is simply a case of we will sit down and study it again.

Q Governor, do you consider July 1st of last year to be current levels?

A It is my understanding that this is where we will set the level. There's been -- up until that point had been the 40 per cent decline in patients matched only by a 14 per cent decline in staff, and that at the beginning of that year the ratio was going to be then maintained on the basis of this continuing decline, and the staff reduced to that level.

Q But the ratio is more staffed now than it was last July 1st. Is rolling back to July 1st maintaining current level?

A No, and there would be more staff next month if we don't start cutting back and the next month ahead. We had to pick a point at which they believed the staff was adequate, the ratio was adequate, and it was set, I had thought, as I said, for January, but it was set for the beginning of this fiscal year, that that ratio was picked and that's why attrition alone wouldn't take care of it, why there is going to be an additional rollback.

Q The Legislature --

A Wait a minute, I --

Q Well, if they want to clean up on this, it might skip the subject.

Q The Legislature should decide on the January 1st date, and there's been indications the Assembly Committee feels that way, would you accept those additional jobs in the budget?

A If the Assembly would tell us we are going to get the sum of \$5,000,000 that this would necessitate.

Q Governor, you said the date level had been set-- apparently was July 1st. Then -- but your assumption was it was January 1st. Then apparently it wasn't set

by you; but by whom was it set?

A This was the result of the conferences that were held with the -- in the department for correcting this situation, and I just simply -- my mistake was based on when they said at the beginning of the year, to me I guess I haven't gotten used to fiscal years yet -- the beginning of the year to me was January 1st. Evidently it was to Dr. Lowry, too.

Q Who, other than yourself, sets those standards, though? Isn't it actually, ultimately, your decision as to which reference would be used?

A Yes, but I don't sit in of this kind -- of a working out of the details that took place in the Department of Health and Welfare, and with the staffs of the hospitals.

Q But it is now at the point where you either take a point that -- of a certain staff level or 800 fewer, which would be July 1st level. And isn't that your personal decision to make now?

A You are nit-picking.

Q Well, 800 --

A A group of people who are familiar with the field and who are responsible for conducting the affairs of the hospital sat down and worked out what they thought was a workable ratio of staff to patients. And in an area, in a situation where the patients are continuing to decline in numbers, and they worked it out and they set it as of July 1st, the beginning of this fiscal year.

Q My only question is if it wasn't yourself and if it wasn't Dr. Lowry and it wasn't Mr. Williams, who was it?

A It was all of them combined. Now, they come to me and I have before me the figures and the ratio, what the ratio of staff to patients will be, and what it has been, what it puts us in comparison with other states. And, with the assurance that this ratio will work. Now,

I went by numbers, not by a date. I didn't set there and say what was it July 1st; what was it -- they told me that this is -- these are the figures. Now, the decision was made. Now, I can only speak for myself, that I walked out of there thinking that the ratio -- those numbers were the numbers as of January 1st instead of July 1st -- doesn't change the numbers at all, just changes the time as to when it was effective.

Q Governor, weren't there Department of Finance people sitting in on those meetings?

A That's right, yes.

Q On another subject, Governor. What was your reaction on Chief Justice Warren's remarks on University of California's campus at Berkeley?

A He's got his right to express himself and I've got my right to disagree with him, and I disagree.

Q Governor, the National Republican leadership is making stronger statements about the fact that the Vietnam War is going to be an issue in '68. Would you give us your comments about Republican alternatives to the Johnson policies and also would you comment on a statement that George Wallace made last week that anyone who protests our direct involvement there is guilty of treason?

A Well, I don't like to make charges of this extreme nature, and I didn't hear his charge, and what he based it on. I can only answer for myself, not the Republican Party, and I have insisted for a long time that our goal should be to win and I think you win as swiftly as possible, that attrition over the long period of time will cost more in lives than a sudden strike for victory. And I -- I think that there is every evidence that in Washington today the -- the policy is coming around to the same policy that they deplored and that they made extremist charges about when it was advised over the past several months, and even back as much as two years ago. I think that they are doing everything



that a lot of other people suggested they should do. Now, they are doing it and I can't help but wonder how much tragedy would have been averted if we'd have taken this course earlier; how many men might still be alive.

Q Governor, do you agree with the GOP Senate policy committee that accuses President Johnson of assuming an enormous discretionary powers in the Vietnamese war, and asks for Congressional approval only after he's acted?

A Well, of course now we get into the argument, and we have opinions. But until you know all of the facts that happened and have been made available, you are sort of moving in the dark, you get into the question of we granted the President the right to commit forces in -- on emergency basis. We sort of police actions throughout the world. But beginning with Korea, suddenly this -- I'm sure that the spirit in which this power was given to the President was based on a more limited action. But we now -- we now approach full scale war and we never bother to go back to Congress and get the implementation of this. We still do it within this discretionary power that was given to the President and I think that this is a question that we have to face. Is there a ceiling? How far is limited emergency? How much is police action? And when does it become war? And maybe some of the ills besetting us would disappear if the representatives of the people were given the necessary information so they could make a decision. There could very well be something that is to our benefit in not actually calling this war. But if so, then I think the representatives of the people should know it, and they should have a right to weigh the merits against the demerits of such a situation.

Q Have we gone beyond that point now, you think?

A Well, I think you have to call this a full-scale war.



Q Governor, do you think Congress should declare war?

A This is, as I say -- is in the area that we don't know all the facts. There may very well be a situation existing that someone has an understanding that it is to our advantage not to make a declared war. Until we know those facts, we actually can't -- can't criticize. The criticism is shouldn't the representatives of the people have those facts so they can aid in making the decision.

Q Governor, on another subject, if we are through with that one. Are we?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Are we through?

Q I was going to ask how do we get that information?

A Well, maybe we go back -- maybe we go back to the Constitutional principle that began this country, that the people have a right to know. If appointees of the Executive branch have the information and they keep it to themselves, and do not involve the Legislators, isn't that contrary to what we have always believed about no secret covenants -- secrets be arrived at?

Q Governor, concerning your economy move back here, I wonder if you are buying your clothes with an eye toward the resale value, and the reason I ask this -- it may seem puzzling, but in the Want-Ad of the newspaper this week-end: "Governor Pat Brown's personal sportcoat, size 43 regular, a beaut. \$25." Underneath it they are selling 40 \$20 U.S. gold pieces for \$51. Does this mean anything to you?

(Laughter)

A It means that the Governor has finally gotten himself into the same thing that used to happen and does happen, I guess, in our own business down there. There are any number of ways the people in the theatrical business have disposing of wardrobe; some by way of charity sales and some of it by direct sale, and there is no

question but that some people grab these off and sell them for -- or try to sell them for more than the value of the coat just on the basis of who wore it.

MR. BEHRENS: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MAY 9, 1967

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the Capitol press corps for their convenience only. Because of the need to get it to the press as rapidly as possible after the conference, no corrections are made and there is no guarantee of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Ladies and Gentlemen, the Coro Foundation, we have 12 students from Public Affairs from Los Angeles and San Francisco here. Welcome, visitors of the Press Conference and that's the only prepared statement we have.

Q Governor, in one of the morning papers your cabinet Secretary, Bill Clark, is quoted as saying that you have three cabinet meetings a week and that you take up ten to twelve issues at each meeting and this briefed down on one page an issue and that you make eight to twelve decisions at each one of these meetings. That's about three minutes a decision. Now, isn't that rather hasty?

A No, we allow all the time that's necessary to make one and it doesn't -- I read that article also this morning, and it doesn't necessarily follow that this is the first time that I've ever heard of any of these issues. These are things that we know are in the mill, things that are being taken up by one or more of the cabinet, one of the directors and his people, and then finally with all of this and with his background information it comes for settlement and is done in the memorandum form and it is very easy to either say yes or no on the basis of the recommendations, or to say hold it over to something else I want to know.

Q Governor, there is word going around in the

Capitol that word has come up from your staff to the Senate that you do not want to see the abortion bill on your desk, you'd rather avoid signing it. Would you comment on that, sir?

A Well, the only comment I can make is pretty much what I've said here on a number of other occasions with regard to this. I have expressed myself as to those parts of the bill that I'm still very question -- have great question about, think that they could open loopholes. There are parts of the bill that I certainly can subscribe to; as I say, I have expressed myself on those. This subject hasn't gotten any easier as far as I'm concerned. I told you a week or two ago that I was waiting for the hearing because I still -- I had doubts in my mind, had problems to be resolved. The hearing didn't do that for me. As I say, there are parts I can agree with, parts I disagree with and parts on which I just -- I don't know whether anyone has the answer to them. I think there are legal questions that have not been resolved as yet.

Q Governor, specifically what parts do you oppose?

A Well, I think there are loopholes opened up with regard to the statutory rape provisions. I think there are -- there is a very great question to me as to where we can actually stand with trying to judge in advance of a birth that someone is going to be born a cripple, and whether we have the right to decide before birth what cripple should not be allowed to live. We have had some great contributions made to mankind by people who have been in the technical sense crippled, and I don't know, would anyone here advocate that we should after they are born make a choice and line up which cripple should be destroyed and which should be saved?

Q On the basis of this thinking, sir, will you then tend to veto the bill should it get to your desk?

A I'm still waiting. The bill hasn't come down and the bill is seemingly up there undergoing a great deal of debate and I'm not going to make a comment until I see

what the bill is.

Q Governor, did you schedule any conferences with the leadership from either house on that particular bill as to its future? Have you talked to anyone in the Senate about possibly -- its possibility of being moved out?

A I've expressed to legislators and others my -- the same feelings I've just spoken here.

Q Governor --

A Well --

Q Do you have -- what parts of the bill do you subscribe to then?

A Well, now certainly the protection of the mother, the health, the life of the mother, and very frankly I -- I think there is a justice in not forcing someone who's been the victim of a forcible rape or incest to go through with this.

Q Governor, do you want to leave the inference then you are more or less opposed to this bill?

A No, I'm trying not to. I'm trying to say that I'm -- I'm still, and I've continued to study not just this, but all that I can find on this subject, Squire, and I'm just -- this is not in my mind a clear cut issue and I -- I just can't give you a decision.

Q Have any of your people passed the word up above that you'd just as soon not have it. That's the question somebody asked over there.

A Well, I don't know, if that's what they inferred from things that I've said.

Q Governor, would you like to see some sort of abortion bill passed in this session?

A I've expressed myself before as believing that there are certain changes in the abortion laws that now stand that could be made. Now, I can't go any farther than that.

Q Governor, have you been contacted on this bill

by Spencer Roberts who has been hired by the Catholic Church to oppose the bill?

A No, I have not had one word from him about this.

Q Governor, has Senator Beilenson asked for a conference with you to discuss the bill?

A Now wait a minute, I'm not stalling here. I'm trying to remember. I'm trying to remember whether or not I'd heard that he wanted to see me or whether I was asked did I want to see him. I'm certainly very willing to see him.

Q Has a meeting been scheduled with him?

A Not that I know of, yet.

Q Governor, has the action on the question of abortion in other state legislatures had any effect on your thinking, such as the Colorado Bill?

A Well, I must say, whether you call this backing away or not, it seems to me with Colorado putting in effect almost an identical bill, it was a great opportunity for the rest of us to take a look at a laboratory example after a while and see how it worked.

Q Have we finished the abortion matter?

VOICES? No.

Q Would you like to see the matter placed on an initiative basis before the people next year?

A Well, I'd rather not answer that until I see what goes on with the legislation that's now before us.

Q Going back to the Colorado question again, Governor, would you like to see perhaps -- wait a year to see what happens in Colorado and then perhaps act on the next year?

A I didn't set any time on this. As I say, it is a great temptation to -- as I say, here is a laboratory example that maybe could resolve some of the questions that we have as to what might happen with this bill.

Q Governor, the North Carolina bill has a residency requirement. Is this something you would like to see

in a bill California might have?

A I've never given that any thought. I don't understand -- I'd not wanted to create a kind of an attraction in the state for this sort of thing, but I'd never thought about that.

Q You speak of the protection of the mother. Do you include the mental health as well as the physical health or do you confine yourself to the physical? Speaking of mental --

A I think you have to consider all of that, both.

Q I'm a little puzzled on one thing, Governor. Now, we have heard from some members of the Senate that some of the colleagues have been told that your office would prefer not to have this bill passed, and I think that was what we were trying to ascertain. To your knowledge has anyone from your office told anyone in the Senate that you or your office would prefer not to have the bill passed?

A Well, I think my people have told them up there that I would prefer more knowledge than we seem to have on this bill as yet, and they have been told also that there are provisions in that bill that -- that I can't find myself in agreement with.

Q Governor, have we finished the abortion?

VOICE: Wait a minute.

Q Have you had a direction, communication from the Catholic Church about this bill yet? Any representation of the Catholic Church?

A No, I haven't.

Q Would you consider your statements today as sort of a notice to the Senate that you'd rather wait a while?

A Well, if they want to take it that way, I tell you, I don't think I've said anything here that isn't on the mind of just about everybody upstairs, too. I don't know of anything that's come along that is so sincerely --



or has so many people sincerely concerned on both sides of this issue. It is -- it is a very profound and a very deep issue.

Q Governor, a week has elapsed since the Black Nationalist -- Black Panthers invaded the State Capitol. Do you think the state law that permits such behavior is absurd and should be repealed or revised?

A Well, now -- I don't know just what you mean about the law that would permit such behavior. I tell you this, I think such behavior is absurd, and I've expressed myself on this. I think they ought to take a look in the mirror at themselves. The idea in a country like ours that grown men and women think they have got to run around playing cowboys with guns on their belts. They come in and try to impress a legislature. If it wasn't so terribly serious, you'd have to laugh at it, but it is terribly serious and --

Q What about the law that allows people to carry armed weapons in the open?

A Well, I have no objection -- as a matter of fact, I think that Assemblyman Mulford's proposal about not carrying a loaded weapon, this would have my support, because I don't know of any sportsman who leaves his home with a gun to go out into the field to hunt or for target shooting who carries that gun loaded. The first thing any real sportsman learns is to carry an empty gun until he gets to the place where he's going to do the shooting. So this would work no hardship on the honest citizen. At least it would be some protection, the fellow had to stop and load the gun before he could pull it.

Q On that same topic, the spokesman for the National Rifle Association has said what we need to stabilize our community is a group of armed civilian posses that would go out during the times of unrest and settle things.

A No, you don't settle anything by the citizens taking the law in their own hand. Let me just further

comment on this thing that happened the other day. I'm not at all sure we didn't have the right to arrest those people on **another charge**. There is a difference between someone carrying legitimately and legally a weapon, and someone that must be construed by the manner in which they came in, as if they came in constituting a threat, and I think there is certainly a question there that if this was not an assault with a deadly weapon. There was a threat implied.

Q Governor, back to the National Rifle Association situation. Do you endorse the concept there that every man ought to have a gun in his own home in order to defend himself and -- or draw a line in a man's own home?

A Well, now I -- I have no -- as I say, I am not in favor of much of the proposed gun legislation. The idea either of registration or further restrictions. I think there are things that can be tightened up with regard to interstate shipment of arms, so that you should have more control of who couldn't buy. I don't think -- you know, people kill people; guns don't kill them. And a very small percentage, actually, of our crimes of violence are committed with a gun. They are committed with other weapons. You can't outlaw the weapons; the wrong fellow has got the weapons. And in my own mind, I like the idea that the law-abiding can have protection in their homes. And I would -- I would be opposed to anything that would make it more difficult for the law-abiding to have that protection.

Q Are we through with that subject?

VOICE: No, one more.

Q Governor, because of the incident -- the Panthers and the Legislature, do you feel you need more security in your office?

A I was surprised to think that anybody thought I didn't have it, because I'm the only one that hasn't got a key, they lock me in. Everybody has got a key around here but me. Maybe I ought to check up and find out what

the political opinion is of some of them that's got these keys. But they have told me that one of these days they are going to get me a key, too, but I don't know. I think we did find out the other day from this that there were shortcomings here in -- with regard to security. And I -- I'm sure ~~the~~ Legislature is pretty concerned about that now, too.

Q One question on that, Governor, the State Police come under General Services, which comes under you. Now, have you talked to General Lolli concerning this or are you doing anything regarding it, either the posture, training or otherwise beefing up of the State Police?

A I haven't talked to him directly, but I have been assured that there is a review going on of the whole security picture, here in the Capitol, because of this.

Q Governor, over the week-end United Republicans of California passed resolutions censuring Senator Thomas Kuchel. This apparently is in defiance of your own position that such groups do not take action against Senator Kuchel, who is the head of the Republican party. What do you think of it?

A As I read it in the paper, the resolutions did not name anyone. They were general resolutions that criticized members of the party and officeholders for not supporting other Republican candidates and no one was named specifically.

Q Do you have any idea who they were aimed at if not Kuchel?

A No, Squire, ever since I read the paper at breakfast this morning, I've been trying to figure out how I could answer that question and not violate the 11th commandment.

Q Who else would they be talking about, Governor?

A You'll have to ask them. They passed the resolutions. I'm not a member.

Q Governor, in some of these programs that you've advoacted and then later perhaps tempered somewhat on, you've been described as a man who charges up the hill

during the daytime and then retreats under cover of darkness. Will you comment on that?

A Yes, I'll comment. I would think that those who make that charge are not actually partisans of mine. And I think there is a certain amount of political fun and games involved in the charge, because frankly I don't know where this has been the case. I don't know of any facts that would bear this out. Now, on a number -- incidentally, I might tell you also that I was informed some time ago when I began to learn that there are no secrets in Sacramento, that this was going to be the nature of a kind of partisan attack on me, and it certainly has been borne out. But, I would like someone to suggest where we have -- you must -- the only evidence of any kind that they perhaps try to hand their hat on with this is the fact that in a number of things that have to do with spending, that you have to base whatever your decision is on projections, on estimates. Projections of what future spending, future costs, future revenues are going to be and as times goes on you discover that you have more evidence to go on and some of your projected figures have to be changed. And the other day I pointed out that the budget bureau for 15 years here -- and this is certainly non-partisan, the professional Budget Bureau has been able in December to make a projection on proposed revenues that comes -- averages within three and a half per cent of being correct. But, by May, the Budget Bureau can then upgrade their estimates based on five or six months actual practice and they reduce their three and a half percent error to seven-tenths of one per cent error, just with the additional information and knowledge.

Now, the same thing applies to us, and we get additional figures. Just as at one time we estimated what the problem -- the budget problem would be, with no knowledge that we were going to be handed a \$99,000,000 jolt from Medi-Cal. Those figures were not available

before. When they came along, it changed our figures by \$99,000,000. I don't think it is backing down to have to admit that you've just been handed another \$99,000,000 expenditure that couldn't have been foreseen.

Q Governor, in a speech here Saturday night, former Governor Brown said that the great shortage of your administration was a lack of compassion for the people in your programs. Would you comment on that for us?

A Well, I don't know, in commenting on what my predecessor has to say about me -- sometimes I'm inclined to think that power corrupts, and the loss of power corrupts absolutely.

Q What's that mean, Governor?

(Laughter.)

A You want me to write an explanation out? I just don't think that the charge is warranted or justified.

Q Governor, Mr. Post in an analysis of your latest budget figure says the attempt of the Department of Finance to avoid the withholding is an attempt to patch up a cash flow structure which needs drastic overhaul. Would you comment on that?

A Well, I think the whole tax structure needs a drastic overhaul, and I have repeatedly stated that while we have had to raise or increase the present tax structure because of this imminent crisis and the necessity by June 30 for having not only a budget but the program to cover it, that at the same time we are embarked on a tax study, a reformed study of the whole tax structure, and I would think that this would very definitely be a part of that problem. But, I don't think that, too, those who just for some reason or other seem so committed to the idea of income tax withholding, that they try to steer everything around as to a reason to getting it. I don't believe that this just -- that the cash flow shortage or problem justifies the grabbing that off.

Q Governor, the Democrats say that your administra-

tion finding \$60,000,000 or whatever it was, to meet that cash flow program are guilty of the same gimmick, finding us in, that you say Governor Brown is.

Q           You say you kind of turn things around there. They charge there would be a \$63,000,000 cash flow deficit as of next December, and they charge that we -- that we were concealing this fact, and there was no such concealment at all. What happened was our finance people simply explained where the \$63,000,000 could be found in that temporary period to adjust for the cash flow deficit and they said that this had suddenly been invented. We didn't invent it at all, we knew it all the time.

Q           I have a question on another subject.

A           All right.

Q           Since last week, since your discussion here, Governor, of Vietnam, it's been announced that William Westmoreland probably wants a couple more thousand men to raise the total to 600,000. Last week you mentioned that it was your feeling that a sudden or a quick strike for victory would be preferable. Would you more closely define "victory?" What do you mean by that, in a military sense?

A           Yes. I just meant it in the same -- in conformity with what I've been saying for a long time, that I think that -- the way to end a war is to win it, and I don't believe that a country of this size and its comparable power with North Vietnam is turning the full resources of this nation behind the forces now over there to win a victory as quickly as possible.

Q           The pattern we are using now, Governor, by everyone's agreement, is a war of attrition, to kill people, not to take and occupy ground. Winston Churchill and others have warned about trying to do this on Asia mainland. Do you still agree this is the way to go about it?

A           I just know you make the enemy want to come to



the negotiating table because it hurts too much not to. Evidently we are not hurting them and it's just been revealed in the papers now -- I don't know whether it's been confirmed or not, but I was interested to read that there's been apparently a four-month effort in which very quietly and without fanfare we have been avoiding certain targets, hoping that the enemy out of a warmth of spirit would come to the negotiating table. But they didn't do it and I think now with all the score of peace attempts that we have made, I think the time now is maybe to try getting them to the -- to the negotiating table because, as I say, it hurts not to come there.

Q Would you preclude the use of atomic weapons?

A I don't think anybody would cheerfully want to use them, but I have also quoted former President Eisenhower, I agree with him, that the last person in the world that should know we wouldn't use them is the enemy. He should go to bed every night being afraid that we might.

Q Senator Hugh Scott of Pennsylvania, Governor, said that at the end of last week -- that the Republicans can win in '68 on the same subject, by giving the people of America a new face, and by giving the Communists in Vietnam -- in North Vietnam, a new face to deal with, the same as President Eisenhower did with Korea, that then they can tell us they can negotiate with us without losing face. Would you comment on that?

A Yes, I'd comment, I'd hate to think that somebody was hinging a political campaign or election on this country on keeping a war alive just to make it a political issue. I'd like to see the end in 24 hours if it could be done.

Q He said that the Communists feel committed to oppose President Johnson's policy and that Johnson policy is locked in, there is no way they can change it; so the Communists need a new face to negotiate.

A Well --



Q Governor, are these answers based on the fact that you might be candidate for president?

A No, I'm thinking -- I think they are based on things that I've said before here and I don't know how we got off on them -- I haven't declared war on Vietnam here in the State of California, although if the President asked us to, I'd be very happy to comply.

Q Governor --

A No, no, not that I'm any candidate and I'm expressing myself as a citizen here. I don't have a foreign policy -- the state doesn't, but I just -- if I were the -- if I were there and someone had suggested that possibly this could be the means of winning an election in '68, I think I'd step up the war and get it over with before '68.

Q Governor, Senator Alquist has proposed a bill for an open 1968 Presidential primary. What are your views on that proposal? This is for December, the Oregon open primary.

A Here in --

Q California. Hearing will be held May 19th on that bill.

A I'd rather think some more about that. I've always believed in primaries. In other words, I know that Oregon has been doing a lot of soul-searching on its own primary, and whether it likes what it has and it has for sometime now. I'd be inclined to take a long hard look at that before we move.

Q Governor, a fellow Californian has been elected President of the National Federated Republican Women. Have you sent her any congratulatory message?

A I've waited for her to come home -- I know Gladys very well -- because I was going to get her on the phone. I'm going to confirm it with a wire. I think it is proper to do so. We are going to send a wire.

Q What do you expect to accomplish on your trip to the San Joaquin Valley tomorrow?

A I'm going down there to meet not only the local people, the Supervisors, our own water people, to find out and our agricultural people to find out number one, all that we can about the extent of the damage and also what plans can be made in the event that that snow pack starts to melt. We have had an unusual year so far. I wouldn't want us to have an unusually warm spring right now, beginning now because if it does, we are all going to be in trouble.

MR. BEHRENS: Governor, there is a question back here, a man been waiting a long time.

A All right.

Q Governor Reagan, I'm not about to ask you a loaded question, because my -- I'm John Cohan, and I own a couple of television stations on the California coast, Channel 6 and Channel 8, called the Goldcoast Television Network. We have the University of California and Santa Cruz, Cal-Poly, and San Luis Obispo. My question to you is the subject of tuition seems to have died down a bit. Are you more firmly committed than ever to charging tuitions at the various universities in California? Being a taxpayer, I think people from out of state should pay. I would like for you to answer this question.

A Well, no question of it. I have not changed my mind one bit about the desirability of imposing tuition. The universities and colleges for those who can afford it with adequate provision for those upon whom it would work a hardship, that there be scholarship or loan or grant provisions to see that no one is denied an education because of this tuition. I am heartily in favor of it, both from the angle of the aid to the taxpayer and from the angle philosophically that I think it would be a good thing for the young people. I just don't believe there is any such thing as free lunch.

Q Thank you very much.

VOICE: Governor --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Mike first and then --

Q Governor, just briefly, back to the Vietnam

questioning. Under present circumstances, would you consider the war a significant issue in the Senate race next year?

A Senator Kuchel's race? Well, I don't -- this -- whether this is an -- an issue, it will be an issue if the war is still there, there is no question about it, but I just think that anyone has got to realize they shouldn't be planning their strategy now based on this issue with these many months to go. I'm quite sure that the President in his -- in his policy certainly must have considered a moment at which the realization that the enemy isn't going to come to the table by dint of persuasion is then going to consider some alternatives.

Q Governor, to get back to the question of compassion for a moment.

A What?

Q To get back to this compassion question a moment. Some of your critics are saying that in such things as your closing of the Consumer Council and your appointment of -- plan for people to labor positions your appointment of business-type people, that you in effect are a representative of the business community and a friend of big business and against the common people. Would you comment on that?

A Well, I think they were saying that when I was running for the office. I don't think anything has changed and I don't think anything has been done by me to substantiate it. I think that this is kind of normal political dialogue between Republicans and the leadership -- present Democratic leadership. I don't believe that we are lacking in compassion in any way and this is just -- further typifies what I've said in my mind is one of the shortcomings of the so-called Liberal, if I have to use these adjectives, which I don't like to use, and I was a Liberal. I was quite a bleeding-heart Liberal. I think I have some understanding of how they think and how I

thought, and the criticism that I have and many of my friends -- and we discuss this good-naturedly, because they still are my friends, but there's been a tendency with regard to social legislation, that when anyone like myself is opposed to some proposed social legislation, the other side never will meet you on the legitimate argument as to whether that particular legislation is the best way to solve the problem. They only want to argue by charging that you are against the humanitarian goals. Now, I said I am wholeheartedly in support of the humanitarian goals of practically all of the social legislation we have ever had. I am violently opposed to some of the methods we have chosen because they have not brought the good they were supposed to bring. I don't think there is any real good to humanity or compassion in adopting some kind of welfare that perpetuates poverty and puts people for three and four generations of their family onto the public dole instead of getting them off the public dole and out as self-sustaining citizens, and this charge is going to continue to be made. I know, and the only hope that I can have now in this position is to hope that we will try our way and maybe they will see as the end result that we did some good and that we did have compassion after all.

Q Governor, as a former labor official, why did you discontinue the long tradition of naming representative of organized labor to the Director -- as Director of Industrial Relations? It goes back for years that there's always been an organized labor man in that department.

A Well, there are a lot of other things that we are doing a little differently than has been done. I didn't even look at that kind of qualification. I didn't want to feel bound and haven't felt bound by the idea that only one profession or one line of work qualified somebody for a job, because if I had gone along with that kind of thinking, I'd have to disqualify myself. There are a lot of people that didn't think actors should be in politics. I chose a man I thought could do the job.

Q Governor, a lobbyist for National Farm Workers Association and some Mexican-American groups this morning charged that you had refused to meet with representatives of workers who are farm workers who are out of work because of the rains, the automation. Have you ever refused to meet with them and why?

A No, I never have and if this is referring to the delegation that got so much publicity last week coming up here, I have in my possession a letter of apology from the leader of that group who is admitting now that he brought them up here on an overnight bus ride and did not have an appointment, but led them to believe that he did.

MR. BEHRENS: Thank you, Governor.