

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 –
01/23/1968, 01/30/1968, 02/06/1968

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

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

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JANUARY 23, 1968

Reported by:

Beverly D. 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: We have two sets of guests here today. We have 15 foreign student journalists from the World Press Institute, and we have 14 seniors from the University of Redlands. Again, that puts you all on your honor, treat me kindly so that they will get the right idea of journalism.

Q Governor, Speaker Jesse Unruh suggests that you quit bad-mouthing the state, running it down and perhaps stick around and help solve the problems. What is your reaction to this?

A Well, I think that on the whole I've spent considerable time here in the state. As a matter of fact, my record could stand up and compare pretty favorably with a great many others on that -- on the matter of traveling. And as to the poor-mouthing of the state, I don't think I've done that. I've talked about the problems we were facing and as a matter of fact, a great many industrialists have taken great encouragement with regard to California when they have heard the plans we have and the efforts we are making to put the state on a sound fiscal footing. I couldn't poor-mouth California. I think California is the most outstanding state in the union and I think it's got a capacity on the part of its people to do more than almost any other state can do or accomplish.

Q Do you write this all off simply as political criticism?

A I think that is as good a description as any.

Q Governor Reagan, in your decision not to veto the CRLA program, you said that they had substantially complied with your modification requests. In what ways did they comply?

A Well, before the -- we have been since November, our state OEO office has been in consultation not only with Washington but with the regional OEO office on this and before they sent it to us, they had made 8 modifications of the program and then in further consultation they -- there were seven additional either modifications or expansions of those 8 modifications. And they themselves expressed their concern over the way the program has been handled here in the -- in the past year. And they have agreed that they will be keeping a very close watch on it in the coming year as will we, and so these are the changes that have made us agree to the program.

Q Can you give us some examples of those changes?

A Well, I tell you, being in a legal area, I would rather recommend that you go to Ed Meese on this, on these specifics and then there wouldn't be any inaccuracies or need for me to back up next week.

Q James Lorenz had said that nothing had been changed at all and I was just wondering what areas had been changed.

A I think Mr. Meese could explain very definitely that Mr. Lorenz is somewhat in error there.

Q Governor, Mr. Horan, who is the western regional director of OEO said flatly that you approved to grant, provide any of the strings attached that your office required earlier this month.

A Well, check with Mr. Meese and I think you'll find Mr. Horan is not quite accurate on that statement either.

Q Governor, do you think the new suit that's filed by CRLA indicates that they are going to run this thing the way you think it ought to be run or that they are going to in fact bring a lot of landmark cases and sue government during the coming year?

A I don't know. I don't know what suit it is that you refer to. Our action and our criticism was based actually on a number of complaints, a great many complaints that we had received from lawyers, from individuals and from bar associations and this formed the basis for our request for modification.

Q Governor, Assemblywoman March Fong has asked that you reveal all the information on the task force reports. Is there any reason why you are holding back the information on these task force reports?

A Not at all. There are 1800 recommendations and there are voluminous pages and documents concerning their -- the path by which they arrived at these and their findings, and so forth. A great many of these things are simply work sheets and as I have told you, putting this together and putting it in a form that will be practical for you, practical for us to work from, is taking some time. We think that -- I believe the date is early next month that we will be able to make some of this known to you.

Q Would you like to see the Legislators take a look at them now?

A Well, I think they'd do better if they let us put them together and get this all correlated before we do.

Q Governor, on another subject.

SQUIRE: Wait, are you done with this?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Done with that subject?

Q Well, I was wondering in putting this together, are you putting it -- is your staff putting it together or is the task force putting it together? What we are going to see, in other words, are we going to see what the task force recommended or just your version of what they recommended?

A No, you are going to -- we are working in concert with them. Some of their personnel is still involved with ours in putting these reports together. No, there will be no way to -- and no reason for us to have utilized the services of these fine people and then in some way try to

turn around and -- and conceal what it is that they suggested.

Q Governor, there is a report Monday that the -- your administration had agreed to give the University of California only \$270 million dollars, and for that reason some regents decided not to vote for your -- for the fee increase, but to hold off another month and then negotiate with you some more. Have you agreed on that amount?

A No, I read that article also and that was only one of the many inaccuracies in it. The idea that there was some kind of last -- I can't call it last minute, last 48-hour change of regents' feeling was discussed. This is not quite true. The truth was that the report from the committee finally having reached all of the regents, a number of them expressed a desire to have more time to study particularly the suggestionsthat have been made as to the use of the money. And therefore it was a general feeling that this should be put over to allow people more time to study, and as a matter of fact, the vote was unanimous to put it over and that included my own vote.

Q Well, Governor, has your administration decided to give the University of California \$270 million dollars?

A The figure that is -- well, no final figure has been set as yet. I can assure the figure is considerably more than that, that has been discussed that I know of so far.

Q Will it be more than -- will it be the \$311 million dollars that they ask?

A I doubt it will be the \$311 million. I doubt -- in fact, I don't know of any department that can get -- those that asked increases, can get all that they asked.

Q Are you in the budget that you are formulating for U.C., are you figuring in tuition or some other charge to raise money and would this -- if they do not charge this tuition --

A No, this has not been taken into consideration at all.

Q Governor, what's your reaction to Assemblyman Monagan's tuition proposal, fee proposal. I understand from

what he told us last week, your office had -- you personally knew nothing about this before he submitted it. Do you feel that that was --

A That's right, no, that is perfectly proper and I'm very interested in -- it is a very interesting proposal that he's made. We had -- in our own proposal, we had looked at the system that was used at Michigan State, which is similar to this, a graduated scale, and there were some great weaknesses in it at Michigan State. I haven't had time to study -- Bob says that he took this into consideration that they modified based on the Michigan State experience to correct some of the things that were at fault there.

Q Governor, still on the university, I have two questions. The first one general, regarding the 16- year term for the regents, do you consider that a good period of time or too long. Do you think it should be changed and in any event, do you think one 16-year term is enough for anyone and the second question is, you have two terms expiring in March. Do you plan to reappoint them?

VOICE: That's four questions.

A It is a package deal. I know there's been a great deal of discussion about the -- the length of the terms and the 16-year terms. On the other hand I think -- I wouldn't want to be hasty in suggesting any basic changes of the kind that have been proposed by here and there a legislator, not only with regard to length of term, but as to the composition of the regents themselves. When you look at -- you pay off on touchdowns, and you look at the record of the university under this regents system, which is pretty unique to California, this great multiplicity university has been built and I think we should go very slow about making drastic changes. Now, in the 16-year terms, the idea of keeping the university out of politics by having 16-year terms I think is a very sound one. It does bring you to a point however in which you have to do some counting on an individual as a regent and it is kind of a -- seems almost like you are counting the days on them or like an insurance actuary when you stop to think that a man who looks to you

as an excellent choice for a regental appointment today, you have to look ahead 16 years and say, well now, will we still feel the same way. As I say, I would hesitate to make changes. I've made no decision with regard to the -- to appointments that are coming up.

Q Another university question, Governor. One of the items discussed at the regents meeting last week was whether there should be a state campus police force as proposed by the staff of the Senate Judiciary Committee. What is your attitude toward that?

A Well, I think there is some merit in the objections to that of the divided kind of jurisdiction and the taking away of a certain amount of jurisdiction from the individual campus. I've been one who believes in local autonomy. On the other hand, I think there are also -- it is proper that we should be looking at this entire subject, and there are a number of changes that are being reviewed or ideas that would not take all authority away from the local campus. I would question that, and I -- but I think there are some changes that could be made.

Q Governor, would you like to see the Brown Act or the open meeting law applied to the University of California board of regents?

A Well, I think it is applied. As a matter of fact, I was a little amazed the other day in reading protest about this and the suggestion has been made that the very things that we are -- we still left for executive session are the things that are today left to executive session. Number one, real estate problems, possible litigation involving the regents or the university and personnel problems. Well, those today are covered, and I think properly should be covered. I think it would be the height of folly to have to discuss in an open meeting some problem that involved a law suit involving the regents or the university. I think by the same token personnel matters, it would be very embarrassing and unfair to an individual to have to discuss in public the hiring or firing of faculty personnel or administra-

tors of the university. And I didn't see that there was any particular change proposed. The only one that possibly could -- I know what you are thinking, is that some of the committees, that all committee meetings should be out in the open. Well, here again I think this -- perhaps there could be a better determination made, instead of having a blanket rule one way or the other, as to again the decision between executive session of a committee depending on what they are going to talk about.

Q Can you clarify Assemblyman Bagley's charge that the decision not to act on tuition and fees was taken at lunch at a closed luncheon of the board of regents?

A No, it was voted on in the open regents meeting.

Q Was the decision made prior to that vote at lunch as Mr. Bagley contends, as the basis for his proposed constitutional amendment?

A No, no decision -- no decision could have been taken at lunch. There was a discussion over a period of several days. I know there were phone calls among regents and we were all kept informed that there were regents who as I said before, felt they wanted more time. And there is nothing wrong in that, in letting you know so that you don't come there and start banging each other over the head in taking a vote and making one of those supreme court 5-4 decisions on whether you are going to do something. But this was voted -- the motion was made -- was voted in open meetings. It was unanimously carried.

Q Was it discussed prior to that during the luncheon?

A I'm trying to recall what all -- it couldn't have been discussed very much during the luncheon because we were eating in two separate rooms. There was a brief period after the luncheon when -- there was some discussion of agenda and so forth. I don't recall--there was no decision made there. There was a discussion of the fact there was -- we were again told, as I say, we have been told individually that there were regents who wanted more time.

Q Do you feel that the public shouldn't be informed as these committees go through their actions leading up to decisions, such as the tuition proposal?

A I said that I thought that each particular committee session and what it is dealing with could be reviewed as to whether it could be open to the public or whether it came under the terms of what should be executive session.

Q In other words, the average citizen wouldn't be in on the discussion and formation of the tuition proposal until it was actually made public?

A This would depend again on where the discussion took you and what it involved. If it didn't involve any of the things that presently are in executive session, I would see no reason why the public shouldn't be involved.

Q Governor, before the vote was taken, the formal vote, did you know how it was going to come out or was the vote -- when they voted, was that a surprise to you?

A No, as I say, I voted for it myself. We are not enemies there in the board of regents, and I think if all of us feel a need, if there are regents who sincerely need more time, want more time to consider something, it is just the better part of good manners to give them that time.

Q Didn't you tell reporters on the way into the meeting that you felt a delay was in order and rather expected one?

A Yes, because as I say, I'd been informed that there were regents with this concern.

Q Governor, if you feel that the executive session should be limited to those matters that you outline, wouldn't that require a change in the law because the committees are now for the most part, not open, including those things that are not covered under litigation or -- or personnel.

A Well, then that would hold true. I said that I've got an open mind on this. I'd like to hear the arguments both ways from those that have greater experience on the regents.

Q Governor, I read where a young teacher handed you

a subpoena and you were going to find out from your attorney whether it was a valid one or not. Did you find out?

A Oh, well, I wouldn't -- I wouldn't refuse to appear in this matter, whether it was valid or not. But, as a matter of fact, this is being checked out, just out of curiosity and I strongly suspect that it was not a valid serving.

Q Will you appear then tomorrow? Will you appear before the Assessment Appeals Board tomorrow?

A I think actually my attorneys are going to ask the board if they could set a specific time, if this is felt necessary, but to point out to them there is certainly nothing that I can offer in this case that would warrant such a trip.

Q Governor, are you much impressed with the findings in the state poll showing that Californians when given both sides of the issue tend to favor a tax withholding system, 48 to 45 per cent?

A Well, I was very interested to note that they were opposed to the withholding system until they were supposedly given both sides. I'd want a little more assurance that they were actually given all the facts on both sides, and I could mention one in particular they weren't given, and that is the state holding their money and their then having the responsibility to apply for the return of that money. That fact was omitted. I would -- I'd want to make sure that there was a -- a better balance with regard to the case as presented to the people.

Q As a general observation, do you hold to your theory of putting your finger to the fire first before you ever change?

A I'm opposed to it. I'm opposed to withholding, not only principal, but also because I believe it is a -- it is a convenience for the state and not necessarily a benefit to the taxpayer and I think all too often up here in Sacramento, when we discuss tax matters, there is a tendency

to see only our problems, the state's problem, the government's problem, I should say, and to think in terms of solving the government's problem. And I think we ought to give some consideration to the individual's problem.

Q Have you detected any reaction to your proposal on the change of 160 acre limitations? Did you speak about that when you were in Washington last week?

A Just briefly, briefly told our congressional delegation that this was -- this was the -- what we were studying here and this was a recommendation of our -- from our task forces. They were quite interested in it. There wasn't any time to get into that in dept and really pin down a reaction, but they seemed very interested in this. I think it is more practical than to try and overturn the historic limitation completely.

Q Governor, I wonder if you'd give us just your general comments on the climate of policy in the state today in light of the qualifications of the new parties yesterday.

A Well, since both of the new parties had their birth in the -- among democrats and the democratic party, I would think that perhaps they are better able to answer what this might mean. This is their democratic right and certainly there must be a percentage of people who feel that neither one of the two major parties offers them an answer to -- to their own particular problems, so they have gone the route of a third and a fourth party. I doubt that they will ever be more than very much minority parties as we have had in the past, and I would hope that would be true, because I think we have evidences in the world of what happens to a nation when you have splinter parties and no one party with the ability to -- to muster a majority.

Q Governor, isn't it also a concern of the Republican party in that a number of Republicans did defect and -- to the American Independent party openly and publicly?

A Yes, but I know in the recent registration of the two major parties the biggest drop was in the Democratic party, I'm happy to say.

Q Governor, you are reported as softening the state's line on the 4.4 million acre feet water guaranteed in the Colorado River. In fact, it was reported you told Congressman that they should negotiate.

A We have taken a position and are taking a position naturally we want to hold to as much as we can for our state, but we think that we must be in an area now to frankly negotiate to gettle this problem and to bring the Colorado basin states together. Where we can between ourselves solve the one problem that has to be solved, which is augmentation, to continue with states going their separate way and a hard-nosed way with no ability to get together, is pretty ridiculous when what it amounts to is that we have cut up water that isn't there. And the only answer to the problem if all of us are going to get this, you see what hangs over us is the fact that the Secretary of the Interior has reserved for himself the right to make the division once the shortage develops, and the shortage develops the minute some of the other Colorado basin states actually start taking their allotment of water. There isn't that much water in the river. And I would rather have the states involved make the decision between them than to turn this over to the Secretary of the Interior to divide it up.

Q Another subject, Governor.

A Another subject. All right.

Q What is your reaction to criticism from both Republican and Democratic legislators over your appointments to the junior college board?

A Well, now, what's the nature of the criticism?

Senator Q /Alquist said that you broke a state law by not appointing at least 7 members who had some experience in education.

A I think Senator Alquist better count again. We do have seven members with previous junior college experience and all of the people appointed have previous educational experience by way of school board, secondary and otherwise and we would have had eight with junior college experience,

except one that was not available and couldn't accept the appointment.

Q Governor, on another subject, what's your attitude toward changing the state loyalty oath to conform with the recent supreme court decision as proposed by **Assemblyman** Hayes?

A Well, I notice this morning that in the paper I've read at least that it was upheld that our teachers can be required to take an oath upholding both the state and the national constitutions. I'm in favor of that. I've never been able to understand the -- any of the decisions against the loyalty oath. I don't see anything wrong with a citizen pledging his allegiance to his country. We still require it for a man who has to go out and get shot and it would seem to me that everyone else ought to be willing to take the same oath with regard to serving their country.

Q Back to the junior college business, two of the most influential junior college organizations in the State, the California School Board Association and the California Junior College Association claim that you totally ignored their recommendations in choosing your junior college board. Was there any reason for ignoring their recommendations?

A No, and you must understand that any time you are appointing even an individual to a commission or board, the recommendations that come in are in great numbers and they come in from many sources and there are just -- there's no way even if you tried to give at least one representative to each representing group, you'd still wind up with some groups who are left out, so that charge could be made by some groups at any time. And we just do the best we can and try to appoint a board that we believe the individual selected have the qualifications to do the job, taking into consideration geographical distribution and so forth, and this is -- this is all you can do.

Q Well, doesn't this fact kind of cast a shadow over your -- for instance, your judicial appointments, where

you are relying heavily on the recommendations or you say you are relying heavily on the state bar's recommendations?

A No, there is a little difference there. The committees that are appointed are in the area where a judge is to be appointed. They are a local committee and they are made up of three parts, the judiciary and the local bar and the -- just laymen, citizens, and each one of those groups send in their own rating, character, experience, qualifications of the individual, and you have a kind -- it is like having a point system in choosing an all american, you can total up who gets the best recommendation for the judge -- for the judgeship, and you make your decision on that basis. That is a little different than groups from all over the state and individuals sending in their recommendations for who should be on the board, and sometimes a commission would send in -- or a group would send in names all from one area. You can't -- and you only have so many from particular areas of the state.

Q Can you tell us if any of the persons recommended by the junior college associations were nominated by you?

A I wouldn't be able to tell you offhand. I'd have to check back and look that up now.

Q Governor, are you speaking of geographical distribution? Why is it then there is only one person selected from the entire bay area, and that was from Walnut Creek?

A Well, there are a great many areas in the state and a great many junior colleges in the state. You couldn't even have one from each junior college area in the state because the board isn't that big.

Q Governor, back to the state water project for a moment. I gather in the instances that I've seen that this administration is not too interested at this particular time in developing the Eel River project because of the financing problems with the State Water Project. At this moment is this true? Would you like to see the Eel River project delayed for studies and just go ahead with the Oroville

project?

A Are you talking about the Eel River by way of coming through Clear Lake?

Q This is what --

A This was a federal project. This was the Bureau of Reclamation and the proposal that they had been studying for a long time about bringing the Eel River down through Clear Lake to cure that summer problem of -- of pollution. It is a shallow lake. The algae that comes up in the heat of summer --

Q How about source of supply, I'm talking about the Eel River source of supply project.

A Well, this is all involved in that the Eel River was to be routed through this lake. Now, the Bureau of Reclamation determined at the cost that it, number one, wouldn't do the job, it wouldn't have enough of a flow to change the situation in it -- in their lake. It was also a hundred million dollar project. The other projects eventually in further phases of the water program, called for bringing different routes that have been proposed, of tunneling and channeling and bringing the Eel river across to come into the entire statewide water project. To my knowledge, this is still in one of the further phases and always has been of the water program. I don't think there has been any decision one way or the other, any change in that. But it was not a part of the immediate first phase of the water program.

Q Which route do you favor, Governor?

A Why, fellows, you know I had trouble finding the Eel River.

(Laughter)

A I don't really know. On this thing I think it is a -- I'd still like to know for sure that there would be no way to help out this Clear Lake program, if there isn't any way, because they do have a great problem there. And if there was a way to solve it, I'd be all in favor.

Q Governor, can you recall for us your immediate

reaction upon learning that Republican Assemblyman Bill Bagley had labeled a Gipper gap existing in your administration.

A Well, I tell you, I was heartened to learn that Bill is also one of the many who have been inspired by the Gipper. Max Rafferty says his first high school teacher coached all their games after seeing the movie and I just am glad to know that Bill's been able to relax and watch the Late Late show.

Q Governor, would you give us your reaction to legislation by Assemblyman Biddle in effect softening legislation on marijuana and leaving it more control to local judges?

A Well, I haven't seen that actual legislation. I'm aware of it. We are going to study that and study it very closely. There is no question but that we want the laws made more effective with regard to the use of drugs and this goes all the way from the hard drugs to these others. So, whatever is going to be most effective in the control of this, we want that. I haven;t -- I can't give you a comment as to whether I think this legislation does that or not.

Q Do you feel then, Governor, something though should be changed in the law, that since the laws have been gone into further extent that the increase has been much greater?

A Well, I think the great problem, and the problem with this legislation is aiming at, whether it does or not, this we want to make sure -- the great problem is do we have in this one instant of marijuana, a penalty so severe that instead of actual punishment taking place, there is a hesitancy to impose the penalty and thus people go off scot-free in these violations. On the other hand, there is the counter-threat of if you apparently lessen the penalty, are you in a sense lending credence to the idea that the violation of this law is not dangerous to our young people. And you have -- I think we want to be pretty sure in the answer to both of those questions before we take any action because I for one would be very concerned about anything

that leant weight to the argument that violations of the marijuana and the LSD or any of these other laws is not really injurious or terribly injurious to young people because I think it is terribly injurious. I think -- I wish we could find a way to see that the weed never grew.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

Q Just one. Governor, if we can get back to Speaker Unruh for a moment. Do you think his more formal reply or attack now with the TV program almost matching your report to the people signifies that he's a spokesman for the party or that he has his own ambitions or how do you analyze it?

A Well, I watched with baited breath. I thought it was -- I thought it was something in the nature of a campaign speech, and as such if I may quote a statement of Winston Churchill, I thought it contained a certain number of terminological inexactitudes.

Q Governor Reagan, with reference to it being a campaign speech, Assemblyman Monogan has called for equal time by the Republicans. Do you agree that the GOP should be granted equal time?

A Well, I wouldn't make such a request, but obviously it was a partisan speech and this we have avoided in any of the reports that we have made to the people. There has been no basis for asking for equal time to any of our reports to the people on the affairs of the state, and this is -- has been so ruled. But I certainly -- there certainly was ground in this one. I thought it was partisan.

Q Governor, what were some of those inexactitudes?

A I would think in getting into specifics of his particular speech, this should be left to his campaign opponents, whoever they might be, but since I used the term you are entitled to know at least one. I thought to portray the -- the special session of the legislature and its costs of \$400 thousand dollars as being due to Medi-Cal was ignoring the fact that the session was called out of necessity for the purpose of reapportioning the congressional districts and it had to be reapportioned before December 7. Therefore we couldn't wait for the regular session. Two additional things were added to that calendar, Medi-Cal and the necessity for the legislature under the leadership of the Speaker to cure a \$25 million dollar goof that had been made by the legislature in the previous session.

Q Having seen him on television, would you offer him any handy hints as to the techniques he ought to use?

A No, no, we will just wait and see if the series sells.
(Laughter)

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JANUARY 30, 1968

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, C.S.R.

(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: We have visitors again.

Professor Marilyn Blawie and journalism class, Hayward State College. Glad to have you here. I'm always happy to have you here, then it gives me a chance to tell them all to be very kind and nice so you'll learn how to be good journalists.

Q Governor --

SQUIRE: Will you make that --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Wait a minute. I have an announcement. Let's in advance now stay on a subject until it is finished here so that we don't have to keep coming back to it and calling for this, so let's finish a subject and then move on to another one.

Q Governor, how do you justify your philosophy of taking judges out of politics and you take Judge Tom Caldecott out of the Superior Court to serve with you on the executive branch?

A That is almost a statement and not a question. I'll answer the statement. I do justify taking judges out of politics. We have to the best of our ability taken them out of politics with regard to the appointments of judges. I have not appointed Judge Caldecott to any position. Judge Caldecott is on a vacation according to the rules of the Court in which he serves, and Judge Caldecott just as a great many other citizens from other occupations have done, based on his past experience in government, is kindly on his own

Jan
30

time serving as an advisor to me. He occupies no position in this government. He comes and goes on his own time and his advice and consultation I find very valuable, as I have that of other citizens. We checked this out very carefully with the presiding judge of his court. We checked it out with the Attorney General. We made very sure that there would be no infringement of any of the rules or any of the laws concerning judges or conflict of interest, and he is not in any position at all. He simply is voluntarily advising me and I -- as I say, am very happy to have his advice.

Q Governor, on December 4 he was named in the Little Hoover Commission. At that time the Attorney General's opinion, that Jack Fenton declared his appointment to the Little Hoover was to be a violation of the separation of powers. You don't believe his appointment as your advisor is not a violation of the separation of powers?

A He isn't appointed to do anything or appointed as an advisor, and as far as the Little Hoover Commission is concerned, I'd like to point out the Little Hoover Commission is mainly concerned with complete non-partisan approach to investigating government, including the executive branch, to check on government and make recommendations how government can be more efficient. And incidentally he has resigned from the Little Hoover Commission.

Q Governor, do you have any more jobs around where you can come and go at will for \$25,000 a year?

A He's not getting any salary from us. He is -- he is on his own judicial --

Q The \$25,000, the judge, I'm talking about.

A But he's on vacation. He can be in Honolulu on \$25,000 a year.

Q How long does the judge's vacation last?

A I don't know exactly what the term is that's been given to him or whether he has accumulated time or not. But he is on his vacation time.

MR. NOFZIGER: Governor, Ed Meese can answer that.

MR. MEESE: Governor, the rules in courts in Alameda County provide that a judge is entitled to a certain

many days vacation and he can carry that to one year back, so he's utilizing that vacation he has accrued. We are talking in terms of matter of weeks rather than any lengthy period of time.

Q Governor, is his position as advisor judicial, executive or legislative or maybe even a fourth branch, a lobbyist?

A No, he's not a lobbyist at all. He is advising me and a great deal of this comes out of his past experience when he was a legislator himself. I told you and I told the people of this state when I ran for election that I was going to turn to the people of this state and -- for their advise for their knowledge to help in solving the problems of this state and I have done that, by virtue of 274 citizens on taskforces, to additional task forces, to commissions and committees, and to individuals. And I find nothing wrong with a man who's public spirited enough to take his vacation and spent a portion of that vacation here and advising me and allowing me to benefit by his previous experience.

Q Governor, if he's advising you, he was meeting with the legislators the other day discussing rapid transit legislation. Is he involved in the advisement of rapid transit legislation or well -- or just advising you to be advising?

A What he does in visits with old friends in the legislature I wouldn't know, but he certainly has not been lobbying in my behalf, and I know of no evidence that he has been.

Q Governor, after Mr. Caldecott's vacation is over, do you intend to appoint a full-time legislative secretary?

A Well, I have two now, Vern Sturgeon and George Steffes, who replaced Jack Lindsey. We have discussed this. We have thought in the past that we should augment that particular staff. We actually haven't come to any decision one way or the other on that.

Q Governor, another subject.

VOICE: No.

Q I have one more question.

A All right.

Q Governor, where does Mr. Caldecott work? Where is his desk?

A You want to know something? I don't know.

Q Is he in your office, in that complex?

A No, he comes to my office and --

Q Not in your office specifically, but is it in the State Capitol building?

A Let me find out.

MR. NOFZIGER: Sure, he's sitting in Jack Lindsey's old office.

A All right.

Q Does he need State secretarial help to answer his calls?

A I don't think anyone was hired for him.

MR. NOFZIGER: He's using existing help.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Existing help in the office.

Q Governor, in the past, Governors have actually taken judges off the bench and had them work for them and elevated them to higher judgeships. Might there be something in store for Judge Caldecott higher than the present judgeship?

A I wouldn't know about that, because as I have told you before, the only way that judges are appointed by this administration is on the basis of returns that come in from joint committees of laymen, the bar and the judiciary. And all applicants for judicial appointments or even names that are suggested by others for those appointments, are screened by those committees, and we appoint on the basis of the total score, the high rating given by those committees and at the same time we are pressing in this session for legislation that will take the appointment of judges even farther removed by making the joint committees provide the names from which a Governor will have to appoint.

Q Governor, when Judge Caldecott came to work in your office, was it your intention that his work for you would just be a matter of weeks, temporary thing?

A That's right. Yes, we knew we were talking vacation-time, there was nothing other than his willingness to volunteer some help.

Q Governor, can you tell us whether Judge Caldecott is receiving per diem or expenses from the State while he is in this position?

A No, he is not. No.

Q Governor, if you do have Vernon Sturgeon and Mr. Steffes working as your legislative secretaries, why is it necessary to bring Mr. Caldecott in at this time?

A I told you, he was -- he was willing on his vacation time to give me advice and I am willing to admit that after one year here there is still a couple of things that I haven't learned.

Q Can you tell us what kind of advice he gives you?

A What?

Q Can you give us a specific instance of advice that he has given you so we can get a better idea of what his function is, Governor?

A Well, only having just arrived, I haven't got a great deal of experience to go on. But things that I'm concerned about, approaches to things, whether they would require legislation, what form a legislation should take, he participates in that as we round-table this and find out how to approach something.

Q Did you consider having the Judge resign from his position and during this time and perhaps re-appoint him later?

A No, he couldn't. He has been elected and has three more years to serve in this, and you cannot in California -- California resign and accept a job.

Q Governor, do you think that his time in your office, his vacation time, will impair his effectiveness as a judge once he returns to the bench?

A Well, the only thing I can see is that if I yield to temptation one day and hit somebody over the head and find myself in his Court, he'll have to declare himself as biased

and prejudiced, I hope, and won't hear the case.

Q Governor, as a former chairman of the ways and means committee, Judge Caldecott ought to be pretty good on the budget. Now, can I get into the budget discussion that way?

(Laughter)

A About the other hands. All right, Murray.

Q One more question. The Alameda County presiding judge, two days after you appointed Judge Caldecott, put out a call to the judicial council for two extra judges because of the increased work load and the lack of Judge Caldecott during February and March. Were you aware that his use by you in the advisory capacity would create a hardship on the Alameda County Superior Court?

A Nor did we induce him to take his vacation. He was taking his vacation, and as a matter of fact it is my understanding that if it wasn't for the statute of limitations imposed by their own rules, that limits them to only accumulating two years vacation in one, that he really would have several years that he has never taken a vacation, while he has been a judge. And I think he's entitled to one, and the fact that he wants to spend -- I wouldn't spend mine this way. I'd go back to the farm myself.

Q Governor, did your administration seek him out or did he volunteer his services initially?

A Frankly, I was not involved in how this first came about. I certainly wasn't doing any seeking or didn't even know that -- that he would consider -- consider such a thing. Now, how this came about or out of what conversations, I don't know.

Q Governor, whether this gets us into budget or not, is Judge Caldecott going to be advising you specifically on the budget matters? Is that his main purpose in giving you advice, is on this budget this year?

A No, as a matter of fact, the budget is being readied now and in a very few days we will be in on any -- yes, I'll seek his advice on anything where it can be helped. I don't

make unilateral decisions completely in there, and any discussions that will still be forthcoming before the budget is presented, I'll be very happy to call on his experience.

Q In view of all the questions about the services of Judge Caldecott, do you think it is worth it for your administration to have him here with the questions arising?

A Well on the basis of my answers, I think it is worth it, because in spite of the questions, I don't think anything -- I hope that any of you didn't intend that, but I don't think anything here has implied or indicated that there is any wrongdoing in what is going on. A fine and honorable man, interested in the government of his state and has a long record of public service to prove it, has been willing to take a few weeks of vacation time and come in and out of the office on his own time, be of whatever help he can and as I say, there are a great many other citizens have done the same thing with this administration, and I'm going to try to continue keeping that alive. I'm going to continue calling on people of this state because frankly I think the state can use the common-sense thinking of a lot of people who are not a part of government.

Q Change the subject?

A All right.

Q One more question, Governor. You have a written opinion from Attorney General Lynch that says that the Caldecott matter is properly handled?

A We are getting a written opinion, but we have noticed that he has already been quoted by the press stating that there was nothing wrong in what he was doing.

MR. MEESE: We received an informal opinion verbally, based upon a memorandum from us, Governor, and I understand that he has been requested by the legislature to give a formal opinion which he is now in the process of doing.

Q Governor a few days ago you were quoted as saying that you should have given North Korea 24 hours to release the Pueblo and prove we were going to go in and get it.

I wonder if you could clarify for us whether under those circumstances you would anticipate armed resistance to our going in and getting it, and if so, whether this would endanger the lives of the 83, and what we do once we got there.

A Well, first of all, no one wants to endanger the lives of the 83. When you use the term "go in and get it," I don't think this should be taken literally as meaning you are going to go in and put a tow line out and pull it out of there. I think there are a number of procedures that our country could have used. I think that what we are ignoring in this climate of recent years of the greatest good for the greatest number is the moral obligation, the sacred obligation of government to protect any individual, wherever he may be in the world, if his rights are being unjustly imposed upon by someone else. That's the purpose of government, to provide the strength of the collective citizenry to go to the aid of any one of us. And now it is the aid of 83 of us, and I believe -- and I said 24 hours. I'd like to point out that there have been those who can quote to you that a former Prime Minister of England has said that had England moved in that magic 24-hour period some years ago in the Suez, instead of getting entangled with the United Nations and diplomacy there would be no Nasser threat today or no problem in the Middle East. There is a kind of period in there in which a country must react and react immediately.

Now, there are a number of alternatives that would have been open. I don't know that anyone outside of government who doesn't have access to the joint chiefs of staff could make a choice from outside as to what should be the procedure, but there are a number of things that have been since proposed by people with experience in the national government involving blockading of harbors, involving the counter-seizing of their shipping and holding it until ours is returned. But I still say that there is no moral justification for this country standing by and letting what amounts

to an act of piracy, an act of war, be perpetrated upon us and write off 83 young men and hope that maybe some way the other side will soften and give them back.

Q My question was, Governor, that if the ultimatum should be, then you've made the ultimatum we are going to go in and get them, what would you anticipate happening? Would the 83 still be alive for us to rescue? Would you want to bomb the port where the ship sits? Take the city by force? What kind of delivery do you have in mind?

A Again you are asking for specifics that I've just told you I don't think anyone can give who doesn't have access to the advice of the chiefs of staff about such an incident. But, if you are going to be overly concerned -- completely concerned as to whether the enemy is going to retaliate in any way, when they are in truth the criminal, they are guilty, then I'd like to ask what number do we set the limit on. How many of our citizens can be kidnapped by a foreign power before the rest of us decide that they have reached a point in which we have an obligation to do something about it? I don't know what the limit is -- I do know what the limit is in my mind. I think the limit is one. I think any one citizen in the world has the right to the protection of his country as long as he is not doing anything that violates the laws of another country, as long as he is entitled to life and liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Q Can I phrase it just one more time. Then do you think it is possible to get back our 83 men forcibly without a very dire jeopardy of their lives, speaking entirely from the viewpoint of the 83?

A Yes, yes, I do. For example, if we seize their shipping and they must have shipping on the high seas and around the world; I have a hunch that they'd be a little interested if we blockaded their ports, for example. There comes a moment in which it must hurt pretty much to hang on.

Q Do you think, though, when you said not to be taken literally, you were not referring to an armed attack, a

bombing, invasion, did you: You were not considering that?

A No, of course, as I have said before, I said here again you have to have access to more information than any of us can have.

Q Governor, aren't 83 men who are engaged in an intelligent~~er~~ operation, which has considerable risks with it, aren't they a little different say than 83 innocent citizens who were caught in an enemy territory or something? Isn't there quite a little distinction between that and just 83 Americans somewhere?

A Then you'd have to ask yourself, do those 83 men who were regular Navy personnel, one civilian, you'd have to ask yourself whether they were told that they were on a kind of mission in which they were on their own, if apprehended, much as a spy is told. And I doubt that. They were on the high seas. They were in international waters. I don't believe that they were any more subject to that kind of treatment than the personnel that's presently sitting over there on the Enterprise.

Q Governor, do you find the President's conduct thus far in the entire incident bordering on appeasement?

A I think it is a continuation of a policy of appeasement that started a long time ago. I was interested to note the other day that General Clark said that this could go all the way to not allowing this country to win in Korea.

Q Governor, are you suggesting that this country has already abandoned these 83 men, just written them off I think is the term you used a little while ago?

A No, I said that this country has done -- what I protested at first was they passed that period at which the Prime Minister of England said that decisive action must be taken, and a pronouncement made. When we started writing letters and asking others to intervene for us, we had lost what could have been our best method. We are the most powerful nation in the world and I wonder what guarantee any American citizen has from any little fifth rate power if it

is apparent that they can tweak our nose and get away with it.

Q Are you suggesting then that President Johnson has ignored the advice of the joint chiefs of staff in pursuing the course --

A You'd have to ask him. I don't know, I wasn't there.

Q Governor, in your remarks about Korea, are you being critical of General Eisenhower in negotiating a peace in Korea?

A General Eisenhower inherited Korea, as we know. But I'm -- I think that it is a pretty general agreement today that Korea could have been one.

Q Governor, what options do you feel remain open to us now in North Korea? You've used the phrase "would have been open, alternatives that would have been open." What can be done now?

A Well, I don't know. Here again you'd have to have more information than any of us have, but as I say, you have weakened any firm stand that we could make by this waivering action so far.

Q Couldn't we still blockade --

Q If it was shown that the Pueblo was in North Korean waters, would you still feel the same way about it?

A Now you've got to -- you've got to remember that I prefaced every remark I made any time I was asked about this up until this discussion today, and I took it for granted that that was part of the ground rules -- I prefaced it by saying if the facts were as we have been given, that the ship was indeed in international waters.

Q Governor, one of the first steps taken by the White House was the referral to the United Nations for negotiation. Do you approve of that procedure and after the 24-hour period that you referred to had passed, is that a proper step to take?

A I think even if we got the men back and the ship back, it would have been proper for us to refer this to the United Nations. You know, when somebody steals your watch

and you get the watch back, you still charge him with burglary.

Q You think something should have been done prior to that--

A Yes.

Q -- action.

VOICE: Can we change the subject?

VOICE: No, I just wanted to -- I got one more question on this subject.

Q Governor, why is it that you feel it would still be too late to blockade -- to --

A I didn't say it would be too late to blockade. I say I think we passed the point at which -- now we -- again, when you follow more or less appeasing tactics, once again you've now made it necessary for us to be perhaps far stronger in any reaction to compensate for the fact that we have shown a tendency to waiver and be indecisive.

Q Let me put the question another way then, Governor. Do you feel that it would be some benefit to be gained for us in blockading one of the ports of North Korea or capturing one of their ships in retaliation?

A I said both of these have been suggested by a number of people in Washington, a number of legislators in Washington and the Congress have suggested this. And it certainly offers a logical possibility and I'm sure that both of these things still could be done.

Q Could we get back to California for a change?

A I'd like to get back to California for a change because I'm not in command of any naval vessels. We don't have any.

Q Back to California. According to the Field poll today 70 per cent of the registered Republicans would like to have some other choice besides you as Favorite Son for President. How do you respond to that?

A Well, you are referring to this poll that's supposed to indicate that the Republican party doesn't want a single or a favorite son delegation. Well, all I can tell you is if I let myself be guided by the Field Poll, I wouldn't have

(Laughter)

All I know is, if you will recall the day after my election as governor, I announced my belief in an open primary, and it was the leadership of the Republican party that appealed to me against my wishes the other way in the interest of party unity to head up a Favorite Son delegation. And I agreed, convinced by them that this would preserve unity in the party. I only know that the Republican organization, statewide organization unanimously endorsed my being a Favorite Son candidate with a resolution, and I don't know who Mr. Field polled, but I've seen no evidence in any of the volunteer groups or among the Republicans in any of the statewide Republican meetings I've attended that there is anything but endorsement and support for what I'm doing. But again, as I say, this isn't something I chose to do. This is something I agreed to do when it was shown to me that this would preserve the unity of the party.

Q Governor, isn't the unity of the party pretty well shattered by Dr. Rafferty's running against Senator Kuchel?

A No, you can't do away completely with a primary on the -- the idea of primaries. I think it depends on the manner in which the campaign will be conducted. As long as they observe the 11th commandment here within the State, I see the party uniting behind whoever is the victor, whether it is just those two or others in that primary race.

Q Governor, Senator Alquist has re-introduced his bill for an open primary which of course couldn't be effective now until 1972. Would you now support this bill?

A Well, I haven't seen the bill, haven't even given it very much thought. And as I say, I'm a believer in -- under normal circumstances, ordinary circumstances, of allowing the people to choose and choose in open primaries. I think all of us agree and this was the case that was presented to me, that we don't have an ordinary situation or didn't have when this decision was made in California. We have had a great deal of blood letting and party division and the question was, could we break open the wounds again if we repeated the

experience of a few years ago.

Q Governor, there is a --

VOICE: Could we finish that subject?

VOICE: I'm on the same subject.

VOICE: Excuse me.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Same subject.

Q There is a story in the Washington Post a while back that said you deliberately called off your presidential campaign. Could you comment on that in line with the persistent rumors that Mr. Nofziger may be leaving your staff and -- and also in line with reports Mr. Nofziger on your staff was known as one of those who were among the presidential hawks in your party.

(Laughter)

A Well, may I also say that the Washington Post and Mr. Field fall in the same category with regard to guiding my life and activities. Mr. Nofziger isn't leaving my staff.

MR. NOFZIGER: You want me to confirm that?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: And all I can say is that finally I guess the question has been answered enough in enough press conferences and we have written enough letters and called enough people and turned them off and ~~that~~ maybe it is beginning to sink home. I am not a candidate.

Q Governor, that bill that Senator Alquist introduced yesterday was the same bill ^(open primaries) that was before the legislature last year and all the Republican senators voted against it. Based on what you know of the bill last year, would you now be inclined to favor it or not?

A Come on, you are pinning me down. I signed 725 bills last year and vetoed 80 some and you are trying to -- I don't even know what happened to that. Did it ever get to me?

Q No, it never got to you, was killed in the Senate.

A Well, actually I don't pay much attention to them until they got down unless they are mine going in.

Q Governor, apparently it is not beginning to sink

in among Republican leaders that you are not a serious candidate. It is apparently a widespread belief that you are going to campaign in the Republican delegation in the Oregon primary. Has there been any change about your not campaigning?

A No.

Q Governor, there has been some significance attached by some person, including me, to the fact that Richard Nixon has not said definitely that he will not enter the California primary. Do you have any private assurances from the former Vice President that he won't be in the primary as a rival to you?

A No, but the former Vice President hasn't said yet that he's a candidate. So --

Q What he said, he's going to enter if he's a candidate and he's named some specific primaries.

A I think it starts with -- isn't it this week that he's supposed to make the decision and announce whether he is? I'm sure we all know what the answer is going to be. But, no, I've had no private assurances from anyone. I'm just relying on what has been common practice and sort of gentlemen's agreement that in these instances, very seldom does anyone in the party ever go in where a Favorite Son delegation is named.

Q Governor, have you taken any steps to try and insure that the 11th commandment is going to be observed in the Rafferty-Kuchel campaign?

A No, but I'm thinking very seriously of just a kind of pleasant conversation and reminding somebody that it isn't out of style, the 11th commandment is still in the game.

Q Governor, getting back to the subject of the Field poll for a moment, aside from the pressure brought on you by the Republican organization to be a Favorite Son, do you feel that Republicans in this state might have a valid complaint in not being allowed to vote for an honest-to-goodness presidential candidate in the primary?

And that it is possible that the Field poll may be accurate and that there is some dissatisfaction about that?

A Well, I don't know. I can only tell you that what I've done is nothing new or startling. It's been done by governors, Democratic and Republican, for many years back. In fact, it is more traditional to do this than it would be to have the open primary. As I can only say, I've seen no evidence of this. I think if you look at the committee selecting delegates and when the delegates list is announced, I think you will see that we have kept our promise to have a broad-based delegation that covers the complete spectrum of the Republican party and I have heard here and there, as you have heard -- there's been a statement in the press of some -- when some dissident suggesting that he was going to start a delegation in someone's behalf, and that's the last you see or ever hear of it. I've just seen no evidence that Mr. Field's poll is correct.

Q Governor, when do you think your roll as a Favorite Son candidate for president will end, at what point?

A Well, I've only been to one convention in my life, so I'm -- I don't know. I think you sort of have to play this by ear. And at the moment, I haven't -- I haven't speculated or even tried to imagine what the situation will be. I think we will know a lot more when some primaries have taken place and lines seem to be more firmly drawn.

Q Governor, won't it end when you or somebody else gets the Republican nomination?

A You are half right, when someone else gets the Republican nomination.

Q May I change the subject?

A Yes.

Q Governor, in your speech in Las Vegas you referred to the situation where crime in 1930's was one figure and then the 1960's, and you also said that the people were poorer then. Do you liken the rise in crime to an affluent society?

A I was challenging this easy answer that seemed to

be the easy answer of the commission on crime, that the solution to crime was the long-term program of eliminating poverty and distress. And I -- I think that's an oversimplified answer. I think that eliminating poverty and distress is a worthy goal in itself, but I was only using this comparison to indicate that you just can't blame crime on the easy idea that people who don't have anything, who are poor and want more, automatically in large numbers turn to crime and that's why you have a crime wave, because when we didn't have -- when we were poor, when there was real poverty and distress in the depression we had this low crime rate, and now the crime rate is skyrocketing along with what seems to be the most affluent period of our history, which would seem to prove something with regard to whether you can blame these social conditions for crime. And this was the comparison that I was trying to make. I think that -- I believe that we could do far better if we would look also at the attitude we have had toward crime, toward the criminal, the increased difficulty of administering justice, of getting a decision after the law-breaker has been apprehended. I think all of these, this kind of permissive attitude as well as an attitude throughout the -- so much of the world and particularly here in this country that the criminal should be treated as a patient with some kind of social ailment, instead of affixing the responsibility to him for his mis-^(criminal)deeds, that's --

Q They didn't count in the 1930's like they do in the 1960's, the number of crimes.

A Now that may well be. I know that's also a pretty easy answer to hear that one state claims its high crime rate is only because it counts better than some other state. But I also know that back in those depression days if you didn't just go by the ^{statistics} / , you also knew that people in a lot of towns in this country, including the ones where I lived, didn't lock the doors at night and in fact, I can't ever remember knowing there was a key to our house. You knew

that people felt safe to walk down the street to take a stroll in the evening, to walk through a park. I can remember when Central Park in New York, one of the most pleasant things for those of us who visited from the hinterlands, was to get in an open hansom and ride through the park in the evening and then in the last few years you've gone to New York and discovered that if you left the hotel to go down to the corner to get a paper, they send a bellboy with you because it wasn't safe to walk 59th Street alone. Now, these aren't statistics, this just seems to be a common acceptance on the part of the people of the difference in the way we live.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Young lady.

Q Would you comment on Bobby Kennedy and the fact that Speaker Unruh still thinks he's still undecided as to his possible candidacy? Bobby Kennedy.

A Oh.

(Laughter)

A I know the name sounded familiar. No, I commented -- somebody asked a question, that I commented the other day that someone asked -- I can't even recall the question now, but I commented on the fact that the remark had been made by someone who's evidently at least a friend of -- associate, that didn't believe he had made a decision one way or the other as to whether he would be in the presidential race. I myself hadn't had many conversations with Robert Kennedy.

Q Do you think that would be a strong possibility at this point?

A I don't know, but as I say, I was interested to note that someone who apparently is in contact with him actually publicly stated that he didn't think a decision had been made, which was kind of a refutation of the idea that -- that it is cut and dried on the other side and the President will be the nominee.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN ✓

HELD FEBRUARY 6, 1968

Reported by:

Beverly D. 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: We have some guests again today. Professor David Gray has a group of journalism students from Stanford University. Full tuition is paid at all times. Welcome. Glad to have you here. So again I know you'll all be very nice.

Q Governor, you've taken a dim view of the professional politician and you said in your campaign brochure that they have too many of them running and ruining the state and yet you've called in Cap Weinberger and Tom Caldecott who are old pros in Republican circles. I wonder how you justify that.

A Well, I don't think at any time I ever blanket indicted. I said I felt that there was always a time for the common sense thinking of the ordinary citizen to come into government, and I think that is a part inherent in our system that they do this. I think that you also find that you have referred to the seasoning of professional statesmen of those people who have made a career out of government. I've never attempted to downgrade that completely. I have been critical of appointments for example that were made on purely political grounds without regard to the qualifications of the individual taking the appointment.

Now, I would just have to say that this is completely consistent with what I've done, with what I said, because the two gentlemen you mentioned would come under my description or my belief that they are statesmen and professionals

of the kind who have contributed a great deal to our state.

Q Governor, does the absence in your budget of any proposal on state college tuition mean that you are not going to recommend to the legislature they enact that this year?

A No, we are still striving, as I said before, we have always concentrated on the university first where it must be obtained from the Regents, because we know that it would be very difficult to -- and unfair to ask the legislature to impose this on the colleges if the university system had refused it. But you couldn't base a budget on something of this kind if it had not as yet been passed.

Q Last year in your budget you did show a place for income derived from anticipated tuition. This year you don't. Does that mean that you are not going to ask for legislation this year?

A No, I'm in favor of this and as a matter of fact, I had a talk about this the other day. I am convinced that we should have it, both the college and the university level.

Q Governor, if the legislature does not provide you with a legislation you want in Medi-Cal and welfare, how are you going to come up with the \$76 million dollars you need?

A Well, I'm just afraid that a lot of things will have to be trimmed back during the year, because we are bound by law to stay within our revenues.

Q Do you have any idea what might be trimmed, Governor?

A What?

Q Do you have any ideas what might be trimmed in lieu of those two things?

A No.

Q Governor, how is it for a man who is so economy minded that you are about to spend more than any other governor in California history?

A Well, I don't think there is any way that any governor -- I have said repeatedly, publicly and to all of you that every year as long as California increases its popu-

lation and as long as inflation increases the price we must pay for things we buy, and the salaries we must pay to our employees, there is going to be a record budget in California. I have always said, however, that the base from which we started I did not believe was necessarily a sound base and we are going to continue, we have not yet implemented those hundreds of recommendations that have come in from our task forces. I still believe there is room for reducing the base from which we start our increase for each new budget. But the present budget represents a reduction of some \$500 million dollars over what was asked for by the various departments of the state. Had we not made the economies we have been able to make since a year ago January, as you have been told by legislative leaders in here, we would have had to have \$130 million dollars more in taxes to finance the budget. So it does reflect some of our economies.

But I would also like to point out that here in front of everyone and in front of all the Californians, there is a perfect example of what has happened on the basis of budgets that have grown up through the years with spending programs adopted on the basis of one-time tax windfalls with no looking ahead to the next year as to what that program was going to cost or the burden that it was going to impose on us; and to all of those people who have been so critical of our efforts to save money and of our economies throughout the last year and the continuing economies, here is a perfect example. You can't have it both ways. Government does cost too much in California, but more than two-thirds of that budget is frozen into its size and its being by law, by statute, and until we can get the full cooperation of all of government here in Sacramento to attack those programs that have been instituted for years ahead, that we inherit each year with their built-in spending, we are going to be limited in what we can do to reduce the cost of government. And that is why we are ~~starting~~ starting now to implement a program that I've asked for, to have a five-year look ahead, a five-year economic estimate of the revenues and the cost of

government so that we can at least point out to the people and give them the facts as to where government might be going, what it might be costing a few years from now and what increases in taxes might be necessary unless we take action now to head off some of these built-in programs.

Q Governor, are you going to be asking them if some of these laws -- that some of these programs that are in the law books be changed by rewritings?

A Well, we are going to point out here and there where -- wherever it is necessary. The people are going -- the people are going to have to be faced with the choice based on what a program is going to come to, as to whether they want that service from the state at the price that it is going to cost. And yes, wherever possible, as we get into this we are going to -- wherever it is necessary, we are going to present to the people and we are going to ask for this change.

Q Governor, if tuition is approved, will the general fund appropriation to the university and to the state colleges be reduced accordingly?

A No, because if you will note, in all of the plans that have been proposed in tuition, the uses of that money are for things that are not now budgeted and there's never been any intention to take this money and use it -- take it from the students and use it to cut the general fund expenditure. But the proposals are for the very things that couldn't be budgeted, the protest to the college and the university system that is, when economy has to take place the things that suffer first are new programs; new things that should go on to expand the educational opportunity. We have to first keep up with just the normal workload increase, and we have made proposals and some of the proposals involved in the use of a charge against the students would be use of this money to provide things that are not now carried on.

Q Governor, you may know, President Hitch of the University of California provided a critical analysis of pledge saying that it would disrupt such organized research as cancer programs at Berkeley; hurt the quality of graduate

education; make it necessary to renege on course promises to undergraduates in some instances; and knock off a number of federal grants probably. Are you determined to fight for the budget in view of these threatened consequences?

A President Hitch and the University have had a great many months to work with the Finance Department on this budget. They have known for quite sometime what was going to be recommended. They have known what it was going to be and as a matter of fact, while disappointed and while they would have liked to have had all that they asked, they have expressed their ability to get along with the budget as it is suggested. I wonder -- I haven't seen what you say is the criticism by the President of the university of this budget, but I wonder if some of the things that he's protesting are going to be lost in the area of research are not out of our hands and cutbacks that have already been announced in Washington, D.C. as the president has sought to get his tax increase by reducing some of his spending or his requests. Because it is my understanding that a number of those do affect education and there isn't anything we can do about that.

Q Governor, Mr. Smith -- and I think you've indicated too, that earlier that the university budget was sort of left open till the last, try to provide the university with as much funds as available. How do you reconcile this with your saying that they had known for quite sometime what they were going to get?

A Well, they knew the area in which they were talking because we didn't do this arbitrarily. We didn't do this by ourselves. We sought their council and advice with the knowledge that -- no question that no one was going to be able to get all that they asked, whether it was higher education or the other. We put a high priority on higher education. We put the highest priority and we made every effort to cut and reduce wherever we could in other spending to have the most amount necessary to meet the growing needs of the higher education system. And as I say, they knew the area and while we couldn't get down to an exact figure, they

knew roughly the amount of money that we would be unable to meet of their original request.

Q Governor, don't you think perhaps that you curbed the university's future by halving construction costs? Entirely for state colleges, too, you cut down capital outlay in one-half.

A Well, we are in a transition year here, for the first time we are going to pay as you go. It must come out of the general fund and again you ask me don't I think that we curbed something or cut something. You can't make something out of nothing. The budget totals up to all the money that is going to be coming in from the expected revenues of the state. Now, the only alternative would be to find another source of revenue. Now I for over a year have been suggesting another source of revenue and they seem to be a little reluctant about that. The only other source would be to turn to the people of California for more taxes and again I say the People of California are paying too much for government now.

Q Governor, as we all know, most of the budget -- more than two-thirds is -- you have no control over nor does the legislature because of the constitution. Did you ever consider exploring the possibility of constitutional changes so that maybe highways can be evaluated against education and we could come out with a more equitable spending program?

A Well, as I told you, we are studying all of these and this involves this look at five years ahead. And as we look there and see where some things are going right now, the areas where state spending is increasing far faster than state revenues, than the growth of revenues based just on present tax structure happen to be in higher education, in welfare and in Medi-Cal.

Q Well, Governor, isn't it a fact that some of these things like welfare and the Medi-Cal --- by statutory law could be changed?

A Yes, the legislature can help us, indeed must help us on welfare and Medi-Cal right now.

Q Governor, would you favor some reductions in and benefits in welfare and Medi-Cal then, some limitation of those who are eligible for these programs, health?

A We think there are a number of things and some of the things will require help from the federal government because we are bound in by their own regulations. This will be in the area of eligibility. It will be in the area of letting us simplify the programs and reduce administrative costs. It could be in the area of allowing us to assess some charges against some of the people for some of the services and let them help themselves in paying for it. For example, in New York, Governor Rockefeller is asking for permission now to assess a charge of 20 per cent of medical costs against the medically indigent so that on their Medicaid program, similar to our Medi-Cal, that the patient himself in the area of medically indigent will pay 20 per cent of the costs.

Q Governor, last fall when you asked for flexibility in managing the medi-cal program, the legislature refused pending their own study to see what the true financial status was. Isn't it a little premature until that study is concluded for you to say that you are going to need \$363 rather than \$402 million?

A Well, we have gone ahead with the \$363 figure recognizing that we need some help from them and further flexibility. They didn't refuse completely. They gave us some flexibility and it was due to that flexibility that we were able to reduce what would have been a tremendous deficit in Medi-Cal by the end of this year.

Now, some gentlemen upstairs have tried to portray the change in figures in Medi-Cal as being totally the result of wrong estimates, and they know better. They know this is not true. They know that some of the changes in figures were the result of our own reductions in Medi-Cal expense due to some of the flexibility they gave us, for example a change actually in the accounting and the system for it; in the change in allowing the period for setting --

for submitting bills. But we need more.

Q Governor, you said tuition or taxes are the only alternatives for new construction and higher education. Would you oppose letting the people consider the -- what the alternative they have used in the past -- another bond issue?

A No, I didn't say they were the only -- I said I had been suggesting one way and the other one available was taxes. Obviously the bonding situation remains a possibility any time but again we have to look very seriously at the bonding market. California is marketing about \$600 million dollars in bonds a year, and there is a ceiling. There is a limit and a great many people know that this is not the best time for bonds. We have to pay an excessively high interest rate now. It is a bad bond market and we -- California right now is responsible for about 14 per cent of this kind of bonds that are on the market in the United States.

Q Governor --

Q Governor Reagan, an official of the mental health services here in Sacramento has notified a number of mental day care centers by letter that they will have to close by the 30th of June. Why is this closing necessary and where will the people who are being treated in these centers now go?

A Aren't you talking about the mental health closing of the state offices under the Short-Doyle Act? If you'll look at the budget, you'll find that we have upped the budget for this local care. We are trying to stimulate and carry farther the -- this very forward-looking program of getting people out of the warehousing in mental institutions and back to these regional and local centers where they can live a normal life, live at home and even with this care be able to go out and work and sustain themselves. It is a very successful program. It's put us in the forefront of mental health in the country in the treatment of mental health. We had some state experimental centers when this program started. The idea then was under Short-Doyle, these programs would gradually be transferred over to the county

centers, and as we are doing this and we are now asking in the budget for full financing of 75 per cent state contribution to 25 per cent county. At the moment there are many areas where it is only 50-50. If we do this, the county centers will be able to take over. In Los Angeles county for example, our biggest population area, the state centers are only handling about 1200 patients and the county are handling more than 18,000. And with the additional contribution from the state, the counties have made it very plain that they can take over our 1200 and absorb them very easily and this is the way the program was always intended to work. So we are simply carrying on the plan that's been in effect for a number of years.

Q It would in effect then be transferred from state centers to local centers under Short-Doyle?

A That's right, with us putting up the additional money to make that not a burden on the counties.

Q Governor, another subject.

SQUIRE: Wait a minute. There is another question back there on it, isn't there?

Q Governor, how long did the search go on for a new finance director to replace Gordon Smith? Was this --

SQUIRE: Governor, are you done with the budget?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Are we done with the budget?

Q I wanted to ask you another question on welfare, Governor. You said that you were considering assessing charges against some -- some of the welfare recipients and I frankly don't quite understand how you can do this. What do you mean?

A Not welfare recipients. I used the example of what Governor Rockefeller has asked in New York of his legislature. There is something about the federal government regulations and whether they apply.

In the area of Medi-Cal, you've got the welfare patient, but you also have the medically indigent. They are not on welfare, but their incomes are not big enough, but they need some help in medical expense.

He is asking for permission to charge those people 20 per cent when they go to the doctor, they pay 20 per cent.

Q That would sort of be like a deductible insurance policy?

A That's right, same theory as private insurance.

Q In the area of welfare -- this is pure welfare, not in Medi-Cal, are you considering a means test or anything? What are you considering to cut down the cost of welfare?

A I'd rather have you talk to Spence Williams' department about all of the things. He has gone about as far as he can go with his own streamlining and his own reduction of regulations and so forth, administrative savings. There is still some that he can do, but there are others in which he requires legislative help and I'd rather have you ask him. That's in his department and it is pretty involved.

Is this a change now?

Q Is that through with the budget? When do you expect you'll have these Medi-Cal and welfare proposals ready for the legislature?

A I couldn't tell you that. We are working on them right now, but I couldn't give you --

Q Governor, on another subject.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: It is another subject? I got to go back here first, then I'll go to you.

Q Again the question regarding --

A Cap Weinberger and Gordon Smith. No, someone asked me this morning when did we -- when did I actually know that Gordon Smith was going. I knew he was going the day he was appointed more than a year ago because Gordon Smith never came here permanently. He came here intending only to stay -- he stayed a little longer than he at the time was willing to say he would. The time when he would leave was up to him. When he came in and told me several weeks ago that the time had come, and we left it kind of flexible, he was going to stay through this budget period. That's when we started

looking. And it was not a last-minute thing in our decision in finding someone. We -- knowing that there are no secrets in the state house, we have kept the cards very close to our chest because we didn't want a lot of speculation running around. We didn't want it -- for one thing it would impair Gordon's effectiveness if it was known he was leaving, and the decision on Cap Weinberger was made in our minds, but then we also had to maintain our silence because there was a period before Cap was willing to say that he could do this. And now he has come aboard with the announcement that he can only guarantee a year, but I'd rather have him for one year than go out and get some of the kind of people we have had working for the state that are ready to stay for the rest of their lives.

Q Governor, another question on that topic.

Q I'm on a different subject.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: You are on a different subject. Just hold it tight.

Q Governor, you say that you knew a year ago that Gordon ^(Smith) would be leaving and yet last summer when you were asked about that, you said, "Well, for heavens sake, don't even suggest such a thing, or I'll get my hat and go with him." And then only on January 2, which was not very long ago, you were asked if there was any possibility of his leaving and you said, "Not that I know of."

A Well, on January 2 he hadn't told me, but what I meant was when I said a year ago, and I've told you gentlemen I haven't concealed this, but I've also told you that I don't think it would serve government or make our job any easier to give you a calendar, an estimated date of when anyone else is going to go. But I've told you that a great number of the people who are serving in government have come here at great personal sacrifice and are serving with the knowledge that they have no intention of making government a career. They have careers of their own to go back to. We have been fortunate to get this kind of people, and when they go we will

try to get others of the same kind who are willing as citizens to take some time out of their lives and contribute to government. But I have to ask the forbearance on this. I think you can -- you could see that it would be like a lame duck if you knew and if the legislature upstairs knew everybody and when they were going to go. But there is -- I've never pretended. As a matter of fact, I campaigned on the basis that we would seek people who would be willing to give a certain period of time to government, and we thought we could get a higher type of person in government if we did so. And this is the situation.

Q On that same subject. Senator Schmitz is rather ashamed of you for appointing Cap Weinberger. He called him a Me Too Liberal and a big spender who not only opposed your nomination but opposed Goldwater. And says the last thing we want would be a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket. Are you trying to change your image or what is your comment on Senator Schmitz' --

A No, I find myself in great agreement with Senator Schmitz on one subject, the last thing I want is a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket. And I'm not sure that I'll find other areas of agreement with Senator Schmitz. And I'm not going to hold my breath until I do.

Q Can we go on to something else?

VOICE: Let's explore that Rockefeller-Reagan ticket for a minute.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Wait.

Q Governor, several Democrats suggested that because of the mixup on the Medi-Cal figures and so forth, Mr. Smith ^(Gordon) provided say embarrassment to the administration and this is why a parting of the company occurred. Would you comment on that?

A Yes, I'll comment very well. I've said many times he provided no embarrassment for me whatsoever because the figures in Medi-Cal were not in the -- confusing in the sense that they have been portrayed by some who would

play a numbers game for partisan political reasons. Just as I said a little while ago, the biggest change in the Medi-Cal figures from an estimate of what the spending was going to be, the biggest changes were actually made by us or made by Spencer Williams in his ability to reduce a spending figure that was there before us. Now, this program from the time it was implemented, I've told you, it was last year -- Medi-Cal cost was budgeted at \$151 million dollars by the previous administration. By December, a month before we took office they had to alter their figures by \$30 million dollars increase. By Spring, we had to alter the figures up to \$202 million. We thought it was the estimated spending but as this went on we had begun and instituted savings and cutbacks in the program. We were able to reduce the spending by some \$31 million through administrative savings.

Now, this does not make the \$202 million dollar figure wrong. The figure was right until we instituted the savings and it still wound up costing -- we were, as I say, we were able to reduce it about \$31 million dollars between ~~then~~ and the end of the fiscal year. Now, are we going to make this change here?

SQUIRE: Governor, there is a man --

Q Well, Governor, I just wanted to know what you meant by the last thing you wanted is Rockefeller-Reagan ticket. You mean you don't want to be on a ticket with Rockefeller or you mean you don't want to be on a ticket at all?

A I mean I don't want to be on a ticket at all. I said this a number of times. Every time they bring this up they are talking about the two non-candidates.

Q Pursuing that along the same line, persistent reports continue despite your disclaimer that you will move into Oregon for an active campaign during the last two or three weeks before May 28th presidential primary. Now, have you taken any steps presently or do you intend to take any to dissuade your Oregon supporters from setting up a state-wide full-fledged campaign for you?

A We have done all the things that we have done in

every other state. We have sent letters. We have -- we disavowed it. We have stated that we are not interested in this and have stated unequivocally I will not campaign there.

I'm dying of curiosity. I've got to find out what this is all about.

Q I think I forgot it. No, I have it.

(Laughter)

Q This is regarding Assemblyman Biddle's bill to modify the penalty on marijuana and increase the penalty on LSD. Could you clarify your position on that? Two weeks ago you told us you wanted to look the bill over before making a decision on it. But then the following week you were quoted as telling a group of Hayward college students that you were definitely against any modification of the marijuana penalty which would seem to mean that you would be against the Biddle Bill.

A No, I hope I didn't give that impression. I tried to tell them the same thing I said in here to you, and I still feel the same. We are studying the Biddle Bill because he may very well have that necessary middle road in his bill. What I said to you and what I thought I said to them was that we still look with great seriousness on the marijuana thing and I haven't changed my attitude about the evil of marijuana and the fact that we don't want to do anything to encourage its use and everything to discourage it; but I said that the fine point was if punishment is not being meted out because the penalty is so extreme that the violators are going free because of hesitation to assess the higher penalty, this is -- this is something that should be considered. But the great risk at the moment is taking an action that puts you over in a position that would seem to officially condone the use or downgrade the evil of and the danger of this particular drug. And as I say, we are looking at Biddle's bill because we think that he may have found the middle ground.

As I understand it, the bill so far, he leaves it still a felony but he gives the judge discretion --

Q On the first offense.

A -- to assess a penalty on misdemeanor type of penalty and this may well be the answer, that middle ground that we are looking for.

Q Governor, in light of your answer on the question about the Oregon primary, many states will be selecting their delegates through state conventions rather than the primary system and Mr. Nixon and Mr. Romney are very actively pursuing those delegates. Now, if anyone in any organization, non-primary states contact you, what would your answer be to them?

A Same as we have been before. We are not a candidate.

Q When you classified yourself as a non-candidate at the same time as Governor Rockefeller, does that mean if he becomes a candidate you might become a candidate?

A No. No, we don't have that close a liaison between New York and California. We only agreed on Medicaid.

Q Governor, on another topic.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, wait -- oops, hold it.

Q Governor, if at the convention there was an overwhelming show of force or persuasion for you to accept the Vice Presidency, the head of the ticket asked you this -- Kennedy asked Johnson in 1960, and the whole convention was then behind him in that choice, what would you do?

A Here we go, writing leads again. No, I've told you, I have no interest in that job. I would not want it. I believe there is a greater opportunity for service to the cause I believe in here in this job than there would be in that one.

Q Then you would turn down the head of the ticket?

A Yes.

Q You have to wait for that five-year study to come in, don't you?

A That's right. I don't know what's going to happen in the next five years.

Q Governor, on another topic.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: All right, I hope so.

Q Way back when you were asked about polls that showed your potential as a presidential candidate you said this wouldn't bother you but the only time you'd be bothered is if a poll showed the people of California no longer rated you as highly. I'm not quoting exactly, but this was the gist. I wonder how you'd feel about today's poll, it sort of reflects that the Field poll shows that people don't think you are doing as good a job as they thought you were a few months ago.

A Well, I think it has to be expected. I don't think you can submit a budget and cut some people's pet programs without incurring their displeasure. You've got one side, though, that look at the total figure of the budget and are sorry we weren't able to wave a wand and ignore the legislature and cut things as I say, that are frozen in by law, and on the other hand when you do cut -- I was interested in noting one large metropolitan daily this morning that had a headline about the record breaking budget. But when you turned to page 3 they had about four stories scattered all over the page -- three or four stories and each one was leading up to the savage cuts that I had made and what evidently were programs they were interested in. You can't have it both ways. And as I told you before, you know the story about the burro, you can't please everybody. You just have to do what you are hoping -- I think it fluctuates. And it is a known fact of political life that the longer you stay in office, the more enemies you make.

SQUIRE: Any more?

Q Have you favored legislation to limit governors to two terms? Have you thought of legislation limiting them to one term?

A I thought of some personal legislation in that regard.

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you Governor.