

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 –
06/25/1968, 07/02/1968, 07/08/1968, 07/16/1968

Box: P02

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 JUNE 25, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, class will come to order.

SQUIRE: Ready for questions?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Ready for the questions.

Q Governor, last week we asked you if you accepted the President's protection from Secret Servicemen. How many have you accepted?

A I don't know.

Q How many have been assigned to you?

A I don't know that either. All I know is that this began Friday. One arrived bearing a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, said this decision had been made in Washington, and I just haven't -- haven't bothered to make inquiries or how they are operating here, but they moved in with our own security people and are making their arrangements as to how they are going to handle it.

Q How many have you counted?

A Well, if they are good Secret Servicemen, how can you count them, you are not to be able to see them..

Q You think this is a right expenditure of Federal funds?

A What?

Q You think this is a correct expenditure of Federal funds?

A You are going to have to ask them about that. I don't know just what -- what value Washington has placed on me.

June
25

more than happy to discuss it with him. As a matter of fact, I don't know of anyone in public life today who has gone farther and done more to try and contact the members of the minority communities to have an exchange of ideas, to hear their suggestions, to tell them what I feel. I again say that a coercive type of demonstration that is organized on the basis that it is necessary to convince either the government of the United States or this state or the people that they must become aroused to the problem of poverty is a useless exercise because if there is one thing that is plain, I'm speaking now of a Democratic government in Washington, a government which I will oppose in the coming election, but I can't say that they are not aware and compassionate toward the problems of inequality and of the poor. We have spent fabulous amounts of money and great effort. I am critical of the manner in which that has been done. I don't think it has achieved the purpose but no demonstration is needed, to arouse the American people's compassion. We are determined to solve and to meet this problem and do our best to solve it and I have to suspect -- to be suspicious at times of the motives of some who continue to delude the less fortunate people in our land that something can be accomplished by this means. Was -- he's still writing.

Q Governor, when you say you don't know anyone who has done more or tried harder to contact the minority leadership, can you tell us specifically what you have done to try to improve our relationship with the group?

A Well, gentlemen, we start with the -- you know of the meetings that I have held and am continuing to hold throughout the state with members of the minority communities. As a matter of fact I was in a Negro neighborhood center in Washington, D.C. the day the fire started, the day after the assassination, seeing -- because I had available time while I was there on other business that concerned the state -- seeing if there was anything that I could learn there, any suggestions, any ideas of things that they were doing. We have continued to hold those. We have

Q In general how do you like the idea?

A Well, there's been no change in my getting around or my personal habits or anything else. I just -- I accept the judgment of this Committee in Washington. I assume they know what they are doing.

Q The judgment of that Committee in Washington is also a national candidate.

A Well there of course they are trying to get into my mind, and I take exception to that.

Q Are you a candidate, Governor?

LYN: Thank you, Squire.

A That takes care of that.

Q Governor Reagan, Brian Stevens who was involved in the tax situation over your property in Los Angeles County says that he is being denied the right to teach school this summer because of him bringing this thing to light. Are you aware of this situation and what is your comment?

A No, I'm not aware of the situation and I don't believe that that could be true at all. Whatever he has done that affects him in his position in school, that's between him and the local school board; we have no control there or would I exert any.

Q Governor, Nelson Rockefeller's people are quoted as saying a Rockefeller-Reagan dream ticket that was talked about a few weeks ago is now passe partly because of your comments concerning Chief Justice Warren. Have you ever considered this?

A No. I have never considered it. It has never been suggested to me by anyone and so I don't know anything that I could have said that would have changed that.

Q Specifically about the Chief Justice, but has anything happened in conversation or communication to indicate cooling on his part toward you?

A Not a thing.

Q Governor Rockefeller described George Wallace as a racist. Do you agree?

A Well, I learned a long time ago, even back when we

were combating what were referred to to as communists elements in the picture business, that you don't go around making accusations until you yourself know this to be a fact. I've never had any conversations with former Governor Wallace. I don't know what his attitude is or his feelings are, and someone else can make that charge if they want to. I don't know.

Q Does he belong in the Republican party as _____ Callaway says?

A Well, I have always said that anyone belongs in the Republican party if they subscribe to the Republican philosophy and adopt our philosophy, but the Republican party should never change its philosophy to go out and solicit someone simply to belong.

Q Governor, at your delegation meeting last week what was the feeling you came away with? How did they split in regard to their feelings on Nixon and Rockefeller?

A Now wait a minute, what?

Q Your delegation, how did they feel, do you think, towards Nixon and Rockefeller, respectively?

A Well, there was never any discussion while I was there. We simply stood up and announced our plans as best we could, our continued desire for a -- when I say "we" I mean Bob Finch, George Murphy and myself, for maintaining unity, and there was never any discussion of that or other than me again reminding them to -- that all of us should refrain from giving out any ideas of second choices or which way we were going to go when we decided to move.

Q Governor, several responsible black leaders, Whitney Young among them, characterized your recent statements about demonstrators as self-defeating for a man who has national political ambitions. Presumably you don't buy this. Do you think this is good politics to make this statement, anyway?

A I didn't make them for good politics, and once again it is a case of others doing apparently what I myself won't do and that is answering on the basis of what are reported to be statements. If they want to know what my position is, I'm accessible and they can find out and I'd be

held them with members of the majority community also as we urge suggestions. I have had meetings in my own office with industrial leaders and business leaders and employers, with Negro leaders, with members of the school board of association, with members of school superintendents association, every area where there were suggestions and criticisms from these people. In addition to that, you just recently in here had introduced to you the individual representatives that are directly responsible to me who are now scattered throughout the state, members of the minority communities to be a go-between for better communications with them, and I suppose this is the first time that I have said publicly, because we haven't tried to grandstand or make any big thing out of this, we have appointed more members of minority communities to executive and policy making positions than any administration in the history of California. In addition to which, using the power that -- the right that I have to suggest draft board appointments to the Federal government, we have made and they have accepted our suggestions to add minority members to the draft boards throughout the state all up and down California. I don't know the exact number of them, but quite a number because their young men are fighting and dying also, and they deserve representation on those boards. Now we will continue to do all of this because we believe that 99 per cent of the minority communities are good responsible law-abiding citizens who want to cooperate and want an answer to these problems and they are not in favor of the coercive method of trying to obtain them.

Q Governor, could you explain your reference last week to the demonstrators as bums?

A Yes. I was angry being ushered down a hall when I thought I was going to go out the other door, but I do not retract. I was speaking not of the poor and not again of the legitimate people who might have been misguided into joining into such a thing, but I don't think it was an inapt description for a bunch of people who were out in the hall, who were chanting they were going to break down

the doors to get in here. I was actually standing in defense of the press. I knew you didn't want to cope with them.

(Laughter)

Q Governor, Senators Moscone and Alquist and the president of the San Francisco Lawyer's club held a press conference yesterday in which they in effect accused your judiciary selection plan as an effort to pack the state bench with conservatives. Do you have any reaction to that?

A Well, if I wanted to pack the state bench with conservatives, all I'd have to do is just do it exactly as my predecessor did and make the appointments to suit myself which I have not done. Instead I have -- am asking the Legislature to give away my right to appoint my particular personal choice for the bench. I have asked that it be a broad based committee of citizens of the bar and of the judiciary to make these recommendations and to bind me and any other governor from here on in having to accept these recommendations based on the -- on the real qualifications of the individual to take it out of politics, not put it into politics. And all I can say is that associations of the bar representing six-sevenths of all the bar in California support this plan as does the judiciary council, as does the state chamber, as does the head of the American Legion, as do countless other organizations from the California Taxpayers Association on through. I can't recite the number of groups. The sentiment, if you put this to a vote of the people, is overwhelming in favor of this proposal.

Q They said the only people, though -- the only lawyers who could afford to serve on this would be wealthy corporate lawyers who intend to be captives of the conservative establishment.

A Well, I have voluntarily been following the very plan that I'm asking be made compulsory. I have not made an appointment of a judge on the basis of my choice. Every recommendation has been turned over to committees, which have been appointed consisting of the judiciary, the bar and the public, and I have accepted the highest rated as they come back, their highest valuation has determined who will

be judges, and I would suggest that someone make an inquiry and find out, even those who were opposed to me politically agree that there has never quite been the quality of judges that we have seen appointed in the last several months.

Q Senator Grunsky, who is carrying this bill on the floor, says however if it had been in effect we wouldn't have had these, what you call so-called civil rights decisions and legislative reapportionment decisions. Do you think if that plan had been in effect you would agree with Senator Grunsky on that?

A I'm not a lawyer. I know that what he might have been referring to are some of the judicial decisions that many people have criticized, including myself, as being not proper judicial decisions as to interpretation of law, but decisions that in effect were pre-empting the right of the Legislature to legislate. In this regard, as I say, I too am critical, but all I believe is that the basis for the appointment of a judge should be on his qualifications, his experience and his training, and his character, and not on the basis of a campaign contribution or rewarding some campaign contributor by appointing a friend.

Q Governor, on the subject of judges, your comments on Chief Justice Warren's resignation. Why do you think it is wrong for a President to appoint a Supreme Court Justice during his administration?

A Well, now gentlemen, once again my statements in Washington, they left off the preamble. Let me recite the preamble again. I -- there is an "if." I said if as has been reported by a number of journalists, and as has been widely speculated in the press with seemingly some substantiation for this, the retirement of the Chief Justice was solely for the purpose of allowing the President to make in these closing months an appointment in order to prevent the next President from appointing that -- to that position. But I said that this showed a surprising lack of faith on the part of the Chief Justice in the American system because if next January there is a change in Presidents, or there will be a change in Presidents, but that President next January

who takes office is going to reflect the will of the people and that's what we are guided by. Government is of and by and for the people in this country, and for someone, if this is true, if someone has taken an action to circumvent the expression of the will of the people next January, this does show a lack of faith in our American system. Now the if is, if the speculation is right. If there is some other immediate reason why the Chief Justice had to resign, that of course makes an entirely different story, but I didn't write these stories and I'm only commenting on what the speculation is.

Q Governor, you imply there is some doubt in your mind whether those stories were true. If it was, wouldn't it have been better not to comment until you yourself had talked to the Chief Justice and found out his reasons?

A Well, remember that everything I said was in answer to a direct question, witting with a group of your colleagues in Washington, D.C., who were asking these questions. I did not volunteer this.

Q Governor, what's your view of Chief Justice Warren's record as Chief Justice?

A I am in great disagreement with a number of the particularly five to four decisions in recent years. Particularly those that have added the difficulties of law enforcement. I do think that they have gone beyond, and this is substantiated by a number of men knowledgeable in the law, that they have gone beyond the actual interpretation of the meaning of the Constitution and have indeed made decisions based on what they think the Constitution should have said.

Q Are you also opposed to the reapportionment decision?

A Yes, I am.

Q Are you opposed to the 1954 decision on the separate but equal -- against the separate but equal facilities for Negroes in schools?

A No, but some of the implementation has gone beyond

the Brown decision. The actual court decision at that time, while it advocated the equal, there was nothing that said that there had to be -- while it said you could not enforce segregation, it did not say that you had to force integration. It simply opened the doors for the voluntary choice on the part of -- of the citizens, black and white.

Q Governor, do you have any plans for traveling outside the state before you go to Miami in August?

A Yes, in July there is the Governor's Conference in Cincinnati. I'll be going to that and very possibly as we have done in the past will probably try to pick up a fund raiser on the way to and on the way back.

Q Governor, regardless of why Chief Justice Warren resigned at this time, do you think the United States Senate should refuse to confirm whatever successor the President appoints until next -- the new President comes in?

A Oh, I would never assume the prerogative of telling the United States Senate what to do. They will make up their minds on that.

Q Governor Reagan, as a general appraisal, has Earl Warren been good or bad for the country in the 15 years as the Chief Justice?

A That is not one of those questions that I'll be writing the lead again, would I? Let's just say I'm in disagreement with a number of the decisions of the court and decisions in which he was a part of.

Q When you talk about permissiveness in national outlook, are you tracing some of that blame to decisions by the Warren court?

A I say that these decisions have made it more difficult in overzealousness to protect the rights of the accused -- they have gone beyond the point of reasonableness in that -- well, this is evidenced by the fact that the bill that was just signed by the President, even though he reluctantly signed it, it was passed by both houses of Congress, the President signed it, and it was a bill which directly reversed a Supreme Court decision, the Miranda

decision and now has once again made it possible to introduce in a trial a voluntary confession of guilt.

Q Governor, I may have missed the preamble on this one, too, but in your speech to the pharmaceutical convention in San Francisco last week did you mean to say that the FDA has no right or responsibility to police the drug industry?

A Oh, no, not at all, and I think the government has a right and responsibility to protect the people in regard to buying something that -- that is falsely advertised or buying something that can be harmful to their health, just the same as I am in favor of all of the Pure Food and Drug acts. I want to be sure that the package I open and the food I eat has been packaged in sanitary -- sanitary conditions in observance of those rules, and so forth. I'm talking however about these regulatory agencies that go then that step beyond and begin trying to decide what's good for you and me, not just eliminating what could be harmful to us. But deciding -- and I was citing this as again with the growth of government the controversy we see between agencies of government. For example, we have an agency of government telling us now that the present diet is -- if you just eat the normal healthy foods that are advertised you get all the mineral and vitamin requirements that you need. We have another government agency that's telling us no, that the diet the people are eating is deficient in the things you need, and the American Medical Association, and because it was -- their convention was being held there, I mentioned that they too had a -- had a view as medical men with regard to the average diet, and the supplement that people needed at times, and simply remarked that this again -- it is one thing perhaps to put on a label of a package that the thing in that package is harmful to your health, as has been ruled with regard to cigarettes; it is another thing to try to put on a package, say a bottle of vitamin pills, that it is government opinion that you don't need these when government can't possibly know

each individual's needs.

Q Governor, do you think the FDA was going that one step beyond when it refused to permit the sale of Thalidomide in the United States in spite of the manufacturer's assurance there was nothing harmful about Thalidomide?

A This was completely in keeping with its policeman role, which it should exercise, that there was evidence to indicate that this was harmful. This was being falsely advertised, they were completely right in doing that.

Q Governor Reagan, you have said repeatedly that you do not want California -- the California delegation to be left out in nominating the Republican candidate for President. If you see, when you go to Miami, that Richard Nixon is apparently going to get the nomination on the first ballot, would you release your delegation prior to the first ballot?

A Well, what I've said in regard to the delegation and whoever it might be that we are going to keep track right up to and including the convention on the basis of making our decision at the right moment, even if this should require a decision before the convention. But that it would be made by all of them in a democratic meeting and not by any dictation on my part. So all I can tell you is we are just going to do our best to keep abreast of the situation.

Q Governor, has anyone from Richard Nixon's office, anyone who represents Richard Nixon or the former Vice President himself suggested to you or intimated to you that they would like to have you as their Vice Presidential nominee?

A No.

Q Governor, Newsweek has a theory this week to the effect that you -- you and Nelson Rockefeller will battle Nixon through four or five ballots and the Rockefeller people hope that the break will then go their way. Do you see this sort of thing happening where between the two of you you would hold off Richard Nixon off that long?

A Bill, if you would be trying to hint would I be a part of a stop-candidate movement, no. I have no inten-

tion to being involved in a stop movement.

Q Not stopping him but having the votes sprayed so he can't win it on the first, second or perhaps third ballot, so the delegates would turn to another man.

A Well, you have two avowed candidates who are going to be competing. If there is any kind of a deadlock between those two candidates, again this is something I think you have to play at the time when you are there, and what it may mean.

Q Going back to something you said a minute ago, Governor, do you see any growing likelihood that the decision about what California will do will have to be made before the convention rather than during it because of the fact that Nixon or someone may be getting awfully close to the required total of delegates?

A Harry, this is always a possibility, of course. Certainly in this election year all the rules have gone out the window and we have learned to expect the unexpected. At the moment the nearest that we can come to -- and the nearest evidence that we have is that this is not -- not happening. But as of this moment, as I stand here, that there is -- it still follows that the convention is going to be an open convention, that no one is moving that fast.

Q Governor, is there any intention of your name not being presented as a Favorite Son candidate?

A Well, again, Squire, that would depend on if conditions changed prior to the convention, and we felt that it was time to take action prior to that convention.

Q Governor, do you have any --

Q Governor, you indicated last week you were opposed to any kind of gun registration bill. Does this mean you are opposed to the bill which President Johnson spoke of yesterday?

A Yes, I would oppose that bill. I again cannot see where this solves any problem or makes it more difficult for the wrong people to get guns, and I can see it creating a -- another vast bureaucracy and another harrassment of the citizen. This additional licensing -- we are licensed

for a great many things now. And it may sound very simple, the individual, he just has to once a year do something about licensing, but we discover that it does become quite a bureaucracy and quite a costly operation of government. And as I say, if this were -- if this were an end that were going to meet the problem of crime, but I just -- no one has ever proven to me where it is going to meet the problem of crime. The plain truth that everybody seems to be overlooking, if you banned all guns, you destroyed them all in a basement, there are people, plenty of them as has been proven in our big cities, where crime is committed who can come out of there with guns in an hour. All you need is a piece of pipe and a few other materials and you can make a gun.

Q This is quite similar to the bill introduced in our own Assembly last week. Does that mean that you oppose that one, too?

A Are you speaking of the Shoemaker bill?

Q Yes, I am.

A Last week when we talked that wasn't even legislation, it was just a news release.

Q Well, this will be heard tomorrow, as I understand.

A So at last it is a bill. I'm opposed to that, yes. Now --

Q Would you veto --

Q I was going to ask you, back to politics just for a moment, has there been any decision yet who will place your name in nomination?

A No.

Q Or who will be a member of your delegation?

A No, we haven't even talked about it.

Q Would you veto that Shoemaker bill?

A You know the answer to that, I'll wait till the bill gets down to the desk.

Q **Isn't it** a fact it is no longer Shoemaker, the bill is Zenovich the way I read it.

A I wasn't in yesterday. I tried to catch up with that time change in that flying yesterday. I hit the sack.

Q Let me ask you one question. You say all your indications are that no one has the convention -- the nomination sewed up yet. How many votes short do you think Richard Nixon is at this time?

A The only estimates that I've heard are around -- around the 400 mark.

Q Governor, as Chairman of the State Toll Bridge Authority, would you approve of a proposition to name the San Diego toll bridge the Robert F. Kennedy Memorial Bridge?

A This is the first I heard of that. It is one I haven't got an answer for you there. I don't even know what the custom has been in regard to naming things of this kind, so let me look into that.

Q Governor, a few weeks ago you were pretty firm in saying your name would be placed in nomination and now today you are saying it may not be because of circumstances or because of your tally of the situation. Is there any change in position in what you are saying today?

A No, no, Bill, I just said if the unforeseen happened the unexpected, if we found that a convention was going to be sewed up prior to convention time, obviously you have to-- you have to go along with that.

Q Why?

A What?

Q Why obviously?

A Well, obviously if it going to be sewed up, no sense in going down there and going through an empty gesture. I'm doing what I'm doing in the interest of unity and it would seem to me that that particular problem would be --no longer be an issue.

Q Governor, when will the delegation meet again?

A I left before the meeting was over. I don't know whether they set a date.

VOICE: Nothing set.

A Nothing has been set.

Q Governor, if I could go back to the judicial selection proposal again. If you are following that proposal now informally hasn't it resulted in an appointment

of a great many more Republican judges than Democratic judges?

A Well, it is also true that the lawyers are disproportionately Republican instead of Democrat and it is also true that if this should continue for the next four years we still wouldn't be able to get an even break with the Democratic judges we now have.

Q Governor, do you think the next Democratic governor, when he comes in, whoever he may be, should be bound by the decision of a Republican nominated commission on its judicial appointments?

A The commission is appointed by the -- partly appointed by the Governor. This is the place where the Governor still has a possibility, he appoints half that commission. The other half then is chosen by the bar and chosen by the Judiciary Council.

Q Do you think the commission would be recommending more Republicans than Democrats to a Democratic governor than to the Republican governor?

A Right now the reverse would be true. One member of the commission is the Chief Justice who is not an appointee of mine who is not a Republican. This would be true of some others.

Q You said you had been receiving names, you had been using this commission even though it is not in law and it has resulted in a disproportionate number of Republican judges. I was just wondering if you thought it would continue to do so if there was a Democrat in the governor's office.

A I don't know, but I know that we have appointed a number of Democrats also and again, as I say, I think that you would have to check out in the profession that is available to you for judicial appointments what is the proportionate membership there, Democrat or Republican.

Q Governor, on another subject, the Secretary of State's office says there is a good chance an initiate would qualify this week that would limit the property tax

relief to one per cent of market values. The Watson's initiative. Do you have any view on that?

A Yes, I think this is a meat-axe approach to this problem and is causing -- going to cause great chaos. We have a tax reform program, or I say have -- we will have for the next session, we are working on it now, the commission is working on it -- it would seem to me that if you are going to -- and I favor property tax relief. As a matter of fact, I favor giving the \$155 million back as was promised by having Democrat and Republican almost upstairs, which still seems to be improbable -- but obviously the only way you can have true property tax relief is to find other substitute revenues which are broader based, fairer and less regressive than the property tax. And to do that it seems to me the logical way is -- you might even have to phase it over a period of time, is to take away certain government functions that are supported by the property tax, find another way of supporting them and remove from the property tax the burden of those functions until you get down hopefully and the optimum would be to get down to the -- just those services that are affiliated or associated with property, and then you would have a fair property tax relief but there is -- simply to limit the revenue that you can obtain and let's have to scramble, I don't think this is a good approach.

Q Governor, your property tax relief bill is likely to be heard in the Finance Committee this morning. Are you still gloomy about its chance? Have you had any personal contact with the Finance Committee members in an attempt to get that bill out of committee today?

A We have done everything we can to make that bill move. There's been no question about our desire to have it, and there is an honest disagreement between myself and the Chairman of that committee, with regard to the answer to the problem, but this is an honest disagreement and a philosophical belief. This isn't the kind of shennigans that we found going on for several months when it was held up over in the Assembly side.

Q Have you been able to work out any kind of accommodation with Senator Miller so that he will allow your property tax relief?

A No, as I say we have an honest disagreement.

Q Governor, have you talked --

A What?

Q Does that disagreement still appear unsoluble as of today?

A I haven't had time to see him and he hasn't -- since our last meeting, and he hasn't sought me out.

Q You just answered my question.

A Oh.

SQUIRE: Any more questions, gentlemen? Thank you.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JULY 2, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOoo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Afternoon. Fire away.

No statement.

Q Have you got a prepared statement?

A No, no prepared statement.

Q This morning Speaker of the Assembly announced that the Democrats are going to introduce some bills to take care of those budget cuts of yours. Do you have any comment about that, particularly the University of California?

A Well, no, they're certainly free to go ahead with that if they'd like. We gave full consideration, Squire, to every one of the vetoes or the blue linings that we did in the budget. In the field of higher education, I'd just like to point out that our increase this year over last year for higher education is a much higher increase than they have received any year in the last 10. As a matter of fact, in the university our increase is almost three times per student spending what the normal increase has been over the last ten years, and at the college level it is around double what the increase has been over the past ten years. It was a -- I think, a well thought of budget, and as I say, we gave great consideration to every single item. We went into each one of them individually as to the reasons for vetoing them.

Q Governor, the Speaker says that he hopes that if they pass some of these bills, supplemental appropriations, that you may be able to reason together and that perhaps you might sign some of these. Is there any room here for negotiations? Is there a possibility you might accept some

July
2

supplemental bills?

A Well, a number of things that the Speaker has suggested I don't see where there is anything to reason about. His greatest protest, as I say, is this one with regard to education. He's calling it a cut in education because he tried to use -- to inject the force of the legislature by way of the budget into changing an action of the Board of Regents at the University. This was in regard to the student charge and this is the very type of thing that we have tried for a hundred years to keep away from, is the use of political force in the running of the University. This just followed up his own attempts to cancel out that student charge or to get the Regents, I should say, to vote against it at the Regent's meeting. Failing in that he took action by a way of a budget.

The other ones have to do with some of the urban spending and have to do with, for example, the \$250 thousand for a program supposedly for summer jobs. Well, now we have a program under way for summer jobs. It is ahead of its goal right now. It is successful and has mobilized the private sector and all the local governments as well as the state government, and to date -- well, to date, back as of June 11, 10,800 young people in the state under the ages of 22 had already been put to work.

Now, his \$250 thousand dollar program had such restrictive language that what it really amounted to was re-opening an office in his own district and I can understand his wanting to do that in an election year, but I think he ought to raise his own campaign funds and not call on the taxpayers for it.

Q Governor, he gave up on that matter of forcing the tuition, but he's going after the salary increases. Do you have any comment to try to restore those?

A Well, as I said, before, this was a very sizeable increase that we made. It was in keeping with the other state employees' increases. You'd always like to pay people more money, if you could. But again we had to turn

to the fact that higher education was the number one priority and if higher education had been held to the same rate of increase, percentage of increase that was given to all the other departments of state government, the University budget would have been \$11 million dollars smaller and the college budget would have been \$28 million dollars smaller than it was. So I think that we did all that could be done in fairness to all the other services that state government has to provide.

Q Well, Governor, the Speaker contends there may be up to a \$70 million dollar surplus in that budget. What do you propose to do with the surplus funds?

A Well, the Speaker, of course, just a few months ago said there wasn't going to be a \$70 million dollar overpayment in his Assembly Bill 272 to the public schools, and it turned out that after he had castigated us on the air and in the press for not knowing the figures, it turned out that \$70 million dollars was just the amount of the overspending under his formula of 272. So the idea that we are getting out of the hole and that we are getting our heads above water, I'd like to point out that before this administration took office the state government had a cushion of \$194 million dollars. That's cash on hand as a balance to take care of any contingencies, to take care of any slumps in business that might affect the revenues, and so forth. And they spend that \$194 and left us with about the same amount over and above that in debt.

Now, there is nothing wrong with the state getting back to where it has a certain amount of cash on hand for contingencies. I am not a believer in great surpluses when the day comes that we can prove that we have more revenues than are needed for the going cost of government. I'm going to be the first one to ask, as I have asked already, for one tax reduction in one area of the income tax. And he overlooks a few of these things. I would like to give \$35 million dollars of that back right now to correct an injustice in the State income tax.

Q Governor, I was just going to ask if, as Speaker Unruh charges, the \$39 million dollars is surplus, is it really honest to go ahead and collect it in the sales tax or shouldn't you allow the sales tax to lapse?

A Well, no, we shouldn't have allowed it to lapse and it's been a distortion to claim that anyone got the three months extension of the sales tax only for the purpose of balancing the budget. That is not true. We got that extension to give us time to try to continue to try and get the \$155 million dollars back to the people by way of property tax relief which was promised by both the Democrats upstairs and ourselves. And I think it is a pledge and I think until we give the \$155 back in some form of property tax relief we are breaking trust and faith with the people of California.

Q What are your plans for that \$39 million dollars?

A Well, I'm trying, as I said, to give back \$155 and to give back \$35 million dollars in income tax relief.

Q Governor, regarding that \$35, Assemblyman Veneman, who's carrying the bill for you, says he thinks that it is dead. He doesn't think there is a chance to get it passed.

A Well, I know that we are up against the Speaker's philosophy that nothing bearing a Republican label should be passed, and that none of these things should be done in this election year. Maybe that's what makes this coming election year -- coming election very important to the People of California.

Q Governor, -- can I change the subject?

Q I got one more on this. That \$39 million dollars that the sales tax is going to -- going to be provided by the sales tax the next three months, the Speaker asserted this morning that that's tied up because of the way the Veneman amendment was drawn, so that it can't -- it's got to go into the property tax relief fund, it can't be used for any other purpose. What is your comment on that?

A I think that would be -- that's a correct statement, yes. Yes, that's why, as I say, all these charges that was made -- that we secured passage by claiming it was necessary to balance the budget, these are not true.

Q Were you aware that it was tied up? Was that a mistake in the Veneman amendment or was that something --

A Oh, no, no. No, we wanted time to continue to try to get the money back to the people.

Q Governor, if the Legislature should recess, and there will be a time around in August where there will be some pressure, too, because of the conventions, without passing a property tax relief bill, would you consider calling a special session for that after the convention period or in the Fall?

A Oh, don't ask me for an answer to anything like that now. I'm going to have to just play this by the way the game is going.

Q Now, Governor, last week we discussed at length your Favorite Son candidacy and vis-a-vis Richard Nixon having tied up the convention. Over the week-end, Nixon made some more strides in that direction. What is your situation now? Are you going to be nominated as a Favorite Son; are you not going to be nominated as a Favorite Son; have you given up? What are you doing?

A Yes, and I realized a question last week I shouldn't have answered. It was on the hypothetical call. It was a little bit silly, a question with regard to what if the convention was decided in advance and the manner in which this was played in the press, I just say I thought it was quite a distortion over what was actually said here. I have since received some wires and asked for my position and I've answered those wires. One in particular, and I'll state it again, I believe it is an open convention. I don't believe it is tied up. I intend to be placed in nomination by the California delegation and if at that time the convention wishes to consider me a candidate, the convention can do so.

Q Governor Reagan, what do you think the effect of Senator Tower's endorsement of Richard Nixon will be?

A Well, he released his delegation, so this means that now I imagine there is quite a hunt on for delegates in Texas as a result of this, because he was only speaking for himself, and as I say, he did release the delegation. I

don't know, you'd have to -- you are in a better position than I am in to judge on that.

Q He in the past had been both privately and publicly very strongly behind the possibilities of your candidacy and I was just wondering what had caused this sudden shift.

A Oh, I never had that impression. I thought the Senator Tower was always pretty much committed to Dick Nixon.

Q Governor Reagan, did Senator Tower by any chance communicate with you before throwing his support with Nixon?

A Well, now in making an effort to communicate with me. I -- I called him to tell him that on the way to the Governor's Conference I had accepted an invitation to a fundraiser in the western part of his state and I felt that since he had at that time, -- and was the Favorite Son, that it was my obligation to inform him, as I would inform the Governor of another state if I were going in, a Republican Governor; he was all enthused about that and happy that I was going to do it, and then in the conversation on the phone indicated to me that he was thinking seriously of stepping down as Favorite Son himself and making a commitment.

Q What might be the affect on California's standing at the national convention if this recall Reagan campaign succeeds in forcing you to defend yourself against in November?

A Oh, I don't know. I've never had any experience on which to base such a thing, nor does anyone else that I know of. This recall movement here in California I think is pretty obvious that it has political connotations. I think it is kind of a shame, regardless of my own personal views about it. I think that for -- it is the first time that I know in which you can see that anyone has ever used the device of a recall with kind of a political motive in mind, and I think it is a very dangerous precedent. I can foresee a day where immediately after an election the losers would automatically start in to create this kind of embarrassment. I'll take my chances on what the -- what

the people say.

Q Governor, isn't the recall a purely political device? What's its purpose if it isn't to remove political officers?

A The recall is a very useful thing. The recall is very similar to impeachment. The recall is supposed to be used in the event that a Governor who is guilty of some conduct unbecoming the office, or who has suspect of being a little loose with the people's money, and so forth, or doing something else that is misconduct, not just a disagreement with your policies and your philosophy that's been pretty well expressed in the campaign, and I think that this is purely a disagreement on the basis of the philosophy and the fact that I'm doing exactly what I said I was going to do all during the campaign.

Now, also, we are getting quite a list of mail -- you fellows are free to look at the record if you want to -- we are getting people who are complaining that they have been betrayed in this, that they have signed these petitions, they want their names off because they were told they were signing petitions to lower their taxes. I received a communication from a student at one of our state colleges that says he was personally in three classes where the professor spent the class period urging students, regardless of their age, whether they were of a legal age to sign such a petition, to sign these petitions. So it is a rather careless operation.

Q Governor, are you concerned about this recall movement?

A Am I concerned?

Q Yes.

A Well, I'm not going to say it is something I'd ask for for Christmas, but --

(Laughter)

A As I say, I just -- there have been other things that have happened that haven't made me happy in this job, and this I guess is just a little bit of the sand in the shoes.

Q The reason I asked that question, it was first

raised at a press conference here many months ago, you kind of brushed it aside, and I'm wondering if you are taking it more seriously now.

A Many months ago, when it was first raised, it was the same kind of little abortive attempts that started last year, that was tried three times against my predecessor, and has been tried against others, but suddenly along about January it -- it seemed to get a new breath of financial life, and I would say that its timing with the political season was rather suspect.

Q Governor, in 1966 on the clean amendment your attitude was that well, it might very well be controversial, dubious, questionable, even unconstitutional, but you said why not let the people vote on it. Now, this is a proposition which you don't even contend is unconstitutional, you just say it's probably ill-advised. So why isn't the answer the same, why not let the people vote on it?

A Well, let me ask you something. You mean after winning the election by almost a million vote margin that every day the people ought to vote again to see whether I come to work in the morning? This is a little precipitant. They started it, you know. I'd hardly found out what all the doors led up to there in the suite of offices when they started this. No, I think there was something different. I said that the clean amendment, that the -- to try and raise a technical issue on it when the people of California had been definitely trying for a number of years to get some control on smut and pornography, when we have become the national capitol for it, that perhaps there would be a useful purpose served if at least we had an expression from the people of California as to their feeling on this issue. Then it might result in some corrective legislation and once I'd -- again I'd like to point out that such legislation is again buried in committee and will get no place in this session of the legislature and I for one am tired of getting letters from parents throughout the United States, sending me the very pornographic and obscene material that their children are receiving with California addresses on it, where

their kids are being solicited to send for even more of the same kind of material and I don't think it is something that California ought to be first in.

Q Getting back to the recall movement, Governor, do you -- are you intimating here that you see the fine hand of the Democratic leadership, wherever it is, in this recall movement?

A I haven't identified a fine hand. I just said I think there is a fine hand. Come one of these days, fellows, I'm going to ask you to all take a loyalty oath and hold up your hands whether you signed the petitions yet.

Q Regardless, whether or not they qualify, if these petitions are submitted when you are leading your delegation in Miami, what affect do you think this recall movement will be had and the outcome will be known?

A I don't know, and I think what you named might be possible, that a grandstand play of a truck load of petitions, even if they turn out to be not qualified signatures, could take place just for that particular thing.

Q Can I ask for specifics on two things. You mentioned this college where the professor took class time, which college was that?

A San Francisco State.

Q And to follow up on the other question, do you have any indication where the financial support is coming from?

A No, no, I don't.

Q Nothing above suspicion?

A No.

Q Well, Governor, if this grandstand play that you referred to, and its affect in August, what difference does it make if you are not a candidate?

A Well, a fellow can get personally embarrassed.

Q Well, you could do that anywhere, at any time.

(Laughter)

A Yeah, sure. No, I think it is the sort of thing -- that's all I meant, I think it is the sort of thing that one doesn't look forward to with pleasure.

Q On another issue, Governor. Last week or the week before you said you were not in support of Assemblyman Shoemaker's gun registration. I wonder now would you veto such a bill if it were passed?

A Well, now you've asked a question that I never answered here. I won't state what I'll do with a bill until it comes down and hits the desk. I'm still not in favor -- no one has ever convinced me that registration is a factor in curbing crime. On the other hand, I have seen an estimate that national registration of guns could be a program that could cost conservatively, estimated at \$2 billion dollars a year to maintain such registration. And I think that there are other things we could do in the control of crime with \$2 billion dollars that might make more of a dent than registering the honest people's guns.

Q Governor, on the Mulford Bart --

Q Before we get to that, on the gun bill. You reported last week in Davis as endorsing in effect the Biddle gun bill. Is that so or do you support the Biddle gun bill?

A I can tell you, I know everything that's in it. I said a number of things in there that I think -- in fact I've expressed myself here in this -- in these press conferences, in favor of. I think we could have a longer period of time than five days. I've heard that the investigating agencies have difficulty in completing the investigation of an individual in five days. I think that would be -- that would be well worthwhile.

Q And what about the provision that he would let the cities and the counties, if they wish, impose registration?

A I'd want to look a little closer at that to see what -- even though I favor local autonomy, to see where we would stand with regard to the rights of pre-emption in that field.

Q Governor, then you are firming up your opposition to registration of guns, is that right?

A Yes, I am, I just don't see that it serves a useful purpose.

Q Governor, in view of the informal election held recently by farm workers who voted to be represented by -- and in view of the recent action by New York city officials that they would not buy California grapes as long as the labor dispute exists, do you plan to take any action to intercede in this labor dispute or to ask the growers to negotiate?

A I called Mayor Lindsey who wasn't aware that his Deputy Mayoer had made that statement, and I told him that the matter, the particular grape grower in issue has been cleared by the Department of Labor, he is eligible for green card workers, farm employment service can furnish employees to them, there is no labor dispute there, and charges have been leveled with the NLRB, have been filed there that this constitutes an illegal secondary boycott, and we are further communicating and sending them facts that they did not have on this situation. I think that New York has taken a precipitant action and one that is not warranted by the facts.

Q Well, do you plan to intercede with the dispute here, asking the growers to negotiate with the union or the farm workers?

A We -- as I told you, I haven't a report in that particular thing right now, but we are ourselves putting together a legislative package with regard to ground rules for protection of both workers and management in the organizing of the farm industry.

Q May I ask about BART now?

Q Can I have -- Is that legislative package going to be put in this session?

A No, no, we are working on it right now. It is not the easiest thing in the world. It is in a gray area that the Federal government itself has disclaimed any responsibility down through the years, and the state has never picked up. For a number of years the state couldn't; until a few years ago this was ruled as the federal government wouldn't handle it but they wouldn't give the state the right to handle it.

Q Do you think that precipitant action, as you call it, results from the fact that the New York's own grape industry finds itself in very stiff competition with California?

A Well, I didn't get any word of that kind back from New York. As a matter of fact, I doubt it because they have been a big market. We produce about 90 per cent of all the table grapes for the market in the United States. So it wouldn't be a competitive thing. I would think that .. it probably had to do something with the complete union organization at the municipal level in New York City.

A Did Mayor Lindsey indicate he was going to reverse the order that was given, do you know?

A He simply said he wanted to get more information and see what the position was, to see why this action was taken. He wasn't familiar with it.

Q This legislative package next year, will it include some provision for workers elections in NLRB?

A Let me say this, the goal is to find out what kind of a legislative package we can put together to provide rules in this area. Now you.

Q On the Mulford BART bill to use highway funds to help out BART, highway funds due only in the three counties involved. Your legislative Secretary said the administration has no position. But the Division of Highways has appeared at every committee meeting opposing the bill and your Director of Public Works just last week took several cracks at it. Is there an administration position or do you just let your people say what they want and appear before committees and take whatever position they feel like on these matters?

A No, I think that the departments there had to do -- had responsibilities in those areas. As far as I'm concerned, I believe this is a legislative matter. If I have my way, I think there is a way they can finance BART and solve their problem at no increase in taxes to anyone, and even a partial decrease in taxes for a lot of people.

If the \$155 million would -- could be given back, I see no reason then why the Legislature couldn't make it possible for the three county area over there to use a half of that half a cent of sales tax for BART^T and they would still be getting a quarter cent reduction in their property tax and they'd be having a quarter cent to apply and this would be ample to handle the situation and no one would have to raise fees, dues or taxes of any kind. But so far no one seems to listen to such a -- what I think is a common sense approach to the problem.

Q Well, then would -- in that event, since you haven't found anyone to introduce such a proposal, would you like to get aboard one of the others that may be moving?

A Well, I'm going to have to be faced with one of them one of these days, but I'm not going to put myself in the position of making the decision for those counties as to how this should be financed.

Q Governor, on another subject, do you think the Pueblo --

Q Let's finish in this first.

A You want on BART?

Q Why do you take the position that you have no responsibility to assist the Rapid Transit, it is purely a legislative job? You are not thinking the office should be behind some legislation?

A No, I don't believe that I should put myself in the position of being the one who made the decision with regard to how this thing should be financed. But if any particular district -- I have insisted that, and we have supported the philosophy of allowing the people in the various areas to make a decision. This is why we were in favor of legislation to allow the people of Los Angeles to make the decision as to how they wanted to finance rapid transit in their area. With regard to BART early on because they had made a decision, we agreed that perhaps it was all right to allow their own county commissioners over there without resorting again to a vote of the people, but again I do not

believe that it is my position to be the one who should dictate or indicate how this is going to be financed.

Q Are you saying then that you are ready to sign any bill that the Legislature sends down, whichever bill they say?

A No, I can think of some things they do that I -- my responsibility wouldn't permit me to do that.

Q Would increasing tolls on the bridges be one of those?

A Well, you again are prying at personal opinions of mine with regard to legislation. If you ask me about the tolls as an individual, I'll tell you that I believe there are better, more effective ways of doing it than making those who simply use the bridges be solely responsible for paying for this.

Q Governor, do you think, on the other subject, that the Pueblo controversy may or ought to become a national campaign issue this year?

A Well, it is the kind of issue that could be pulled out from under you if they suddenly turned them loose, sent them home. And we have had evidences that the enemy boasts occasionally on television of affecting American elections to suit themselves.

My only issue is -- on it is that it is another example of what I think has been a fuzzy-minded approach to our whole international situation to have let it go as long as it did. I think this country had a responsibility to demand the return of its citizens within the first 24 hours after they were kidnapped.

Q Governor, at the time the Pueblo was kidnapped you said you felt that the United States should go in and get it with whatever it takes -- am I misquoting you, that you should go in and get it?

A No.

Q Now, do you feel the same way about the planeload of G.I.'s that was forced down in the Iturup Islands, should we go in and forcibly get our men back here?

A I just heard a report here that they are being

sent back, it's been solved and almost makes one think it was kind of a happy coincidence with the Russians, what with the talks that are now supposed to ~~take place~~ ^{take place} with regard to nuclear disarmament and so forth.

Q Governor, I'd like to clear up a point on this con-
vention business. What do you feel was the distortion of what you said last week? Didn't you say in effect that there were -- there might be conditions under which your name wouldn't be placed in nomination?

A No, I was asked a question whether, what if it was all over and everybody knew and there was no question about it, that somebody had the nomination sewed up. Well, in answer to a question then, I realize what I should have said was I'll wait until that time and then make that decision because the manner in which it was then put out was used as an indication -- the implication was that I believed that such a thing was possible and had a course all set. I thought I was answering a, you know, -- a question like would you still insist in your turn at bat in the last half of the 9th inning if you had already won the ballgame.

Q Do you believe it would still be an open convention no matter how many Favorite Sons are released in the delegation?

A In this year I wouldn't predict anything. I still believe, as of the facts of the moment, it will be an open convention.

Q On the way to Miami are you going to assign some of those Secret Service men to guard the pilot so the plane won't get hijacked?

(Laughter)

A Say, listen, we have got another one there. You speak of the Pueblo incident, we have another one there of an American citizen who is now being held in another country..

Q On another subject. The City of Berkeley has been opened up again tonight and if this should become worse and they will have more demonstrations particularly over the Fourth of July, do you anticipate the state will move in over Berkeley?

A The state has been in close contact with the police

in Berkeley and we stand ready in the city's system of tombs (?) that has been worked out to do whatever is necessary and whatever is requested, but you must realize that these requests come from local government or we don't act. And so we stand ready and we have observers on the scene for this as we have had through these last few days.

Q How much longer do you think that the city of Berkeley or the people can keep tolerating having the city shut down night after night after night?

A I don't think they should tolerate it at all, and I think that it is a -- while the university itself apparently is not directly involved, just having large numbers of students there, I think that it is a ^{mutual} ~~mucal~~ problem between the university and the city because I think this type of group has been attracted there, ~~by~~ the atmosphere in the campus. I think the willingness of the university to accept non-students as participants in the campus demonstrations, some of whom are the leaders in this present demonstration, means that the university must, as I have indicated, and in the last few weeks, take an action to change the climate in the campus and then I think that the community again -- it is a case of law and order and quick and certain punishment for those who are found guilty of breaking the law and as I say the state stands ready when requested to do whatever is necessary to preserve the law and order in that and any other communities.

Q In international affairs, your remarks on the return of this plane seems to indicate there is a relaxation of tension between the Soviet Union and ourselves. Do you think this is desirable or even possible at this point?

A I think it would be wonderful if it is far true, but we have been -- we have been burned a few times in the past. I just think that we ought to -- we ought to keep our guard up and not be so willing to not show our hands yet on these. If they really mean it, fine. We can -- we can learn that at a table. But again I would say that this sudden decision to enter into nuclear talks again could inside, with the measure now before the United States Senate as to whether this nation should proceed with an anti-

missile defense, and one could assume that maybe the other side thought that this might soften those who want that anti-missile defense, and might stiffen the resolve of those who are opposed, and we might wind up with no anti-missile defense. At the same time that we do have information it's been widely carried in the press that the enemy does have such an anti-missile defense.

Now, I wonder if he's willing to make as one of the first bargaining points that if we do pass -- embark on such a thing he'll do away with his.

Q Governor, on another subject, what are your plans for the property you've purchased in Riverside County? Specifically is that for investment or are you going to establish residence of some kind there?

A Well, that's -- that's for ranching and whether it becomes a permanent residence or part-time residence as was our previous ranch, we haven't made that decision yet. I don't know yet whether we can manage to escape the city completely, but it gives me great comfort at night to think that it is hidden away back up there and a lot of bushes I can get in and hide.

Q You haven't decided whether you are actually going to build a home or a residence?

A Well, we will build, but whether it will be permanent home, our only home, or whether it will just be a sort of week-end cabin, we haven't made that decision.

SQUIRE: Any more questions, gentlemen? Thank you, Governor.

A There is one, Squire.

Q The mothers of pre-school children are concerned about this recommended cut in state funds for their child day care centers. They say if the state makes the cut, the matching federal funds will also be cut, the entire program will be crippled.

A I have learned that no cut was made, that the full amount is in the budget, so there is no further need for them to worry.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JULY 8, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

SQUIRE: Governor, before you start, will you ask them to stay on one subject till they complete it as much as possible.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: All right. Wait a minute, I have a statement here. Good morning.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read release #457)

Q Do you know how many young people there are that should be getting jobs during the summer in the state?

A No, I wouldn't be able to have a figured on that. I know that this is considerably better than has ever been done before. Last year we were disappointed. We were late getting started on such a program, so we began and continued right from last summer on working up the plans for this concerted assault and it involves all local governments, private sectors and even in many of the local communities where they are really in charge, they are even organizing householders to make available that type of job.

Q Do you have an idea what proportion of the jobs are in agriculture?

A No, the labor -- you might be able to find it out from the state employment office. I wouldn't know.

Q I take it some of them are?

A Oh, I'm sure they are. This has always been a big source of summer employment in California.

Q Do you have any figures to compare with past years so that -- a comparison of this year's situation with the

past?

A I don't have them. Now you might be able to get them because as I say, last time I'm sure we were way ahead of what we were able to do previously. Last summer was the first summer where we really set out on a concerted campaign to organize a campaign of this kind. When I say "we" I mean the state. This is the first time we had a chance to and I'm quite sure that this is a bigger and better effort than we have ever put forth.

Q Governor, in your actions on the budget, you cut out a \$250 thousand dollar item which you said duplicates the states efforts. Now there is a \$5 million dollar bill going through that the Assembly passed the other day. Is that in the same category?

A Well, it would seem to me that here again, to be discussing now legislation for a \$5 million dollar program which is supposed to be coordinated with the local communities which are already coordinating with this one and putting out a maximum effort, for them to be forced to put up matching funds and then run the program, it is very obvious that we -- school would be in session again next fall before anything could be done. And by a curious coincidence that \$5 million dollar piece of legislation is really \$4,750,000 of jobs and \$250,000 by the language of the bill, is the same \$250,000 that I cut out of the budget. It in effect would result in opening an office in the district of the Speaker.

Q How is it going to do that, Governor? The Speaker --

A There was a youth program federally financed and they changed priorities back in 1966. They did not reduce the effort or the amount, but they changed and opened some in some areas and closed some on the basis of whether they were effective or meeting the purpose. One of them closed was in that district, and the language of the bill is a little clouded, but what it in effect says is that the \$250,000 would return to the status of the 1966, before the Federal government changed the priorities, and that just turns out to be opening

an office in that area.

Q Which is to say then that you don't look kindly on that \$5 million dollar job package?

A No, because I think we are already embarked on the same program and I don't think that it could get under way in time to have any effect on summer employment.

Q Governor, for perhaps the first time yesterday you talked specifically in terms of votes at the Miami convention. Would it be fair to say that you are inching closer perhaps to a statement of some kind?

A No, I didn't talk specifically about it, Bill, I answered some questions that someone put to me, did I have any knowledge about whether there were any others in the California delegation or did I think that the California delegation alone would be enough to make someone a serious contender, and I said no, I didn't think so.

Q But you are talking about the convention in terms you haven't used in the past, isn't that true?

A No, except that at the airport were questions that haven't been thrown at me in the past, and they were the result of Governor Rockefeller's statements here in the state about delegates changing and delegates being loose and it being an open convention, and I tried to make it plain that I thought he was in a better position to know about that than I was since he's out campaigning and meeting with the delegates. I said also that I believe there would be now more communication between delegations because I still believe is going to be an open convention, and I think we are all interested in the thinking of each other.

Q Yesterday Governor Rockefeller said that a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket was certainly not out of the realm of possibility. Have you talked with him in the last few days or what's your comments on that statement?

A No, I had no conversation with him at all and all I can do is reiterate my previous position, I am not interested in the second spot on the ticket.

Q Governor Rockefeller says you are working pretty

hard for the presidency.

A Well, that's Governor Rockefeller's opinion. I've been working pretty hard for the party and I've been pretty successful in that work and I'm very proud of the money that we have been able to raise for the party. And as I said yesterday, since the Republican campaign budget is going to have to compete with the whole national budget which will be used by our opposition to further their political aims, why there is a great need for money.

Q Do you get very annoyed when Rockefeller, for example, proposes a Rockefeller-Reagan ticket?

A Why, fellows, you've never seen me get annoyed anyway.

(Laughter)

Q Governor Rockefeller was asked yesterday if he took your candidacy seriously and he said he took it very seriously, indeed. To reverse that question, how seriously do you take Governor Rockefeller's candidacy?

A I take the candidacy of even Harold Stassen very seriously. There are a number of talented Republicans, of which he's one, running for the office, and I think every one of them should get complete and full consideration at the convention by all of the delegates before the decision is finally made.

Q Including yourself?

A What?

Q Including yourself?

A No, I was talking about the fellows that were running.

Q The Sacramento Union this morning says that at the airport yesterday you indicated that instead of releasing California's votes to another candidate you would consider holding onto them yourself and becoming a serious contender for the presidential nomination. Is that an accurate reflection of your thoughts at this time?

A No, I said my position is unchanged. At the convention I will be placed in nomination by that delegation.

If the delegates of the convention choose to consider me a candidate seriously or otherwise, that's what will take place. There's been no change in my position at all.

Q Is that an accurate reflection of your thoughts at this time, the report to the public this morning?

A Let me just say this. I'll answer this, and the most accurate description I can give you as to my attitude with regard to the California delegation is that the reason for becoming a Favorite Son to begin with was in the interest of unity of the Republican party in California and I'm going to do or take whatever action I believe is necessary to preserve that unity.

Q Governor Rockefeller indicated that he felt two key delegations at this point were Michigan and Ohio. Do you think that that's true?

A Well, he's had a lot more experience in this than I have and I wouldn't have anything on which to base an argument one way or the other. I assume there must be some validity in that.

Q Governor, do you consider this recall movement in California a serious threat?

A Oh, I suppose it is like a pebble in your shoe. You can live with it but you'd be happy if you -- if it wasn't there. No, I think the -- your colleagues writing for the People's World, who seem to be in support of that particular movement, have indicated that it is not so much design to secure a recall as it is to present enough names prior to the convention, whether they are valid signatures or not, in order to prove an embarrassment and I would think that that's probably an apt description of the effort.

Q Do you think that it will succeed?

A Well, it just depends on whether I feel embarrassed or not. I don't feel embarrassed. I have an abiding faith in the good people of California. I think it is rather a shame, as I said before, that this device, which is in the constitution for a reason, is being distorted and used in a political sense and it is being used in a political sense.

Q Governor, last week you said it is the sand in the shoe. This week it is a pebble. Does this mean --

(Laughter)

A No, I tell you, I was afraid that some of you, if I said sand again -- I regretted sand last week because of the -- you know, they refer always to the sands of Florida and I didn't want you to draw a connotation from sands, so I came back to a California rock.

Q Governor, do you think that there should be any change in the recall procedure in the constitution to prevent it from being used in the way that you say it is being used against you?

A Well, now this is a -- it makes me a little self conscious, since I happen to be the particular target; for me to make some -- some movements now would sound as if they were self-serving. Let me only say that in keeping with the editorials of some of your own papers recently about the distorted use of this, that some day when the sky is clear and such thing isn't going on, it might be well to look and see if we couldn't perhaps be more specific, much as an impeachment, as to -- as to what the actual consideration should be, that would warrant such a thing. Because it is a great expense to the people.

Q Governor, are you aware that if there is an election and you are defeated that the state will pick up the tab and how much are you prepared to spend to defeat such an election?

A Well, first of all I wouldn't anticipate a defeat and I'm aware --

Q Pardon me?

A Yes, that they have to pay for the campaign.

Q You wouldn't anticipate a defeat? I say if you defeat the recall election, in other words if you win, the state picks up your expenses. Were you aware of that?

A Yes. I am.

Q Is that somewhat of a relief?

A Well, you know me, I'm on an economy binge. I would -- I'd try to do it as cheaply as possible.

Q Governor, in your reference to the People's World and its recall movement, are you implying that the recall movement is run by the communists or communist dominated or tied to the communists in any way?

A No, I just -- I just wanted to establish the point that there are those even supporting it who have been rather frank in their statements that the goal was embarrassment without too much emphasis on whether all the signatures were valid, which ties in with the reports that we received that the people have been urged to sign this even though they are not registered voters, even though they are not of a proper age, including even in some high schools.

Q Governor, how many valid signatures do you suspicion these people come up with?

A I haven't the slightest idea. I really haven't.

Q Governor, last week you did say that you detected a political movement behind the recall petition. Would you care to specify today who you mean?

A No, not today. Maybe sometime before it is over.

Q Do you know who is behind it?

A No, let me just say that I've been interested in the sudden development of the program beginning in January and that suddenly they did attract certain elements and they had funds with which to carry on quite an operation, but we will just wait it out and see what happens.

Q Can we go to a different subject? Is the state -- your administration giving up on the effort to have the state declared a community action agency by the OEO, and is this because -- if so, it is because that there's been a disappointing response from the local governmental agencies?

A No, I think there's been a great deal of misunderstanding about the state being designated as a community action agency for the OEO. This was the intent of Congress, was to allow a state -- this did not mean that the state superseded those communities that already had or were community action agencies. This gave the state the opportunity to declare itself such in order to keep from -- communities

and local governments who hadn't made themselves agencies, to keep them from being shut out. And so we took this action in conformity with the Congress' wishes. It was evidently misinterpreted to mean that they -- we were trying to monopolize the field and take over from those communities that had already established themselves. There was no such intention. Now this incidentally was the request of some communities, that the Congress make it possible. I'm a little hard put to understand why OEO should have become so upset itself, but then I'm a little surprised at some of the things OEO does anyway. And I don't know what the situation is now with regard to that, where we have progressed, Bill, on this or whether we have,

BILL: The state has not submitted a plan as yet.

A They haven't submitted a plan as yet.

BILL: We are still negotiating with the grand OEO regional.

Q Governor Reagan, in your letter last week to Mr. Bubb, the Citizens for Reagan and other delegations, you say you do not encourage them or disavow any connection with them. And say that you were not a candidate. Yet in that letter you said you will be considered as a candidate when your name is placed in nomination. How do the two compromise one another?

A There was no distortion there at all. I regret the necessity of having to send him that wire. I thought it was a courtesy in answer to his because there had come out of one of these press conferences an inference that I was actually going to stop being a Favorite Son candidate and turn our delegation loose prior to the convention. Someone has put forth the effort that he has, and certainly without very much encouragement from me, wanted to know if this was true, and I reiterated no, that I will be placed in nomination at the convention.

Q Governor, if you've been trying to turn Mr. Bubb off, as you have said several times in the past, wouldn't a good way to turn him off to have said yes, that's what you were going to do?

A Well, as I told you a few weeks ago in here, I've given up sometime ago on that. This was -- we started out trying this. The movement kept springing up. There were well-intentioned people that insisted on their right to make this effort and told me they were. And I've tried to level with them.

Q Governor, Richard Nixon has admitted being a member of a club that bars both Negroes and Jews. Do you believe that any man who aspires to be the leader of all the people should be a member of any organization that discriminates against any group on the basis of race or religion, and would you secondly, belong to any such organization?

A Well, the only time I did, I -- I withdrew, resigned and stated my reason for resigning. I think that in the customs of the past, I think it is very possible for someone to find himself in such an organization and unknowingly, because sometimes things are buried in the bylaws and haven't even been referred to for many years in these modern times, but go back to the origin of the club. I think every individual has to make that decision for himself. I personally don't favor organizations of this kind.

Q Do you think one should stay in if he aspired to national office?

A Every individual has got to make that decision for himself. As I told you, the only time I found myself in that case, I withdrew.

Q What organization is that, Governor?

A It was a country club.

Q In southern California?

A Uh-huh.

Q Governor, on another subject, the Senate yesterday passed a bill which gives state legislative employees much more generous pension plan than other state employees at an estimated state cost of \$1.8 million dollars, annually. What would be your reaction to such legislation if it got to your desk?

A Now, wait a minute, what is the status of it?

Where did you say?

Q It passed the Senate yesterday. Now it goes to the Assembly.

A Well, again I'll wait till it gets downstairs.

Q Does it fit into your economy plans?

A Huh?

Q Does it fit into your economy plans?

A I don't know, let me take a look at it.

Q Governor Reagan, what is your reaction to the Berkeley City Council turning over Telegraph Avenue to the bunch of political activists?

A I'd rather not comment on the local government's move. They were there and involved in the situation. We were aware of it certainly here, and at one time when it was violent, when the demonstrations were going on, at their request we provided highway patrolmen but that's their decision. You'd have to ask them about that.

Q Governor, the Assembly has passed Assemblyman Greene's bill to help schools in poor districts and it carries a \$50 million dollar price tag. Realistically, what chance is there of such a bill being enacted this year? Could you accept such a large expenditure?

A Well, first of all, they are going ahead with legislation upstairs on the premise of money being available, and this is taking into consideration a lot of assumptions that we have -- we, who have to be responsible for the budget cannot count on. There is not the surplus that they are talking about available for all these bills. Assemblyman Greene's bill certainly has or his ideas he expressed to me I think should be the subject of some study, more study than apparently has been given it so far; the idea of cost effectiveness, goals being set for some of these programs in education, I'd be in favor. But I think it is a little premature right now to -- the legislative language actually is a little vague on this and I think that I'd rather see several months study and with the Board of Education, the Department of Education involved in it. And then see what we can do with it.

Q Governor, sort of following up on the Berkeley situation, the Regents are meeting this week. Do you plan to make any specific proposals or suggestions in controlling future student demonstrations?

A Oh, I don't know. I'm sure that this will be on the agenda and this will be part of the subject. I intend to promote the idea I suggested before that I think the Regents should have a staff, small staff of their own, reporting directly to the Regents on the implementation of Regents policy. And to make sure that policy is being carried out in various campuses.

Q Your comments on Assemblyman Greene's bill means you are going to be vetoing the appropriations bill that come down to you on the grounds the state doesn't have any surplus?

A Well, I'm going to have to be guided by what the state's financial situation is, and the state's financial situation is very -- is very simple. We have approximately \$70 million dollars from this year. We would have had about \$140 million dollars if it had not been for the over-spending in the school bill. And you'll remember back in the numbers game, when it was being played a few months ago, why there wasn't any \$70 million dollar over-spending in education. But now they have spent it and it turns out to be \$70 million dollars. Now the Department of Education has said that next year is going to be \$80 odd million dollars, and again we are told that that isn't so. But the assumptions on there being a surplus that the Assembly is going by are the -- or the leadership of the Assembly is based on several assumptions that can't be borne out. One of them is that Senator Teale's bill will pass reducing that \$80 odd million dollars by some \$29 or \$30 million. There are some other assumptions with regard to this, is assuming that there will not be a reduction as we have asked of the state income tax. And the truth is next year's budget is still out of balance to the extent that it is spending more than the estimated revenues and is balanced on the basis of the \$70 million that remains this year over and above paying off the \$70 million dollar school over-spending.

And I would like to point out that about a hundred million dollars of the money that we had available to pay off that \$70 million and give us this added money this year is the result of economies effected administratively and without help from the legislature, without legislative changes. There were actually this many economies and savings made in the running of the government.

Q About a hundred million dollars?

A A hundred million dollars. Then there was around \$40 -- \$40 odd million dollars, you'll recall, that came in as increased revenue over and above estimates in the income tax.

Q Governor, if the legislature -- if the Senate fails to move AB 149 before it adjourns, will you call a special session in September to have another go at it?

A Oh, I haven't -- I actually haven't got too many specific plans. Incidentally, let me -- you just reminded me this again is another one of the assumptions. The assumption is that that half a cent of sales tax due to the 90 day extension is available to the General Fund for balancing the budget, and it is not. If they'd read the bill they'd find out that that is pinned down definitely for property tax relief.

Q Governor, on that subject --

Q Let's get that cleared up. Part of it is down there for property tax relief, not the whole business.

A It is my understanding -- Cap, is this -- is this true? He says that part of it is only ear-marked for property tax relief.

CAP: Well, \$39 million approximately, Governor, is ear-marked for property tax relief and about a little less than \$7 million dollars would be available for the General Fund.

Q What do you figure the surplus -- year end surplus is for next year as we stand at the moment, after signing the budget?

A Well, we can't -- we can't anticipate because of these assumptions, whether the relief for income tax will pass, whether Senator Teale's bill will pass.

Q I mean whether or not they do, how much money is there available for other spending in the General Fund?

A How much -- we don't --

CAP: Assuming Senator Teale's bill passing and assuming there is income tax relief, we believe there will be somewhere in the neighborhood of about \$19 to \$20 million dollars.

Q And assuming neither one of those passes?

CAP: Well, from the property tax relief, if Senator Teale's bill did not pass, we will then -- we would need about an extra \$30 million dollars, would use that right up. If income tax relief doesn't pass, that would just about make that \$35 million dollars and put it back to somewhere in the neighborhood of about a \$30 million dollar surplus. There are all different assumptions you have to make.

A Now, let me say one thing, lest a year from now you start talking numbers game again. Let me state to you also that we are continuing with our task force reports and programs that we think are going to begin showing further economies, money that I believe should be given back to the people by way of tax relief. Government costs too much. But there is no way in advance, if you are going to run a responsible business -- there is no way that you can just optimistically say, well, let's guess at some of these economies and pretend where everything is going to turn out right, and we are going to get them. All I can tell you is that I hope that next year I can stand here again and say we were successful for X millions of dollars in these economies and thus we didn't spend all of the budgeted amount. But we cannot earmark and pretend now over the budgeted amount that we are going to make those economies.

Q Senator Teale has been quoted as saying you would cut out the \$140 million from his Lake Tahoe -- on Z'berg's Lake Tahoe bill.

Q 140 million?

Q \$140 thousand, I'm sorry. Is that correct, that you would cut out the money and sign the bill?

A No, --

VOICE: We haven't said --

A No, there's been no statement on that and I don't even know that we have sat down to look at that or add it up.

Q Another topic. The Assembly has passed Senator Way's bill which would exempt from public utilities control dump trucks being used on public works projects. This is the same bill you vetoed last year when it was charged it would assist some Mafioso who were under prosecution and some of those prosecutions are still pending. I wonder if under that circumstance you'd be inclined to veto it again if it gets to the Senate.

A Well, let me just say in keeping with the rule about not talking about bills and so forth, let me just say that it will be given the utmost and careful scrutiny if it arrives at my desk as it was given careful scrutiny last year.

Q Have you and Senator Way had any discussion on this?

A No, I -- that's why I said we haven't had any discussion on this.

Q There is one on your desk at the moment, involving the marshals and civil process serving; it is on your desk now. Have you made any decision yet?

A No, no, as a matter of fact, when you say it is on my desk, it hasn't actually -- it's come down and I'll have to wait till we get up there and take a look.

Q Governor, are you satisfied with the operations of the Golden Gate Bridge district or do you approve of an attempt to place tighter controls on its operations, and the way it spends its funds?

A Oh, I don't think I'm prepared right now to make any flat statement on this other than to say that I know that it is high time that this whole subject did have some careful study with regard to the funds, to the tolls, to the funds that the bridge, it is my understanding, has piled up

over and above its needs.

Q Have you heard from Mayor Lindsey and Governor Rockefeller on the grape boycott or are you satisfied, you need legislation?

A Well, I don't know. The word that we heard back was that -- that the Deputy Mayor hadn't said all the things that he was supposed to have said, but -- and that the -- well, anyway we just heard back that they didn't want to go to war with California.

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

Q Wait, has New York -- have they withdrawn that order then, Governor? Have you heard from New York?

A I don't know. I really don't know.

Q Governor, are you personally aware that the Reagan for President group has bought an hour spot on a major network the evening of Sunday, July 21st?

A I'm aware that they bought a half hour time to play a film -- a film version of the speech that I did, the fund raising speech in Indianapolis and I can only tell you that -- I can't help but be proud of the fact that they want to do this. If I hadn't wanted to say those things and have an audience here, I wouldn't have said them, and I believe in what I said, and so if somebody wants to play it for the country, fine.

Q Is it being blacked out in California?

A I don't know what all they bought.

SQUIRE: Thank you again.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JULY 16, 1968

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, I see we have some visitors back there, I understand are Ron Randall's children from out of state. Glad to have you in here.

SQUIRE: Are you ready to go?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No opening statements, let her go.

Q Governor, I have a question. Recently published report by this little business magazine indicates that a poll of California--leading California businessmen are quite fond of you as Governor and want you to stay as Governor and wish in effect that you would desist any national activity. Do you have any comment on or any reaction to this?

A I'm here, and I'm grateful that that's the reason why they -- that they want me to stick around. I think that's kind of a welcome change in the news of the last few weeks. No, I appreciate that and --

Q Governor, they are starting to draw up a platform and Governor Chaffee, that is, asked some governors for some suggestions for platform. What do you think are the major things that should be in a platform? What is your present thinking along that line?

A Well, I have -- I've talked in general principals regarding law and order and the whole approach to welfare and the fiscal stability of our country, including also, I think, the necessity for a realistic look at our national interest with regard to defense. But I've -- I participated

July
16

at the last Republican Governor's Conference on a committee that sent our representatives to the Platform Committee with some recommendations in the areas of welfare, of block grants, tax sharing and so forth on the part of the Federal Government.

Q On another subject, Governor, could you give us your reaction to the --

SQUIRE: Wait a minute, let's finish this up. Any more -- over there, on this thing?

Q Yes, Governor, could you be -- now you sent those recommendations in, but could you enlighten us specifically on some of your views like on what should the platform say about Vietnam with the talks going on in Paris and what should it say specifically about law and order with the rising number of demonstrations in the country and that sort of thing?

A Now, if you'll just wait a couple of weeks, I'm appearing before the Platform Committee and I will tell you now that my -- I have never been one who believes that the Platform Committee should spell out actual specifics, methods and such as even proposed legislation. I believe that the platform should deal in some general policy positions, and this is the area in -- the kind of testimony that I will make before the committee. And it will be testimony to the effect as I said of the necessity for us recognizing our national obligations, but also expressing the view that the Vietnam conflict is in our national interest that we could not withdraw from there and simply pull out in a peace without honor, without destroying all of our Asiatic alliances and losing our friends throughout the world as they lost confidence. But in the same way, I will talk about the failure of welfare, the need to change the direction of welfare more toward jobs and helping people help themselves. But it will -- I will not deal in actual specifics as to method and I have -- as I say, I've always felt that the platform should deal on a broader policy basis.

Q Governor, four years ago Senator Goldwater thought that the platform should be a declaration of principles. Is that in general your opinion?

A Well, I know even before Senator Goldwater made that recommendation this was also the view of -- of President Eisenhower, that it should be a statement of Republican policy of our approach to these problems and this -- I've always subscribed to this belief.

Q Governor, you said you were -- you would talk about law and order. I'm sure everyone is in favor of law and order. Do you have any proposal as to how law and order can be maintained?

A Well, yes, but here again now you'd be dealing -- I have some ideas, you'd be dealing in specifics again. But I think -- I was dealing in the approach to the permissive attitude that's abroad in the land, the over-zealousness in protecting the accused's rights which is admirable until it reaches the point that they are protected at sacrifice of the rights of the innocent and again this would be in the area of broad policy.

Q On another subject. Governor, what is your reaction to the Board of Regents' vote after you left asking the legislature to override your reduction of the University of California budget?

A Well, I'm sorry that some Regents evidently allowed themselves to be drawn into what I think was a politically motivated move. And I'm wondering with regard to when they pass that, whether they included that I should or the Regents should encourage the overriding of my veto for example of the three and a half million dollars which was linked to the student fees, since the University got word to me before that bill came down or the budget came down, urging that I do veto that particular item, and I did veto and I don't know whether they have changed their mind, but I think the thing that I am a little concerned with, since this is -- it is a case of dividing up the money the state has and the priorities, and since every agency of the state government asked for more money than we were able to give it, and since the greatest amount of increase was given the colleges and the universities; there is no cut in their budget, there was simply a reduction

in the amount of increase they asked, then I would suggest that perhaps President Hitch and some of those Regents might suggest to me which services of state government they would curtail in order to find more money to give to the university to augment its budget. Would they advocate closing down some of the mental health facilities or cutting back on the aid to crippled children or in the area of law enforcement? Every service must be deemed as important to the people of California or it would not be a matter of law and included in the budget. And I'm sure that they know this. I'm sure that President Hitch with his vast experience in government at the federal level, of course -- I know that he knows this and he must be aware that if he is to get more money for the university it must come from some other essential service. Perhaps that is part of the problem, President Hitch perhaps was with the federal government so long that he's just used to deficit spending and doesn't understand it isn't legal in California.

Q Governor, he says in his report on Friday, which the Regents also adopted with only 2 dissenting votes, almost unanimously, that this budget will damage the university. Now, where is he getting his figures on which he can make this kind of conclusion and where do you get your figures to refute this?

A Well, all I can say is that since the rate of increase in spending or budget for the university is roughly the same as it has been for the last ten years, then the decline in quality of the university must have started a long time ago. I can't believe that -- that suddenly that rate of increase turned out to be not sufficient for the university. And incidentally, our budget this year reflected a decline in the number of student -- or the applications for enrollment at the university. There are less students enrolling than they had predicated their budget request on, and we had to reflect that. I think this is perfectly natural, the case that was made by all of our department heads, every branch of government, they made a good case. They

pointed out things they could do better if there was more money. There just isn't more money and I -- I can't believe that the President of the University is suggesting an increase in taxes for the people of California. If he is, he and I are on a collision course.

Q Governor, you mentioned political --

Q Do you have trouble reconciling their position that there just isn't the money for these kind of things with your advocacy of a \$35 million reduction in income taxes for the upper and middle bracket taxpayers?

A Yes, the budget was put into effect on the basis of expected revenues of the tax bill. Now, it developed that in one area -- one segment of the tax-paying public received a burden greater than had been intended. Whether that's the fault of all of us drawing up the legislation or not, it did turn out that they were unjustly imposed upon, and I think it is simple justice, equity, to level this out and not penalize one particular segment of our society more than another, and so this is the only reason. This wasn't a tax reduction from the standpoint that we have money to give back. This was simple justice to a certain group of people we had never intended to penalize them in the way in which they were penalized.

Q Governor Reagan, the University of California has hired a man to do almost full-time counseling with young men as far as the draft is concerned to try to set them in the proper way rather than burning their draft cards. What is your reaction to this step?

A Well, if it is as you say for that purpose, I think that's fine. Also, it isn't a completely new thing. In the past this has been done, done during the Korean war not only for that, but for counsel and advice to young men who might find themselves drafted in and their collegiate career interrupted, and they need help in what their situation will be, what will be to their advantage when they come back in picking up their education and so forth. So I think all of those things are involved and I think it is a -- it is a necessary

office today.

Q Governor, this type of thing will lead to a decrease in some of the problems with the draft dissenters.

A Well, if that -- if that can result, I'm all for that, too, because California happens to be, I understand, out ahead of the nation in -- with regard to draft evaders and convicted draft evaders, and those who are taking this stand and it is one of the things again in which I regret that we are a leader.

Q Governor, I was going to ask, you mentioned political motivation. Are you saying that you think President Hitch was politically motivated in his attack the other day on your budget plans?

A No, I think the motion that followed that with regard to the override put the Regents in the position of involving themselves in partisan politics.

Q Governor, you said --

Q Governor, you suggested --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Wait, wait, wait.

Q Governor, you said the university asked you to veto the section on reduction of student fees. Who asked you to do that, was it President Hitch or one of his assistants?

A It was relayed to me as the position of the University.

Q You suggested that the resolution on the veto was politically motivated. Do you think Mrs. Chandler and Regent Carter would vote for a resolution that was politically motivated against you? They were two of the votes on this.

A I'm not picking out any Regents. I simply -- I simply say that, and I said again, that they were drawn into this and I'm quite sure were sincere in the positions they took with regard to their belief that the University should have more budget, but it is regrettable.

Q Also on education, Governor, the students at San Francisco State have voted to delete money that would ordinarily have been given for intercollegiate athletics and it

suggested the state should pay that money. Do you have any comment on this?

A Well, I haven't seen all of what's going on in that complicated situation. I must say that you can trust them over there in San Francisco State to do things new and different. Usually for a losing team they fire the coach. This is the first time I heard about them firing the team.

Q It is a championship team they are firing.

A It is? In which sport?

Q Football.

A Oh, they had it? See how busy I was last Fall? I didn't get to go to the game. Somebody else with one?

Q Governor, do you have any new insights or new information as to who might be financing the recall movement?

A No. I may have some suspicions. As I have said before, I think that it was -- that, too, was politically motivated, but again I have faith in the people of California. I think it was created obviously as an embarrassment. I don't think there is any real effort made to achieve the valid signatures to achieve a recall and this, too, will pass.

Q Governor, has your office or anyone in the Republican party that you know of checked on how many petitions actually have been signed? Those people are claiming 750,000. Do you have any information to indicate otherwise that they don't have 750,000?

A The figures have bounced back and forth as to how many they have. I will be very much surprised if they come in with anything even approaching the required number of signatures.

Q Do you have anything to base that statement on? Has your office looked into the numbers?

A Just following the news that comes out and putting together -- and in fact I did a little arithmetic one day when it was announced how many signatures someone had obtained on a particular street corner in a given period of time, and if the figure was right, that meant they had gotten a

signature every 15 seconds and I doubt if they had.

Q Governor, how -- what do you feel about the resolution that was introduced yesterday calling for a _____ to the possible changes in the recall -- recall provision of the Constitution?

A Well, Mike, I said the other day that it would sound a little self-serving if I said anything about it, and once this blows over I know someone is going to do it at the time. I think it might be something that we review to make more specific what justifies a recall other than just a political difference of opinion, because that's what the election year is for, is for the political difference of opinion. And it is a needless bother and expense to the state and it is going to be a great burden on the county registrars to say nothing of the Secretary of State's office. And I think much as an impeachment, there should be probably some formalizing of -- of what justifies the recourse to the recall.

Q Another topic --

Q No, same topic.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Same topic.

Q Governor, do you think elements of organized labor are financing this recall movement against you?

A I don't know, but we know that at least one labor counsel and one union that has involved itself in this. Now, whether they voted the member's money or not, I don't know. But I sure wish the Legislature would get off the dime sometime and give the working men and women of this state the right to a secret ballot and then maybe you could have more faith when money is spent, that it reflects the will of the members of the union.

Q The Chairman of the Youth Opportunities Agency in Los Angeles says he asked for a meeting with you to discuss your veto of the Pacoima Street Scene project. Will you be meeting with him?

A I haven't seen the schedule that far ahead. I don't know whether the request has gotten here or whether

there is such a request actually made.

Q Is there any chance you might rescind your veto of the Pacoima project?

A Well, in all of these vetoes we have always made it explicit and made it plain why we are vetoing, and if the conditions can be rectified so that it is a constructive program and worth the money -- we have made changes. As a matter of fact, for every veto there have been dozens of programs in which we threaten veto unless changes were made, and the changes were made. I think the score is up around 250 or so programs that were changed at our request.

Q The Pacoima Congregational church that is sponsoring this outfit says they are trying to channel the leadership of these three gangs into constructive areas. Do you think there is a possibility or this is a losing battle from the beginning?

A No, I've always believed in salvaging human beings. I believe -- I think there is no one that's lost. You could hardly subscribe to the religious beliefs of the Judeo-Christian tradition and not believe you are supposed to try and salvage anyone you can. The idea is whether this is a practical approach and whether it was an excessively costly approach when it was running as high as \$8,000 per young man per year for this salvage operation.

Q Governor, Supervisor Warren Dorn has reported to have told the Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors today that if AB 149, the property tax relief measure, is not passed the Governor will -- Governor Reagan will veto any other approach to the problem and will call the Legislature back into special session to reconsider this -- the situation. Is that correct?

A Well, I haven't made any specific plans yet as to how I would react to that or what I will do, so -- and I would be in no position right now to announce any plans on it. I am still hopeful that we can get that bill passed because I think it is a promise that was made to the people, not just by me, but by the very Legislators who at the moment are

opposing it, and they are breaking their pledge with the people. And I'm quite sure that the voters will be reminded in November of those who did break that pledge.

Q Well, Governor, was Supervisor Dorn's statement incorrect?

A Well, it was incorrect if it implied that I actually had a plan. I don't know whether he said that or whether I had already made such a plan, because I had no consultation on this.

Q Had you discussed it with Warren Dorn at all, the possibility?

A No, only discussed with him that I am going to do everything I can to get this passed.

Q You didn't mention this as one of your alternatives?

A No.

Q Governor, this morning on the Assembly floor, Mr. Mulford was asked if he had knowledge that you intended to veto any appropriation bill on any -- in any area that the Legislature passed, and his response was that no, you will find out in a few days that that is not so. Have you -- do you have any appropriation plans now going through that you favor?

A Well, I've never taken any position other than that we will look at every one of them and weigh it against what our financial condition is, and whether the money is available and the merits of whatever appropriation comes down. This was done with regard to the vetoing of the budget, not just taking a blanket line across. We sat for hours, the whole cabinet and myself as well as some of the Legislators in going item by item over these, and we will treat with each appropriation bill the same way.

Q Governor, Congressman McCloskey of San Mateo says that he will not endorse Dr. Rafferty. Will not support Dr. Rafferty for U. S. Senate. Does this violate the 11th commandment?

A I would suggest that it does, and I would suggest that maybe a young Congressman has a little more to learn

about party loyalty, and perhaps we can change his mind about that.

Q He said they just have very basic philosophical differences between himself and Dr. Rafferty and he simply in good conscience can't do it. Now, do you think that's fair on his part or should he put aside his philosophy for the practicality?

A Did Congressman McCloskey then declare that he is perhaps in sympathy philosophically with Mr. Cranston? If so, I think that would be interesting for Republicans who supported him to learn.

Q Governor, what do you mean you might teach him something about loyalty to the -- in what way?

A I didn't mean just me, I just meant that I thought that as time went on, I think -- I've learned a few things since I've been here. I think everyone that's getting on-the-job training like he is ought to pick up a few things along the line.

Q Governor, the Legislature is trying to wind up the session now with the first one in an election year as a general session. How would you characterize the accomplishments of the session so far?

A Well, I think that there is a great deal of legislation that's of great importance to the people of California that is lying dormant or buried in committee or has failed to passage simply and largely because this is an election year, and yet in the next few weeks I will be signing more than a thousand bills and most of the people of California couldn't care less whether those bills become law or not because they were -- they will have little import or little effect on the lives of the people of California. But such things that they have been crying for for years in the area of pornography, of better crime control legislation, control in the areas of drunken driving, property tax relief, small as it is, but at least a start toward it, the Judicial Merit plan, the taking of the appointment of judges out of politics, all of these things are lying up there in the Legislature and they have been unable to get to them while they pass this --

more than a thousand unimportant bills. I would say that as the first trial out for an annual legislative session that this leaves a little to be desired.

Q Will you be asking for a Republican legislature this Fall on the ground that Harry Truman asked for a Democratic Congress in '48?

A I'll be asking for it on the grounds that I think if the people are going to get the legislation that they have indicated they want, and that is needed, that seems to be the only way to bring it about.

Q Governor, you Republicans were left a good deal responsible, say for instance on the Judicial Merit Plan. Are you holding the Democrats entirely to blame on all these?

A No, I would think in this one the people of California have made it plain in overwhelming numbers that they want the appointment of judges taken out of politics. There are evidently some Legislators who would prefer judges to be appointed on a political basis rather than on merit and I will leave it to them regardless of party to explain their position to the voters in November.

Q Governor, on that subject, specifically what is your reaction to Assemblyman Bagley's criticism of you? He said that if you really wanted law and order, you shouldn't be criticizing the judiciary all the time, and this might encourage more respect for law and order.

A Well, I think that Bill is a little guilty of exaggeration. I think he has to find out and draw a line between criticism of judicial action or policy and criticism of the judiciary as individuals. I have never done the latter. I have not been one who has assailed as individuals the members of the court or the members of the Supreme Court. But I have echoed the same criticisms that have been made by the state Supreme Courts of a majority of our states and very high-ranking members of the judiciary as well as of the legal profession who have been critical of some of the decisions of the court and this is certainly a citizen's right and whatever Bill had in mind, I don't know, but he's never voiced that criticism to me.

Q Governor, in Salt Lake the other night you offered your assessment of how the delegates looked to you right now going into Miami. Could you explain that, you elaborate on it, how do you think they stand, committed, uncommitted, undecided?

A Oh, I haven't got a hard count, but I just said that it continues just as it's been for the last several weeks, that apparently no candidate has or is within the step-over-the-line mark on the required number and therefore I reiterate my belief that it is going to be an open convention. I think that the -- the majority of -- well, I don't know whether it would be a majority, but enough of the delegates are uncommitted and are deliberately keeping themselves uncommitted until they get to the convention to insure that it is going to be a multiple ballot convention.'

Q Governor, could you explain briefly what your role would be at the convention? Do you plan to attend the general sessions yourself as a delegate or would you be -- are you going to be on the floor talking to the delegation and --

A Well, I am a delegate, so -- and Chairman of the delegation, so I will be on the -- on the floor, yes.

Q What about after your name is placed in nomination?

A You know --

Q Assuming it is.

A I'm sure you are going to ask that, and I don't know the answer to that. Never been in this spot before. I don't have anything to base it on. I can see where that -- that's going to get some consideration.

Q Why, Governor, do you think that you are regarded as a man who can head off possibly defection of Republican voters in the south to George Wallace? Do you see yourself as an alternative in any way?

A Oh, no, no. I was invited to come down there simply because those people who for a number of years have been making headway in getting the south to be a two-party system, just felt that they -- they needed some outside blood, I guess, to come down and kind of help them in a fund raiser

and stimulate a little interest in the Republican party. So I am able to accept that invitation on the same day that I leave the convention, and -- Governor's Conference in Cincinnati. I am coming home by way of that one fund raiser they have scheduled, and this was asked of me by the party simply again to -- to try and keep alive this growing movement toward a two-party system.

Q It was not so long ago, Governor, you said here that George Wallace was a Democratic problem, not a Republican problem. How do you reconcile this?

A Well, I guess now the manner in which he's raising and campaigning with his new party, he's either a third or a fourth party, whichever way you want to call it, so I don't suppose technically I can call him a Democrat. But earlier when I made that statement I was talking about views he had expressed and there seemed to be an attempt simply because he is out here campaigning and critical of the administration to seem to line those up with the Republicans, and I said, well, he's one of their own, he didn't come from our ranks, and that was the sense in which I meant that. But now I guess we have to recognize he's created a party.

Q Governor, this is on a different subject --

Q Let me finish that subject, Bill. Governor, when you are down south or someone were to ask you why shouldn't I vote for Governor Wallace, what would you tell them?

A Well, I would tell them that because I don't think that this -- based on history, the third party movements get off the ground, that if they really are so convinced that the present administration must be put out of office, their best chance for getting that done is to vote for a Republican and that -- that there seems to be no better reason than that, that they should be voting for someone that does have a chance for ousting the party in power instead of going for some long-range plan whereby they might just keep anyone from getting a majority and throw this into the House of Representatives where once again, if they do that, they have increased the chances of preserving the party in power.

Q Governor, what views of George Wallace do you disagree with?

A What?

Q What views of George Wallace do you disagree with?

A Well, now, lately on the basis of his speeches this would be kind of hard to pin down because He's been speaking a lot of things that I think the people of America are in agreement with. But I would have to say on the basis of his past record and his -- that I can't believe that he has the philosophy that I believe in, and the Republican party at heart because on his past record and as a Governor he showed no opposition particularly to great programs of federal aid and spending programs and so forth. Right at the moment he's dwelling mainly on law and order, patriotism, and so forth, and these are attractive subjects, and I'm sure that there are very few people in disagreement and I think this perhaps is responsible for some of the gains he's made.

Q Governor, you made it clear Sunday that you don't favor racist policies. What about those people who want to vote for George Wallace because they're segregationists. What would you say to them?

A Why should you ask for my opinion to --

Q Because you are going down south and you are speaking to a lot of these people.

A Well, I doubt that when I finish speaking they are going to come up individually and tell me why they voted for George Wallace and then ask whether they should or not. They seek my advice and someone asked me on an outright segregationist or racist basis, I'd have to tell them that I think racism is wrong.

Q You listed things in George Wallace's past record that you don't like. You left out his stand at the school-house door and his opposition to school integration. Was that on purpose or would you include that as things that you don't like?

A No, I would have -- I would have to include a number of those things that I don't like.

Q Governor, when you talk about Judicial Merit and

appointing judges on the basis of politics. The appointment you made of Mrs. Martin, whose husband has been for some years a lobbyist, you see no conflict between this appointment and your stand on Judicial Merit?

A Now wait a minute. Are we talking about judge appointments?

Q Yes.

A No, because I tell you as a -- Bill, everyone knows I haven't actually been appointing judges. I've made the final appointment, but voluntarily I have been subscribing to the plan that we are trying to get put into the Constitution. We have set up committees of the bar, of laymen and of judges in all the districts of the state, and every suggested name for a judicial appointment has been submitted to those boards and I have made the appointments on the basis of the ratings that come back, how they are rated. And in almost every instance, the rating has been the top rating. I say almost, because sometimes there are two or three come back so nearly evenly rated that then I have to choose between one of those, and sometimes I have made that decision on -- on an age basis, not qualifications, say choosing a younger one because of the more years of service that would be ahead, this sort of thing. But, by and large, you could say that the appointments have been made purely on the recommendations of the -- of the boards and commissions, I have chosen no one myself to be a judge.

Q Then being the wife or husband of a lobbyist would not necessarily enter into it?

A No, I think this would be taken into consideration by the board that was rating this individual.

Q But not by you?

A No.

Q Just back to politics for a moment. When you are in the south, do you think you would be discussing any of the problems of racism or racial divisions?

A You know, I don't -- basically I think I'll be talking on this trip pretty much what I've been talking in all these fund raisers, saying the same things about unity

and I think down there I should also be talking about the importance of the two parties.

SQUIRE: One in the back row there.

A But I haven't chosen.

Q Governor, back to the George Wallace thing for just a moment, I understand you to say that you think the Republicans should not vote for Wallace because this is not their best chance through the administration, and there is no better reason than that. Are you saying that there is no ideological basis in your view for people of the south to repudiate Wallace?

A Of course not. I happen to believe and I thought that was just understood -- I happen to believe in the Republican philosophy. I don't know enough about George Wallace to where he agrees or disagrees with that philosophy. I would say that on the basis of his long membership in the Democratic party and as an office-holder in the Democratic party, he many times supported things that are contrary to that philosophy, particularly in the economic field, domestic economics, government spending and so forth. I would say if the people are opposed to the present administration because of what it is doing both in the domestic scene and internationally, their best chance for getting a change that will reflect their opposition to those policies would be by way of the Republican party, a party which is polarized around the belief in state right, local rule, individual freedom.

Q Those are the things Wallace has been espousing, however, from the beginning of his campaign, Governor.

A That's right, but you also have to look at the man's whole policy. There have been others espousing things, too, in a campaign here. I noticed that Hubert Humphrey is suddenly sounding very conservative and I wonder if he will remember in December what he said in May.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

Q Last week --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: You cut Mike off there.

Q Last week Harold Stassen told that he agreed with you in effect that the convention would be open, but he said when the impasse reached between Rockefeller and Nixon they would turn to you. What is your reaction on that?

A Oh, now, Mike, come on, I heard him say that they would return -- the last time I saw him on television just the other night, he said they would turn to any one of a number of four, and he included me as one of the four and included him as one of the four, and included a couple more in there.

---oOo---