

Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
Digital Library Collections

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

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

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –
01/08/1969, 01/10/1969, 01/14/1969, 01/24/1969

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 JANUARY 8, 1969

1/8/69

Reported by

John A. Theakston

(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---

Q Before you start, Governor, could you divulge the big secret so that some of the men can be on their way?

A I used to play in some of those pictures when they had to run for the phone and get jammed at the door.

Q Give me a re-write.

A No. You got the line wrong, Bill. The line was with your hat. You have the hat on the back of your head and you say, "Give me the city desk. I got a story that will crack this town wide open.

I got to open with a little reminiscence if you don't mind. You have all been so busy. When I was a sports announcer many years ago, from the first game on, on Friday night I predicted I would win the game the next day and they lost. The next Friday night I predicted they would win that game. This went on right up to the last game of the season. Every Friday night I predicted they would win and the next day they lost. The last game of the season they were playing one of the top-rated teams in the country. I again predicted they would win, and they did upset the team and won. And I was the only commentator in the country that picked Iowa to win that day. A tough team.

And so, gentlemen, you can be guessing and guessing. But the new Lieutenant Governor is going to be Congressman Ed Reinecke. Ed was notified yesterday. I didn't make the decision until then. Bob Finch was notified, of course, at the same time. I called him in Washington and asked if Bob and Ed would get together back there and do the same thing

because of the shortness of the notice, instead of trying to get him out here for this meeting. So when they finish, they will be holding a press conference back there for the same purpose.

Q What were the overriding reasons for your decision to appoint Congressman Reinecke?

A Well, as you can well imagine, this has been a very difficult choice for me. Actually my problem was any embarrassment of riches. We have a wealth of manpower capable of performing that job. And some of the considerations, for example, were our own legislature. You all know and you yourself have speculated on the problem, the narrowness of the margin. It just would have been unthinkable to toy with that. In our own shop, in my staff and the executive branch, there were several, all whose names have been mentioned by you: Gordon Luze, Cap Weinberger, Spence Williams, Vern Sturgeon. And over the weeks as I went over each one of those names, I realized that I was in a position where, frankly, I just couldn't break up what I think is a most capable team. Every time I thought about one of them as the Lieutenant Governor, I thought I would be asking him to keep the same job he has and be Lieutenant Governor, too. I realize that wouldn't work because I just couldn't do without them. And up and down the state I have touched base with all the party leaders, with people who have been prominent in party activities, and I have contacted all of them. There was a great variety of opinion as to individuals, but there was a great consensus on the need for someone who was young, energetic, a vote-getter in the party with a future in public life. Ed Reinecke fit all of these. Ed Reinecke was a very successful businessman. So philosophically we are in agreement on the goals and aims of the creative society. He is a proven vote-getter, articulate, able to expound his philosophy and his beliefs. And he believes in what we are trying to do. I made the decision on those bases.

Q Did his contribution to the gubernatorial race in 1970 figure into your decision?

A Well, this was one of the things. And this consideration would have fit practically in with all of the others that I named. The idea that someone in this position, as I say, would have a political future in public life. In other words, it wouldn't just be a holding action. This was a consideration based on his own ability and his own record in his district to win public approval.

Q How would you equate your political philosophy with his? Is it comparable or --

A Yes. A belief in more emphasis on the private sector, local autonomy, less big government and bureaucratic control.

Q Would you call him a conservative-moderate?

A I don't use those labels any more. Let me say he is a believer in the creative society.

Q Assemblyman McGee said he definitely will campaign for Mr. Reinecke's seat. What happens to the legislative balance if he wins?

A I did my best in that regard. Obviously anyone is free if they want to do something of that kind. I did my best to give consideration to that. I can't comment on what some other individual might do.

Q Was Congressman Reinecke one of the names favored originally by Lieutenant Governor Finch as his successor?

A No. Bob and I have had some discussions about the whole general subject, about the names that have been discussed. At all times, Bob left this completely in my hands.

Q He didn't recommend any particular names?

A No. Nor did he attempt to persuade me on anyone. As he said to you earlier in that little press meeting we had upstairs when he first came back to announce he was going to Washington, he said his responsibility was to make that decision and my responsibility was to pick a successor.

Q How early did Reinecke's name come into the picture?

A How what?

Q How early did his name come into the picture?

A Fairly early. Of course, there was a wide variety of names that were suggested as the weeks went on from communities, supervisors, city councilmen and a few mayors.

Q I'm not sure of the implication in your reply to this question about 1970. Were you saying that you picked him to bring him along as the prospective gubernatorial candidate that year?

A No, no. As I say, someone interested in a future public life. No, this wasn't what I had in mind, but someone who would be interested in either continuing in that office, at least continuing in politics on the part of the ticket.

Q What was Lieutenant Governor Finch's reaction when you told him about your decision?

A He was delighted. He knows Ed also. But I'm sure that would have been true of any one of the other very competent and capable people. As I say, the problem was an embarrassment of riches.

Q Did you ask Assenblyman McGee not to run for Congressman Reinecke's seat in order to keep the legislative balance?

A No. I have spoken to no one about that. There have been no things such as commitments or anything with regard to this. I have spoken to others whose names have been mentioned to tell them of my decision yesterday. I unfortunately was not able to get to all of them. But there has been no such thing as a commitment or asking anyone not to.

Q Could you give us your latest thinking on your own plans for running for re-election in 1970?

A Well, Bill, you know that this is too early for such a thing as that. We have a chore to do here in the present session. I have told you before that I would be reluctant to leave a job half finished.

Q Did the possibilities of your running in 1970 play a major part in the selection of the new Lieutenant Governor?

A No.

Q Would you regard the new Lieutenant Governor as more conservative than the old Lieutenant Governor?

A Let me say that at all times Bob and I were in agreement on the goals of the creative society. He was a member of the team. He was a participant in the decision by way of all the cabinet meetings just as the new Lieutenant Governor Reinecke will be, and so I anticipate no change in that.

Q When do you expect Congressman Reinecke to come to Sacramento?

A I'm going to be talking to him again today. I hope very quickly. I know for sure that he can arrange to get out to California for the weekend and I hope to have him here if I can get him here a little earlier than that. Of course, this was pretty short notice for him because, as I say, he was called only yesterday. And I will hope to have him here. And when we get him here, we will present him to you gentlemen for your questioning.

Q Governor, when do you plan to call a special election now for this seat and also for Senator Miller's seat? Have you given that any consideration?

A I expect to move just as quickly as I can. You recognize, of course, there is a slight technicality in regard to this appointment. You must delay something about this because technically Bob Finch is still Lieutenant Governor until the inauguration and until he is confirmed by the Senate. Therefore, Ed Reinecke is technically still a congressman and simply a designate for Lieutenant Governor. So until this is actually official and legal, we have to accept they are still holding those offices.

Q Was anyone else sought for the Lieutenant Governorship that was offered the post and then turned it down?

A Dr. Parkinson made it plain when his name began to be talked about that he was not interested. This would be the only actual turndown.

Q But this was someone who was actually offered it

and then he turned it down?

A Well, no. No one was offered it, no. I leveled with you at all times. I kept my mind completely open during the entire process of getting all the input I could from up and down the state, and then I went in a dark room, sat down by myself and made the decision. The decision was finalized yesterday.

Q Was that question of the political balance of the Legislature the final determining factor between Mr. Reinecke and others?

A Let me say that when it came down to the final moment of decision, I had to weigh that. I did not close the door, as I told you many times. And when I came down to the final decision, I had to weigh in both instances not only the Legislature but, as I say, our own team, our own cabinet. Finally in the last analysis I had to rule that I just couldn't do that, I couldn't break up that legislative team, and I just realized that in thinking of those in my own shop that every time I thought of them, as I told you, I had in mind them doing both jobs. And I realized I just couldn't do it. I realized also that I just was unwilling to do without them -- I mean, those that have been named up there.

Q I understood you said you would be reluctant to leave a job unfinished. Is that more or less opening the door for 1970?

A Let me say I stuck a piece of paper in the hinges so none of you would slam the door on me and lock it.

Q When did you last see Congressman Reinecke?

A He was up here a few weeks ago on business and dropped into the office for a few moments. We had a chat. He did not at any time touch on this particular thing. Let me say again, none of the people whose names have been mentioned have campaigned. They have all stood back and waited the decision. There has been no effort on the part of anyone to persuade me.

Q Who did carry the ball for Congressman Reinecke then? Who was his supporter in your circle of advisors?

A As I told you, up and down the state there was no consensus. There was a consensus on the general idea of not having, say, a holding action, but of getting someone who, to use a cliché, was a comer. And all of the names that you have speculated about, all of them had support. Generally, all of the names that had been mentioned the general opinion was that there would be pretty general satisfaction with my choice whenever it was made and whoever it was.

Q Is there any decision on Senator Miller's vacancy?

A No. Again, I shall do it as quickly as possible. This tragedy was very sudden. My mind didn't immediately turn to that kind of action. And now with getting the session underway, I just have not had time to pick a date. But it is my intention to do it very quickly and to have it just about as quickly as we can.

Q Now that the AFT strike seems to be spreading, Governor, to the other state colleges, what do you see as the immediate solution for the state college problem now? You outlined some legislative answers yesterday, but how about your immediate problem?

A The immediate problem is that, as you know, we do not have strikes of public employees. The Educational Code provides that five unauthorized absences from class is grounds for a termination or resignation on the part of the individual involved. I have been working with the Director of Finance and the Controller to insure also, in conformity with the law, that there will be no pay for those who are taking these unauthorized absences. I am sure this comes as a surprise to some of them, that they are off salary while they are out there absent from their classes. And we will take action in conformity with the law when the five days goes by. The law makes it very clear that there can be no question but that this move on the part of some of the faculty is tied in to the action by the dissidents. They have made as an integral part of their demand the student demands. Strangely enough, one of those student demands is a demand that one of the members of the

administrative personnel of the college be fired simply because a group of students disapprove of that individual. This seems a little strange to be supported by other members of the administration and --.

Q Are the striking members of the faculty being notified that they are not being paid? Did they know this?

A I assume they do. I think that they do at least at San Francisco,^(State) I am sure they should be aware of it, of the law. And all I'm doing is ensuring that the law is upheld.

Q Governor, when you spoke the other day of keeping the school open at the point of a bayonet if necessary, were you speaking particularly of the National Guard?

A No. Let me make one thing plain on that because the gentleman is here who asked several questions with regard to the academic atmosphere. I did not use that phrase with regard to keeping the school open. I have used that phrase before in a different context. It is rather interesting that it only now seems to get so much attention. Two years ago in the campaign during a great deal of questioning by members of the press, not just the Capitol press corps but out on the campaign trail, about civil rights, I made an observation then that I believed that if anywhere in this country the citizens' constitutional rights were being violated by another individual or by a group or even by a government, it was the responsibility of government to protect and enforce those constitutional rights at the point of a bayonet if necessary. The question the other day had to do not with the keeping of the campus open. It had to do with the rights, the academic atmosphere, those who wanted to study. I answered that I thought it was necessary that force be used to protect them in those rights. And then I said that the rights of the student who wanted to go to school and wanted to study, the rights of the teacher who wanted to continue teaching, they had to be protected at the point of bayonet if necessary, the phrase coming back to me from the previous observation meaning that there

was no limit other than the limit as to the force that is available to me when someone's rights are involved. But I think I am duty-bound by my oath to protect those rights with whatever force is available. This is what I meant by that expression.

Q Could you clarify for us a little more clearly your reference to the five-day limitation? Are you saying that after five days on strike an instructor at the state college loses his job?

A This is the Educational Code. It says five unauthorized absences from class.

Q And you are enforcing that?

A No other choice. I took an oath one minute after midnight.

Q Do you have any plans for filling the vacancies that might occur under this policy?

A No. The Governor doesn't hire or fire professors. And I wouldn't have it any other way than it is at present. The proper administrative authorities of the college make those decisions.

Q Governor, do you know how many teachers have already lost pay because of this five-day rule?

A No, I don't. And I also don't know how many belong to the AFT because so far they have been most reluctant and no one in the college administration has been able to obtain any figures as to the membership of the AFT. I am inclined to believe it is smaller than some of the figures that have been tossed about.

Q Can I have just a slight clarification of the pay versus the five-days? Do I understand that immediately when a professor takes an unauthorized absence in a strike situation, he is removed from the payroll?

A It is docked from the time of the absence.

Q Governor, is there any set of conditions at San Francisco State that you can foresee it might be advisable to close that campus?

A I can't foresee any at this time. I suppose some

great catastrophe could, some emergency where we would have to declare a state of emergency. The great tragedy that President Hayakawa has shown by his own actions and the efforts that he has made that there are many of the demands which are very acceptable, and that he has tried to institute already, and he has made faster progress than has been made in the last two years in the implementing of the black studies for example, the ethnic studies groups. And this much progress could be made if the dissidents would stop their unlawful conduct in an atmosphere of order, and have confidence in a man who has an unblemished record as a faculty member, who has made it evident that he believes in progress on campus and has been a part of many of the progressive moves on that campus. This is why I have to challenge the motives of the dissidents, I have to challenge that they are deliberately seeking provocation to bring chaos and a disruption as a takeover of power, a power grab, and that they are not sincere in their ideas of coming closer to a solution of the urban problems, the problems of discrimination or anything else. It is tragic that they have managed to lure some well-intentioned but misguided individuals, both faculty and students, into joining or supporting their efforts. I claim their effort is one that is nothing more than seeking anarchy and the takeover of the educational system.

Q Many of these demands that you say have some merit are not new demands. Why have they not been put into effect before?

A Well, for one thing you would have to ask the academic senate, the faculty senate at San Francisco State. They have been studying it, the ethnic studies program, for two years. While studies have been instituted, many of them are in separate departments. The idea of consolidating them into one school or one department, this has been furthered in these few weeks of chaos and disruption more by Dr. Hayakawa than at any time in the last two years. I don't mean to be disrespectful to the academic community.

It is true that sometimes in the academic atmosphere they do love to debate and discuss, and time goes on and they don't implement it. Dr. Hayakawa has shown an inclination to implement.

Q Is this likely to contribute to the feeling on the part of the dissidents that perhaps this is, after all, the way to achieve what they want because, as you point out, it has not come about until after this agonizing chaos there on the campus?

A Well, I doubt it because a great many of the students who are doing this in many instances weren't there over the last two-year period. As a matter of fact, many of the dissidents who are doing this are students only recently admitted under the new federal program of the admission of students who do not meet the normal educational requirements.

Q If I could change the subject, are you planning on moving out of your home on 45th Street, or are you going to renew the lease there that is expiring?

A I don't know. When I get the answer to that one, I will be the happiest fellow in the world. We are coming to the end of the lease. I don't know what the disposition will be, whether we will be house hunting or not. I can give you one positive answer. We are not moving back to the place we moved out of.

Q Are you doing anything to have Professor Hayakawa made permanent president?

A No. This subject to my knowledge has not come up. I am in constant touch with the trustees and with Chancellor Dumpke's office, but in the heat of all that is going on, there has been no talk of this. I saw the other day that Dr. Hayakawa, in answer to that question, announced he was not interested, that he was an educator and a teacher and that he looked forward to returning to that.

Q Do you think that under Dr. Hayakawa's presidency that there has been a satisfactory education being given at San Francisco State College at this point?

A Far more satisfactory than was being given prior to

it. You have the same chaos and the same disruption but you didn't have students who wanted to go into class or have an opportunity to learn. The school is open. There is controversy over how many are getting the education, but our figures indicate a very sizable percentage are being taught. Some people are taking their figures from those departments and those classes whose teachers are out on the picket line. Granted, they are very scarce. When you move over into other departments that are not participating in the strike, you find there is a very good level of attendance. I talked to a professor some time ago on the phone who, previous to Hayakawa's takeover, had at his own expense rented space out in the city and was teaching his students out in these quarters. The day that Dr. Hayakawa was appointed, he cancelled that and moved back into his classroom. Incidentally, this is a professor, who among others, related to me the threats, the physical threats, that have been made against him and against his students for going to class or for trying to meet their own rights as students and as teachers. And these threats have been up to and including threats of death.

Q (Question not heard by reporter.)

A I think we have to once again fall back on something I said before. It is time that all of us recognized that in this particular area we live in, not just here, but in all of California, there is an element in the land, ^(dissidents) aiming at insurrection, that preaches a code of violence, that preaches violent takeover and violent destruction of the status quo, the establishment or whatever you want to call it. We had a little experience ourselves with attempted fire bombing at our own home. This type of thing, these threats of violence, the idea of students marching into offices with a list of students that they wanted admitted, and doing it at knife-point, ordering who he should admit to the college at knife-point, this is not just student unrest, this is not just youthful exuberance or youth wanting more of a voice in what is going on. I believe in youthful dissent,

I believe in young people wanting change. We all benefit from this. It is the new surge of thinking that comes in with every younger generation. We all did it at one time ourselves. Sometimes the causes were different. But it is done in a manner that does not impose upon other people's rights. And this is why I believe that the only solution when you have this element doing this is that you either fight or surrender. If you surrender, then they have won a victory and they have taken over. And I believe that law and order, the ability to progress in a peaceful manner, the respect for other people's rights, requires that society today take its stand against this bargaining force and make it plain that society does not have any retreat, that it will stand firm on this line. They are going to grow more violent. It is tragic. There are going to be tragedies throughout the country as there have been already, and as there were in Chicago. They have delivered the ultimatum. I think a little more attention should be given the fact that the dissidents at San Francisco State are the ones who first said, "Our demands are not negotiable," at knife-point literally, at fire bomb point, "you must give in to all that we ask."

Now, it doesn't take a genius to figure out that if you give in to that, then they are back the next day. I for one believe that this country is too big, has come too far, and the people of this country too decent and law-abiding, to start paying off to blackmailers at this point in our history.

Q There is a group in California and nationally using all of the acceptable methods you refer to in addition to their youthful exuberance seeking legislation to lower the voting age from twenty-one to eighteen. I wonder if you take them seriously?

A Oh, I do take them seriously. I talk to many of these young people myself. I don't have a closed mind on that subject. I lean the other way. And I pointed out to them some of my thinking about that. For one thing, I think

a lot more study is needed on this as to whether all young people at eighteen are of the same degree of maturity. They themselves admit they aren't. Also I'm concerned about the fact that no politician, no political party, would be able, or could afford to not move in and organize or attempt to organize the campus once you've lowered the voting age. All of these are things that I think need more study than anyone has given them.

Q Do you think there's any need for the tougher conflict of interest law opposed by Mr. Unruh as it relates to the Executive Branch of government?

A I can't say that I have studied all of this proposal. I believe, of course, in the public's right to know, but I do believe also there is a line of personal privacy where the public business is not affected and therefore the individual need not declare. But I believe if you check the actual code and the laws that we have, you will find that they are basically pretty effective. Frank Lanterman was the father of this kind of legislation here in California, and I would suggest a review. They held extensive hearings over a long time. It took him a period of years to further and promote all of this. I think that you will find that we have a pretty sound provision. If there are loopholes that need closing, I am all for closing the loopholes.

Q Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

Joint
PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN & *Lieutenant - Governor -*
Designate Ed Reinecke

HELD JANUARY 10, 1969

Reported by
John A. Theakston

(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)

1/10/69

---o0o---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Ladies and gentlemen, may I say that Congressman Reinecke and soon should be Lieutenant Governor Reinecke has had his first experience in learning about the airport and tule fogs in Sacramento. He was due here at 8:30 this morning. He just walked in. He has been airborne most of that time. So I am happy to present him to you. I'm sure you will all have questions for him. The designate for Lieutenant Governor, United States Congressman Ed Reinecke.

CONGRESSMAN REINECKE: Thank you for your patience, Governor. I am sorry about this morning, but I guess you understand it better than I do. As a matter of fact, there was even something before the airplane that didn't get here, which was something mechanical about the helicopter in Los Angeles. So this was bound to be a tough day.

I particularly am pleased to be here, and I want to thank the Governor for this great opportunity that is now presented to me. I am anxious and eager to get to work up here, and I can't wait until we can take care of some of the mechanical problems of moving a family and three children in about ten days and so I can find out where the office is and really get down to work.

I don't know that I should make any particular statement right now. I think probably it might be just as well to answer some specific questions so that we can get

to something of greater interest to you people. I have watched the Governor's program very carefully and I do support it fully, and I'm looking forward to augmenting it not only in the Senate but implementing it wherever throughout the state I possibly can.

Q What programs are you talking about that the Governor and you approve of?

A Generally speaking, the creative society.

Q What was your motivation in leaving your career in Congress to come to California to become the Lieutenant Governor?

A I guess you have to say, why did I go to Congress in the first place. I was a businessman. I was president of a small manufacturing concern. I felt the need for some business sense in government. I didn't see that at the state level, I didn't see it at the federal level. As a matter of fact, what happened here in Sacramento in 1958 is what changed me from a Democrat to a Republican.

Q Were you a Democrat up to 1958?

A Until 1960, yes, sir.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: We have a great many things in common.

CONGRESSMAN REINECKE: So I just decided there was an opportunity, I felt there was a need, I decided to go for Congress. I didn't come to Sacramento first. I was fortunate enough to get elected in 1964. Now I think here's a greater opportunity. And I believe an administrative or executive position offers greater potential for service than does a legislative position, though both of them are equally important and certainly valuable. I see this as an opportunity to expand my capabilities, and particularly now I want to concentrate in California --.

Q Do you plan to run for Governor?

A I have no such plans at the present time.

Q Did you talk about it with the Governor?

A No.

Q Do you think you should?

A If he wants to talk to me about it, that's fine. I am here as Lieutenant Governor to back up his programs. What the future holds -- I might say right now, I don't mind announcing my candidacy for re-election in 1970 for Lieutenant Governor. Beyond that I don't think I have anything to say.

Q Would you describe for us what kind of Republican you are, your philosophy?

A I don't like labels to start with, so I avoid that, if you don't mind. I think when it comes to financial matters, you will find me liking balanced budgets, liking responsible business attitudes toward revenues and expenditures. I suppose that makes me somewhat conservative, although, as I say, I don't like the labels.

 When it comes to the more human issues, I suppose I'm pretty much the same way, but I don't read that label the same as a lot of people read it today. I see a true conservative as a person who really wants to conserve the individual rights of everyone, and as such these labels become meaningless. This is what I don't like them. The people who claim to be marching for various purposes call themselves liberals, and yet I find myself in great sympathy with the objectives of their particular purpose of the moment although I don't always agree with their methods.

Q How would you describe the creative society? What is your understanding of it?

A A society which, first of all, is sensitive to the desires and the needs of the people, that attempts to accomplish the clearly defined objectives of that society and attempts to accomplish those objectives as much as possible but involving the private sector by involving the responsibility of the individual and by providing the greatest possible incentive for individual accomplishment of those objectives.

Q What point of view do you plan to take to your post on both the Regents and the state college Board of Trustees?

A This is a very serious problem and I want to do a lot of work on this, a lot of reading on this. I must confess that I have not read as much detail as I have, as I want to. But certainly I will say that state colleges as well as any other state institutions are public property, are paid for by the taxpayers and cannot be and must not be and as far as I'm concerned, will not be shut down by any group. If they have some complaints, there are grievance procedures, and I will back those grievance procedures to the hilt. Perhaps there are modifications that might be made in some of those procedures. I don't know. I am willing to listen. I have a completely open mind and I have a very sympathetic ear to all causes. As far as I'm concerned, if the people who are expressing their grievances want solutions, I will work very hard to find those solutions. But I'm not going to do it under threat of duress. I have no intention of yielding to ultimatums.

Q What is your view on the current situation at San Francisco State and the walkout by the professors and some of the militant students?

A I would like to pass on that simply because I don't know what the real complaint of the teachers is. I don't sympathize with the militant aspect, the attitude, of the students. The teachers, I am told, are sympathizing with the students. This to me doesn't fit right, and I want to know more about that before I take a firm position.

Q You indicate you are willing to consider more negotiations, however, with the administration and --.

A I have a completely open mind towards anything. If there needs to be a modification of grievance procedures, I am willing to talk, yes, but I don't intend to yield to ultimatums and to intimidation.

Q What discussions have you had with the Governor about your role here in California?

A Very brief. Do you want to answer that?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, we have not had much of an opportunity to talk. We are in agreement in the

few words that we have had. We had intended to have a meeting, the two of us, and have some time to discuss a great many of the details of the new position prior to this meeting with you. Then we had the airplane difficulty. Next time take the train. But the little bit that we have had time to talk, we are in agreement about the same things, and that is to make this particular position far more important so that he will be an active participant in the Executive Branch of government instead of what has been characterized too often in the past as a position of anonymity where he simply presides at the Senate.

Q What is your schedule now, Congressman? Are you going to stay here until after the 20th?

A I will stay here until this afternoon, and then I am going back to Los Angeles, I hope, this evening. I will probably be back up either Sunday or Monday to solve some of the staff problems, the housing problems, et cetera. My wife will be with me at that time. Then we will go back for the inauguration, returning here immediately after.

Q Have you had an opportunity to talk with the Lieutenant Governor Finch about the new job?

A Briefly, yes. I had lunch with him the day before yesterday.

Q What advice did he give you?

A Well, it was a difficult lunch because this was his first time in the Capitol Hill Club on the Hill and it was my first time in the Capitol Hill Club after the Governor made his announcement. As a matter of fact, it was sort of a simultaneous thing. You gentlemen seemed to have found a leak somewhere in the information circuits around here, so, therefore, people were congratulating both of us on a constant basis. I do have a pocketful of notes he gave me right here giving me some idea about the budget, the administration of the budget, the type and size of staff I need and briefly a quick rundown on some of the boards and commissions.

Q Did he indicate to you what he thought would be the

toughest part of your new role?

A Just finding time to do everything that you would like to do. That probably is not the answer you were looking for, but he didn't make any specific recommendations.

Q Congressman, do you see your role as Lieutenant Governor, perhaps, as a liaison between California and Washington more so than has existed before because of your background?

A I intended to make it that way, yes. I have many friends in Congress. I think these will certainly yield to all benefit out here. And I do intend to keep as close as possible contact. I have discussed this with several members on both sides of the aisle of the California delegation in Washington, and I'm looking forward to a much tighter relationship.

Q Did you play an active part in the Goldwater presidential campaign?

A No, sir. I was running as a challenger for the first time in 1964, and I felt it was a very strong Democratic registration district, and I ran pretty independent.

Q Did you support him?

A No, I did not.

Q Where do you stand on the issue of capital punishment?

A Well, generally speaking, I would still support capital punishment. I think this is something we need to talk about. I want to review statistics. I have never faced the problems dealing with this directly, and so I have not spent a lot of time on it. But I do feel that capital punishment is a deterrent to crime. I know there are statistics that sometimes countermand that, but until I'm a little more convinced, I will still stand by capital punishment where absolutely necessary.

Q Had you given any thought, Congressman, as to whom you might support as your successor in Congress?

A Yes, I have thought about it. A number of

people have stepped forward. I can name ten or twelve that have contacted me.

Q Did you take a stand in the senatorial primary last year between Kuchel and Rafferty?

A No, I did not, no. I avoid Republican fights.

Q Does the fact that City Councilman Potter stepped off your airplane in Los Angeles yesterday indicate any --.

A No. J. B. is a very close personal friend and an even closer personal friend of my public relations man, Mr. Bob McGee whom many of you know. He just came along for the ride. I will not endorse Mr. Potter or anybody else in this primary.

Q Have you had an opportunity to meet with Hugh Burns or have you met with any of the members of the Senate?

A Not officially, not yet. I am meeting with Mr. Burns this afternoon.

Q Congressman, how do you understand your name came into the attention of the Governor in this selection process?

A I really don't know how I first became -- first was tossed into the hat. I was aware that it was here about mid-November or late November, I guess it was, and I was pretty much in the dark and wondering about it myself from thereon.

Q At one time had you been considering running for mayor of Los Angeles -- and why did you decide not to run?

A A number of people were trying to convince me to run. The job never fascinated me or intrigued me. I have said no for a year and a half or maybe two years to people who wanted me to run and they wouldn't let go and they began putting out information. Well, I guess they were testing, but they were doing it on their own. I never intended to run. I would not yield a seat in the Congress for a seat in the City Hall.

Q During the time Governor Reagan was considering several people for this job, he was obviously doing so with great deliberation before you were told you were

picked. Did you have the idea that the man who eventually was chosen might be the man the Governor would want to replace him as Governor?

A Well, I think any time a man appoints someone as his lieutenant, I think that has to be a possible eventuality for any reason. I don't know that he looked at it as a point of necessarily running in succession on an election basis, but as Lieutenant Governor, I will stand in for the Governor any time he is out of the state and any other eventuality that might occur. So I think that has to be a major consideration though certainly not the total one.

Q When the day comes that Governor Reagan does step out of that job, will you expect his endorsement at the primary?

A I would have to ask Governor Reagan about that. Again I take a very strong position. I like the people to have their choice. And I don't endorse primaries as has been asked here this morning and I would not expect the Governor to endorse me. If I haven't demonstrated my ability by that time, why, then I think I would let him off the hook.

Q Doesn't your response to the question about your being a candidate for mayor conflict with your statement of why you took this job in the first place? You said that the administrative potential provided the opportunity for greater service than the legislative would.

A That's true, except in the case of the Mayor of Los Angeles, number one, the city has a very weak charter so that the administrative possibilities are not as strong as they are in this position; and, number two, there is a lot of muddy politics around Los Angeles. I am not sure that this should be quoted, but nevertheless it is there. And it is just not a job that intrigues me. I think there is greater potential, and in particular, I think I could do more in the House of Representatives than I could as a mayor.

Q Congressman, one striking similarity between you and the Governor is that you both used to be Democrats.

Would you explore that a little bit?

A Well, I didn't know him at that time and I'm sure he didn't know me. I voted for Harry Truman in 1948 and I voted for Eisenhower in '52 and '56. Then I changed to a Republican and voted as a Republican since. At the time I felt that I was -- my philosophy was that of the Democratic party. I feel now the Democratic party philosophy and my philosophy is basically the same, but I think the Democratic party, the leadership, at least, has changed its direction dramatically and left me with the old line, may I say, Jeffersonian Democrats.

Q The Government said he used to be a bleeding heart liberal. Would you say you were a former bleeding heart liberal?

A I don't know that I would use that same adjective, but I was pretty wild in college. I didn't demonstrate, but I sure had some ideas.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: In your questioning, I am learning even more things than I knew before. The similarities are cropping up to such an extent that you and I may become known as the gold dust twins in politics.

Q Congressman, your predecessor was elected by 3,800,000 Californians, and you have a job as a result of one vote, sort of a one-time one vote.

CONGRESSMAN REINECKE: Right.

Q Can you exercise any independence?

A Well, I am an independent person. The Governor and I did not discuss this. Yes, I think I can exercise my independence. I intend to be that person. Fortunately we think alike so much of the time. You may not think so, but I do intend to act very independent. I have been called down several times for it in Washington, and I may be called down for it here a time or two.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Let me assure you that that independence will be appreciated, and let me point out that once the appointment is made that has a constitutional officer in his own right and is beholding to no one from that point on except the people of the State of California.

And I certainly wouldn't in any way seek to change or impose on it or violate the constitution where that prerogative remains.

CONGRESSMAN REINECKE: Thank you, Governor. I think it will provide a stronger team if we have two independent thinkers.

Q Does your flat statement that you will seek a election as Lieutenant Governor in 1970 mean that Governor Reagan has assured you that he is going to seek re-election?

A He has not assured me of anything in that regard. I have not asked him.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I think that was probably one of the more tactful things that has been said here this morning.

Q Is there any chance you might run for the United States Senate if George Murphy doesn't run?

A No. I would like to stay here. I am not a puddle jumper. I don't intend to be jumping back and forth. It was a big decision to move from Washington, and now that I am here, I would like to do a good job here. So I don't anticipate leaving.

Q Would you be bringing any of your staff here with you?

A Possibly one lady.

Q Would you like to see a system of payroll withholding?

A I have opposed this for a long way back, and I would still oppose it.

Q Governor Reagan was sworn in a few minutes past midnight. I wonder if you are going to follow that tradition?

A I really don't know that.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: He may not have the same reason or pressure on him to be sworn in as early as I was.

A I will be back at the inauguration, and conceivably Bob Finch's confirmation will be acted upon on the day of the 20th and I couldn't possibly tend to my resignation and get back in time to require a one minute after midnight

type of thing.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Would you fellows be mad if we found out we could swear him in in Washington one minute after the confirmation?

Q What is your opinion on full disclosure? That seems to be a topic of discussion here?

A Full disclosure of political contributions? I have no compunctions against any disclosure of any kind.

Q How about personal holdings?

A Well, to a limit. I would say yes, we should have full disclosure. I don't think it is necessary for a man to bare his soul completely. Unfortunately political officeholders are subjected to a great deal of scrutiny and sometimes unfairly so. I think to completely yield all information about a man's own financial holdings is not necessary unless it has a bearing on some of the offices or the points of influence of the office he holds.

---oOo---

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JANUARY 14, 1969

Reported by

JOHN A. THEAKSTON

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

GOVERNOR REAGAN: My opening statement is good morning, you take it from there.

Q. Governor, do you plan any change in your approach to getting through the legislature your bills? Are you going to take a more personal role in talking to the legislators and meeting with the new Republican leadership?

A. Well, from the very first, we have tried to find the best answers and the best procedure for keeping personal contact and being available to them for when they have questions or want to consult on anything and we just continue to modify as we find better ways to do things.

Q. On San Francisco State College, the secretary of the Secretary of Labor Council, Mr. George Johns, said he was holding negotiations, or was about to, which he thought would end the teachers' strike, and that they were called off on a directive or an order from you by Mr. Meriam. Is that true?

A. No, What he is talking about is that Mr. Johns went into a courtroom where there was a hearing being held with regard to the attorney general's injunction and stated that negotiations were being held. And this was not true. To my understanding there has been no authorization by the Board of Trustees for such negotiations. The law makes it very explicit with regard to the inability of the Trustees to negotiate with a group such as the AFT that does not represent the faculty. And so to my knowledge there are no negotiations that have been ----. Mr. Johns was in error in saying this. If Mr. Johns is referring to negotiations that the Labor Council could have been having with the AFT trying to determine whether they are

having a strike or not, you will have to ask him about that.

Q To your knowledge will the San Francisco State teachers who will go five days not teaching without a legitimate excuse, would they be fired?

A We have no choice in the matter. That is the law. The difficulty right now is the discovery that the San Francisco State administrative procedures under the recent regimes until the present have been so sloppy with that regard, and the great difficulty with regard to the keeping of records and establishing those who are now eligible for this discharge on the basis of their performance. But this is the thing that has been pointed out to Dr. Hayakawa and to others who didn't understand. But this isn't a case of where we have any right of decision. This is the law. It is up to us to use every means we can to see whether the law has been violated.

Q Have you seen any reason for optimism for settlement of the San Francisco State problem?

A No. I wish I could be optimistic. We have to continue in the present lawful manner in trying to keep this school open for those students who are desperately trying to get an education. We could cite a number of incidents of individuals over there -- and I am sure they are typical of thousands -- who have sacrificed a great deal. This is not the normal type of college student: Working people, men with families, women with families who have been working and at the same time trying to get an education to better themselves. Their entire investment in this is being jeopardized by this little dissident minority that has created this entire problem.

I think we have an obligation to see that they get their education and get their diploma and the degree that they want in order to better themselves.

Q How do you resolve this problem though without some form of negotiation? You indicated trustees cannot negotiate. How are you going to resolve this without negotiation?

A Well, both students and faculty members who are outside are in a sense violating not only college rules but in many instances the law. I don't know how you negotiate on that basis.

Among some of the demands there are certain legitimate areas for not only discussion but improvement. All of those are open and available. I don't know why you keep throwing the burden back on the college administration or the trustees for negotiation. It is the law breaking dissident element of students that have said that their fifteen demands are non-negotiable. I have perfect faith in the administration of the college that they are doing their utmost and they have for a long period of time to implement things that would be for the improvement of education and to erase whatever inequities have caused any discontent. They will proceed with this. But the main issue now is, can you have an orderly society, can you have an educational system subject to coercive demands under threats of violence by those who are willing to take the law into their own hands. And you cannot. Therefore you cannot under that threat sit down in an area of good will and legitimate negotiation with someone who has a knife pointed at you and say, 'It is my way or else.'

Q In his telegram to you, Mr. John said -- I don't think he used the word 'negotiation'. I think he said 'To continue or start up again the immediate conciliatory efforts that have been going on between representatives of the trustees and the campus.' Have you responded to that telegram? What is your answer?

A Well, Mr. Johns, he is asking me in that regard to violate the law. What I answered him was to the effect that there was no way that I can order the trustees. I am obeying the law also. I am one vote on the trustees. When the trustees meet, I can express my opinion and I can vote my way. If anyone thinks that the governor can coerce either the regents or the trustees, you only have to look back at numerous times that the governor has been on the losing side when the vote was taken.

Q You did not order or ask Mr. Merriam to call off the talks they were having on the negotiations but --.

A Well, when I began to read that such negotiations were going on, I called Mr. Merriam as President of the Board of Trustees to ask him and to point out that no committee was

authorized to negotiate in any way. And Mr. Merriam, as Chairman of the Board, took it from there.

Q How about the negotiations that have been going on between President Hayakawa and moderate members of the RSU? Have you been advised of those and are you in favor of those negotiations?

A I don't know whether these are negotiations. If Dr. Hayakawa -- apparently, from what I read in the stories is talking to some students that have revealed there is evidently some division, some cleavage and that they want a different solution, that the solution advocated by the violent leaders -- I certainly believe that is within his province and something he should be doing. Anything he can do to persuade any of them out there to get back into the school and to return to law and order, I think this is fine that this should be done by anyone and everyone.

Q You are not being kept current on the negotiations, though?

A No. Contrary to some of the charges made, there has been no political interference with higher education.

Q Your interpretation of this five-day rule has been so definite and clear, I wonder why in the more than five days now these procedures have not been cleared up. I am not quite clear on this.

A I call your attention to a story in the San Jose Mercury about the San José College campus where there has been this demonstration by the AFT professors there. The San Jose Mercury carried a story quoting a number of students who happened to be the sons and daughters of the professors in which they stated -- one girl stated that the President of the AFT Chapter on their campus has not been in attendance in his own classes in which she is enrolled since on or about November 5. Granted you want to treat faculty members certainly in an adult manner. You don't want to treat them like kindergarten students asking everyone to raise their hand and say that they are present. You give them a latitude and a leeway. But now with this clear or implied violation of the law you now challenge the State. There is the little matter

of the legality of the certification. They have just opened the door to the fact that it may be necessary to tighten the procedure, and, because of dissident and irresponsible few, impose some kind of system of actual certification as to attendance from here on out in order for anyone to receive a check. Of course, the penalties for falsely certifying that someone has fulfilled his duties gets into the area of a felony.

Q Are these procedures being tightened? Is that your understanding?

A I hope they are being tightened now. We have indications that at San Francisco State, as I said earlier, this procedure has been allowed to deteriorate far more than on a number of other campuses.

Q Are you saying, governor, no one can actually prove that these professors have not been -- I mean, have been off the campus?

A The problem right now is the difficulty of proving that. Let me make another point about the so-called strike of the AFT. They can't have it both ways. It's time for them to find out they have already established a certain lack of courage of their convictions or principals. In the first place, in order to get the Central Labor Council backing, they abandoned the students, separated themselves completely from the student demands. Now, according to the press and the stories and the quotes that have been carried from some of them, their so-called strike is a little bit phony because they are no -- in an attempt to get their paychecks, they are attempting to prove that they haven't missed their classes. Well, when is a strike not a strike? This must come as quite a shock to some of the legitimate labor movement, members of the labor movement who have from time to time gone on strike and laid their jobs and their incomes on the line with the knowledge that they believed in the cause for which they are striking to now discover that this small intellectual group in the area of labor at AFT is not quite so willing to abide by principal or to back their conviction with any sign of courage or sacrifice. They want to carry a sign that says, "On Strike," but at the same time they want to establish that

they have not been on strike, that they have just been carrying signs.

Q Could I clarify your use of the word "felony"? I suppose you mean a department head certifying that a teacher was present when he was not?

A That's right.

Q You say this is not the law now but that we may need legislation?

A No. I say the penalty now for falsely certifying. But we may need some legislation that tightens up and requires an actual establishment of attendance for each professor on every campus in order to receive each paycheck.

Q On a related topic, in the last few weeks you appointed, I believe, four new regents to the University of California Board of Regents.

A Three.

Q And you have Mr. Peinecke.

A Yes.

Q And Mr. Monagan.

A I didn't appoint them.

Q And Mr. Grant. Would you assess what your chances are now for getting tuition imposed at the University of California or boosting fees, and will you try to do so at the next regents meeting?

A Well, whether at the next meeting or not, I haven't had time to check on the agenda of that meeting. No. What I've been talking about for some time, whether you want to use the word "tuition" or what, I don't like the word "increased fees" because I think some real study should go in right now on the rather excessive fees and, in some instances it has been charged they are being paid by the students, and whether this hasn't in effect been a kind of tuition under a different name. But the need to tie the financing of higher education in some way, some of the cost of it, to those who are getting the education, some kind of a system that would not work a hardship on the student but perhaps would be paid over the years following graduation.

This is not just true in California. This is a

national problem in private schools as well as in tax-supported schools. There have been more comments and suggestions made by men such as Owen Brewster that perhaps over the whole period of his life, a man should pay a certain percentage of a kind of tax for the part of the cost of his education. I think something of this kind is necessary. And the so-called enrollment charge, or whatever they called it, that was thrown out by the Regents' Committee and adopted some time ago in answer to my plea for tuition. But this isn't the answer to it either. I think that we have to legitimately sit down and study this need and this problem. And I'm going to ask the regents --.

Q You aren't going to ask for tuition immediately? That's the whole point.

A Well, as I say, let me abide by what seems to be priorities right at the moment. But I have let the regents know and I am going to let them know that I believe we must engage with the university in a study, and with the colleges on this problem.

Q On a related subject, the decision is being made now in San Diego whether to renew for another year the contract of Dr. Herbert Macuzza, who is known as the philosopher of the new left and is a professor of philosophy at San Diego on the university campus. Are you in favor of his contract being renewed for another year?

A Well, this is something I am willing to leave to the administration of the college, except I would like to make one point. I have never been one who, even though I am in great disagreement with Dr. Macuzza's philosophy -- I have never been one who believes that the answer to these problems is to try to shut off those whom you are in disagreement with. What I think is a lack in our present educational system in California, in both of the college and the university level, is the lack of any one of a contrary philosophy. I have a trust and a faith in the students ability to hear varying points and to make a decision and an intelligent decision, but when the university presents a preponderance of one opinion and doesn't counter it with those of an opposite opinion, this I think is where we are

shirking our responsibility and we are short-changing the students and subjecting them to indoctrination and not education.

And before I would treat with whether Mr. ^{Manu}Macuzza should continue there, I would like to urge that there be a little more attention to getting some others of a different viewpoint so that the students do have two viewpoints at least.

Q Is it your view now then that they are being subjected to indoctrination?

A Well, this has been mentioned before by others in regents' meetings. I think there is a great lack of balance, particularly in the social sciences.

Q On the tuition then, it sounds like you would be supporting Bud Collier's bill for the pre-payment of a college education?

A I must say there is a great deal in Mr. Collier's program to recommend it, but Bob Monagan also introduced such a bill last year and his too was based on the idea of, to avoid hardship to a student, allowing a student to pay after graduation. There are a great many students who work their way through school in the past and over the years that have done this in effect by way of nonprofit long funds from foundations.

I paid back one of those myself, at the rate of, I think, ten dollars a month.

Q On what do you base your opinion that you just expressed that you think there is more stress on the teaching of a new left philosophy?

A I say there is an imbalance right now in the social sciences and political science and economics. This may not be true of each campus or every campus, but predominantly education has tended towards what is usually referred to as a far more liberal viewpoint.

Q What leads you to that belief?

A Well, just contact on campuses and the knowledge of viewpoints *that* are being taught. If you wanted me to get personal and bitter, I could tell about the reactions of certain types of speakers on the campuses and the difference between the professors in the social sciences who give credits

if they would listen to one speaker but who urge them not to go listen to another.

Q You have Senator ^{Smitz} ~~Smitz~~ teaching on the other side.

A There are always exceptions to prove the rule.

Q Governor, are you referring to higher education in general, or to ---

A I am going to confine myself to speaking to California. Let other governors in other states take care ---

Q Is this just public institutions, or are you including the privates?

A I think there is a certain amount of this in the private. It is not as broad. There are certain campuses that do reflect a different viewpoint.

Q Are you proposing then anything specific to correct this as a regent and trustee?

A As one regent and as one trustee, this has been mentioned in our meetings before in discussing personnel. As I say, this hasn't been brought up even in my absence by another regent to show that this is not just my own particular viewpoint, a regent who has rather consistently voted against me in a meeting that I couldn't attend. I read in the minutes where he had made this observation himself. So you can see that it is kind of across the spectrum within the regents that there are people concerned with this.

Q Who was that?

A Well, I would rather not because I am trying to get him to vote more my way.

D Did you give any thought at all on how this better balance could be achieved? What can you do? What can the regents do?

A Well, I think that the university itself as to -- this would involve the regents, of course -- the approving personnel. I think that higher education has to recognize its responsibility to furnish all viewpoints. They cannot defend wholeheartedly the retention of someone who is far out to one side or the other unless they are willing to agree that they will definitely make an effort to see that varying viewpoints are presented.

Q Would you prefer to see both extremes presented, or just have more of a central-type philosophy approach?

A Well, no. I think that the students have a right to hear and study all viewpoints.

Q Can we change the subject?

A All right.

Q You recently appointed a commissioner to the Public Utilities Commission. Did you consult with anyone before appointing him?

A I didn't personally. Whether anyone on our staff did or not -- I can tell you that the view that has been expressed to me by more than one individual with the utilities has been that they recognize the responsibility of the public and their only viewpoints with regard to appointment to the Commission are that the appointments should be made on behalf of the public and should not in any way reflect the utility viewpoint.

And I will tell you honestly, this was voluntarily advanced to me by utility heads in California.

Q But you didn't talk specifically about --.

A The names? No.

Q Do you believe that profits of private utilities are too low, or do you think a guaranteed profit of seven per cent is reasonable?

A Well, now, you are getting me into the area of exact profit percentage or what is needed. I don't think I am an authority on that matter. I do say that I think that there has been some problem in our great expansion here, that in an attempt to protect the public from high rates, there has not been enough attention paid to whether we are allowing the utilities leeway to finance the expansion. I think this is a problem we have to look at with the great growth that is needed to match our population growth. And I have been concerned for quite some time that we haven't made proper provision in that area to allow them to expand and to grow.

Q Governor, in your State message, you suggested that you were going to seek legislation in the area of farm labor relations. Mr. ~~Cooke~~ said this was not your intention. Would you clarify that?

A Yes. I think we are talking about two different things. Mr. Cooke and I are in complete agreement on it. The thing that I believe belongs in the national viewpoint and not from the State viewpoint, is the fact we mentioned we met nine of the ten criteria laid down by the Department of Labor in Washington as to having good farm management labor relations. The nearest state to us has only met six of these. The next one met five, and from there on it was less than five.

Now, this places us competitively in a poor position with regard to other states producing the same produce. Here I think the Federal Government has responsibility in this area. This is a different subject than the subject of labor management relations and some of the things that we can do here in our own State in that regard to insure that there is no penalty if farm labor wants to organize, but to see that farm labor is also protected, that they cannot be exploited or coerced into an organization, and also to protect the farmer in the event of collective bargaining that he cannot be held up to the threat of blackmail at harvest time or the threat of letting a crop rot in the field.

Now, some of these areas are state. I think that if we took the lead --. I have no intention of introducing an administration program. I do know that such labor legislation is being considered not only by farm groups in California but by a number of the legislators. And I have said that I will support such legislation. I am looking forward to it.

Q Would you comment about your appointing the Amador County District Attorney to a position in the State OEO?

A You have asked me one right now -- I just couldn't answer that offhand. There's too much of that that goes on.

Q I would like to go back to this university thing.

Q Would you stay on the agriculture?

A All right.

Q Governor, are you proposing any legislation to support green belts and keeping the agricultural land in agriculture and stop closing them down because of high taxes?

A Well, this subject I would rather treat in the framework of tax reform. There is a great need there. I would hope that we could find some way to meet this with simply meeting

the whole problem of the property tax which has become terribly regressive in California.

Q You said that the students have a right to study and hear all viewpoints. Would you clarify what your objection was to Eldridge Cleaver?

A Yes. My objection there was lack of qualification. And, thank you. You opened a door. Let's get something else out on this. On this Eldridge Cleaver matter, I think it is time to review. The motion that I supported in no way interfered -- I didn't make the motion -- I supported it -- in no way interfered with the right of the faculty to create courses or dictate the content of courses or the curriculum. It simply ruled that Eldridge Cleaver was, for one thing -- that his appointment violated Rule 5 of the University, which was written by the professors themselves. I simply wanted a flat veto by the regents of his appointment and they could go right ahead with the class for credit and simply come up with an acceptable teacher.

The motion that was then introduced when mine failed on a tie vote, or the one I supported failed on a tie vote, the motion that was introduced was introduced by the president of the university, and his was the motion that changed the entire custom of such courses and took back the authority with regard to designating who could lecture and teach and set the one lecture requirement. I voted against that measure. I still feel the issue was one that Eldridge Cleaver was not totally qualified to be a teacher or lecturer on that campus. His appointment was completely contrary to the whole movement to upgrade the educational personnel which has been in effect for so many years and has lead to the present stature of the university.

Q It has been reported that a professor at the University of California is going to give credit for the Cleaver course in defiance of the Board of Regents?

A My comment is that as a regent I am going to be asking the university about that. That is in complete defiance of the regents' decision. The course did not meet the credit requirement as laid down by the administration of the university.

I think it is a challenge that cannot be ignored.

Q I understand there is a fairly small number of students who had signed up for that series needing those credits to complete their degree work. Do you think some special arrangement ought to be made to go ahead and grant them their degrees so they don't have to come back for another?

A I would be happy to hear any case or have it come before the regents, any case of that nature. But I think the warning was clear and explicit. If there is such a case, I would like to know about it. I really don't know of any. I don't think they have much of a case because they were warned. There was plenty of time for them if it was a question of needing more credits to go into another course.

Q Would you care to comment on the State Capitol mini skirts?

A Well, since I have never drunk out of a fountain on the Legislative floor, I am not aware of what the problem is all about.

Q Gordon Luce sent out a memo to your department heads suggesting they lower state employment by July 20th, below what it was when you took office. What is the significance of the date he set?

A I don't know. You will have to ask Gordon about the date. But it has been a subject of cabinet meetings. With our freeze, which reduced substantially, well, first of all, cancelled out the growth pattern, reduced substantially the number of employees. Even then it reduced the number of employees to less than what they -were when we took over. We are not sure we have completely reached the maximum in that. And again without laying off and without firing and so forth, we believe the policy of attrition should be tried perhaps on a more selective basis now. We can take some areas, like our Corporation Commissioner, where he has reduced in his shop the number of employees from 430 to 206. And he has a far more efficient operation than he ever had in that department before. So you can't make an across-the board evaluation. You wouldn't want to say to him that he could go even farther.

I think he has done a pretty good job. But there are other shops where we believe we haven't gotten down to the complete efficiency we could reach, so we are going to try some more.

Q Thank you, governor.

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD JANUARY 29, 1969

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: The furnace wasn't working in our house this morning. I just came in to get warm.

SQUIRE: We will warm you up.

(Laughter)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: That's Squire. I'm counting on that. All right.

Q Are you going to give up your lease while you are on the subject?

A Oh, actually, I don't know what the situation is.

Q Is there some difficulties with the lease or --

A Well, just that the -- the lease actually expires in April and I haven't done anything about whether it goes on beyond there or not.

Q Governor, on another subject, in your budget message, are you going to propose any sort of punitive measures against students who don't obey the laws or -- and measures to help students who do obey the laws? You mentioned something along that line in your speech to the Republican convention on Sunday, that you were going to deal with the subject anyway.

A Well, I'm going to refer to it and refer to the faculty that we have resisted suggestions that in some way we try to use the budget as a punitive measure because there could be no way you could do that without punishing the vast majority who are legitimately trying to get an education. And as a matter of fact, I'm going to suggest

augmenting scholarship funds.

Q Augmenting scholarship funds?

A Yes.

Q Governor, do you -- the State Controller's office has withheld pay checks for 350 faculty members in San Francisco State and San Jose State. Do you think that that's an accurate determination of the number of teachers who are actually involved in the strike?

A I couldn't tell you. I honestly couldn't. All I know is that this number there was enough evidence to indicate that they couldn't certify them as being eligible for the full paycheck. Now, it can be that as they go into individual cases and hear from individual teachers, they may find that there have been some errors made. But this was their estimate of -- it is kind of a negative more than affirmative thing, they just simply could not make the certifying statement guaranteeing that they had put in the time required to get a full check.

Q Would this be the maximum number of teachers then that are involved in striking activities?

A I would think it would be the maximum number that have been involved to the extent that there is a belief they have not been fulfilling their requirements. We know that there have been some carrying picket signs who are at the same time going back in and teaching their classes.

Q Governor, there is some evidence that things are beginning to heat up again at UC. Is extra police power available if needed there at that campus?

A We are in touch with the plan that we have always followed with the local authorities there and in constant communication with them on this. I think again this is just an example of the next echelon up in the tactic of the flea.

Q What about the firebombing or the tear gas bombing yesterday that injured some students there?

A Well, it is another example -- that tear gas as I understand it was thrown by the demonstrator, wasn't it?

Q Yes.

A It is another example of what I say it is, we have long since passed the point where anyone should continue to be so naive as to believe that these are just well-intentioned students with a grievance and there is no praise for this.

Q Governor, what do you think of Assemblyman Bagley's proposal to take the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor and the Speaker off the ^{Board} ~~Berea~~ of Regents?

A Well, I'm in disagreement. I think this is a policy that basically worked well over the last 90 years. It is -- the system has built this great educational institution that we have and it would seem to me with the long terms that the Regents are appointing, once appointed there they are, and there is no access on the part of the people to changing that or to registering any disagreement and the one way that the people have of having some control and getting at least their views presented is by way of the electoral process of the ex-officio members. And I just -- I don't think Bagley has thought this out very well or completely.

Q Governor, do you think 16 years is a proper term and if so, do you think that they should be reappointed and serve as long as 32 years?

A No, I've made myself clear on that. I don't -- and I'm reluctant to put this in the context of the troubles that we have been having is the length of the term, because I don't think those two things are tied together. If there were no trouble at all, I've tried to make it clear that just from this two year's observation I think the term is too long and a number of Regents who have served lengthy periods say the same thing. As a matter of fact, Mrs. Chandler made it very clear in her resignation that she was ~~doing~~ this to register her protest against the term. She said that as one who has served more than 14 years or around 14 years that she felt there was a tendency to get too possessive with regard to the university. I have also encountered the problem of the limitation that

places on you with regard to age. Certain qualified excellent people for the Board, and you just have to do some hard cold mathematics and you look at their present age and add 16 years to it and you don't make an appointment. A shorter term, and I happen to believe that 8 would probably give -- would give the same protection against one Governor dominating a board that 16 gives.

Q Will you actually push for a constitutional amendment along that line this session?

A Let me say, I'll certainly support one. I understand I don't have to push that some things are being proposed. But I don't think you'd find any resistance from the Regents on that. Many of them feel the same way.

Q Do you intend to imply, Governor, that the Regents who are now serving are not responsible to the public will? You say the only way the people have of getting their -- getting their way is through the electoral process.

A Well, the only -- I'm not commenting on the conduct of any Regents. I'm only saying that since the final authority stems from the people, and the people have vested so much authority and responsibility in the Regents literally creating a corporation that in itself owns the university, then the people at the same time should have some way if a body of Regents begin to pursue a policy that is not in keeping with the people, their wishes, that they should have some way, some representation and I think they have, registering their like or dislike, and they can do this by way of the electoral process.

Q Governor, we understand that the Regents are having a closed meeting at a private home in Los Angeles this Saturday. Do you plan to attend that meeting and what will be discussed?

A Well, this is -- no, this is a very simple matter and it is a closed meeting in the sense that it is an executive meeting because it has to deal with personnel. It has to do with consideration of some of the names that have been proposed for positions on the faculty and of the administration, and so this is a -- normally an executive

meeting and we had to have a special one because we have to resolve it without waiting till the next meeting, and it is not going to be in a home as I understand it, it is at a hotel at the airport for the convenience of all the Regents.

Q Governor, what is your personal appraisal of Dr. Nathan Hare, the man assigned to head the new Black Studies Department at SF State, who was arrested the other day, who went around yelling "The hell with Hayakawa."

A Well, I think this is regrettable since Professor Hare had been named as one that the students had approved of, who could head up the ethnic studies group. I think his conduct in this whole thing is -- is such that this now is a problem. It is a problem for the administration and I as the Governor am not going to comment on it. I'm quite sure that it will be a subject of discussion among the trustees and I'll put on that hat at the Trustees meeting, but that is a personnel matter, so it wouldn't be advisable for me out here, except to say that there's got to be a realistic facing up to the irresponsibility of some of the people connected with the colleges and universities who continue to throw fuel on the fire.

Q Governor, do you think that a campus order would be helpful that dissident students be expelled after a specified number of arrests?

A Starting with one. I think that -- I think that one of the failures right now that we have to face up to is the administrative process whereby you can dismiss or discipline a student, suspend them or expel, and the time has come I think to face up to whether some dissidents who for a period now of many weeks or even months have refused to participate in the educational process except to break windows and hold meetings and picket, as to whether the time hasn't come where you simply say to them by your own choice you are no longer students here and you are going to be treated as trespassers if you continue to do this, and get rid of them once and for all. I would commend to all of you if you haven't, you should have heard Eric Hoffer last night in a discussion with Mr.

Severeid on television about this, I heard more common sense in an hour than I have heard in a great many meetings I have attended in the last two years.

Q On a new subject, Governor.

A Yes. O. K.

Q Regarding the -- your feelings of observation in increasing the gas tax a penny for the flood and mud slide damage around the state, will there be enough additional funds in the state and federal monies to cover this or why would you propose this?

A As it appears now, yes, and this is -- I tried to make this clear yesterday on the trip that we have slammed no doors, we will do what's necessary, but that is an -- an increase in the gas tax even on this temporary basis is a last resort. We do feel as of now that we can handle this, that we do have the funds available to handle it, and obviously that's preferable than to having even a temporary increase in taxes.

Q Governor, do you plan to consolidate the special election of Mr. Reinecke's district with the council elections that are being held in Los Angeles in April?

A I couldn't actually tell you right now. We have been in and are in consultation with people in the vicinity in that district down there, taking some polls and so forth with the date, we want to have it as quickly as possible. So we will very shortly be announcing the date for that.

Q Have you talked to the President since your trip for the floods?

A No, just the call and the conversation with him the night before last.

Q Are you going to report to him what you saw?

A I -- unless something comes up that requires a consultation. At the moment we are in agreement and I know that he through his own federal officers out here is getting the actual report. If it should become necessary, why again as I say, I have not only his assurance but his

request that we deal directly and so I won't hesitate if there is a need to. You had your hand up.

Q If they are still on floods, why --

A Oh.

Q I wanted to change.

Q I did, too. Governor, what prompted the decision to drop the plans for the Otay Mesa Prison?

A Actually, this particular prison, there's been a great deal of pressure for it, but at the same time we have been looking at whether we couldn't meet the problem with regard to remodeling and enlarging some of the existing but we do have a long-range study going on the needs over a longer period of time and we don't want to jump into something as happens so often with government, in which you make a move and create something and find you could have gotten along without it. But at the same time we are advocating hanging onto the property. We are not -- we are not disposing of the property, but we are making this study of the future and at the moment we don't believe that the need -- let's say, not the need, the priority, we don't place as high a priority on prisons as we do on education and some of the other things, and since we are limited in the amount we have to spend, we are going on a priority basis.

Q Do you believe that there is better parole procedures and practices, earlier parole is a solution or a part-time or part of the solution to the problem of total incarceration?

A Oh, you are into a field here that I'd rather have you deal directly with the people on the parole board, the youth authority. I think that we have upgraded our procedures, they're doing a better job than has been done in the past.

Q On another subject, Governor, during your visit to Washington for the inauguration, did you specifically request Bob Finch not to appoint Assemblyman Veneman as Under-Secretary because of what it would do to the Republican majority in the Assembly?

A I did not. I've seen a few rumors to that effect around and they are totally false and unsubstantiated. The only conversation that has ever been held was one, and Bob in my office told me that he wanted Assemblyman Veneman back there, that Jack, as he expressed it, wanted to go also, but that their concern -- both of their concerns was what it might do in the narrow balance we have here, and he, Bob Finch, expressed his concern about the possible feelings of the -- particularly the people in the party here in the state having achieved this majority now having it taken away and as a matter of fact, my exact words were to him, "Well, this is a problem that you'll have to make the decision."

Q Governor, on another topic.

A All right.

Q Today a number of Legislators, both parties, have denounced the closing of the Cal Vet offices at various parts of the state. I wonder have you given any consideration to rescinding that closing those Cal Vet home offices?

A No. Johnny Johnson seemed to feel and assured me that -- that the business could be conducted and that every effort had been made to minimize any inconvenience that the -- that he felt there would be virtually no inconvenience to the veterans in doing this and now of course John is leaving us, but I found no need to review that.

Q Governor, have you decided on a successor to Johnson?

A No, not as yet.

Q Max Rafferty, ^{the} the Department of Education, would like another \$350 million dollars in free school aid this year. Could you hold out any hope that money would be available for that?

A No. We are going to put into the budget a substantial increase in school aid, but actually the educational groups aren't pressing very seriously. They know that it is impossible in that amount that has been mentioned. I think it is really \$365, not 350, the figure proposed. It would be fine if we could. It just isn't

there. We, as I say, are making a substantial increase but everyone and the school authorities we have been talking to know of what we are going to propose. Everyone wishes they could. It just isn't there.

Q In your '66 campaign Dr. Rafferty noted you pushed for a 50-50 balance in supporting local education. Have you given up hope on that?

A Well, let me tell you there are two ways to reach this. When you talk 50-50, and I would like to see the ratio where the state could share in this. Further as a further way of reducing the burden of property tax. But there is one way of talking of it in which you are talking -- taking off the backs of the local property taxpayer a share of the money they are now paying. But there is another approach that leads to the 350 or 60 million dollar figure, and this is an approach that the state just keeps matching up on a 50 per cent basis with no control whatsoever on how high the local share goes. And so far they have kept increasing theirs, that their idea of 50-50 is that they decide what should be spent and we just have to come up with it. That is a little different than suggesting that the state should try and remove some of the present burden from them. Now, I believe that one of the great things is the very thing that I mentioned in the State of the State address, was the idea of some study and research to find out if we are getting our dollar's worth in educational spending, if we have explored all the innovations and the new ideas and the things that could lead to reducing some of this burden. There is no question but that education at present is increasing in its demands, faster than the revenues can increase for the state, and it doesn't take a genius to figure out if you don't find an answer to this pretty soon some place up here, if not already, you come to a point at which you have reached the maximum that you can ask for in taxes. So it is -- it would be well before you reach that point if we haven't reached it already, to try and

find out if there isn't some way to make the educational dollars go faster.

Q What range is the substantial increase that you propose?

A Well --

Q A hundred million dollars?

A You'll all know on February 4. Don't get me into that or I'll begin -- you'll be pinning me down on budget figures, but it will be a substantial increase and it is a number one priority with us, so it will be as much as we possible can produce.

Q Do you have any ideas right now how the people can get a better dollar's worth for their education?

A No, and I think there is a good call for experts in that field, but also some new kinds of experts also. There are some very exciting things going on in industry in America where a number of large corporations have gotten into the field of educating for their own needs, and their own purposes, and I think that we should be taking a look at some of the things they found because they are interested in providing the education in the shortest period of time, getting the greatest effect out of it, because they are dealing with people that they want to make productive employees, and I just feel that there is a whole area for exploration out there; we haven't touched it as yet.

Q Governor, I understand that your budget is going to be for Wednesday a.m. releases. Does this have anything to do with the fact that you are going to be on television the night before with your budget message to the people?

PAUL BECK: I think it will be released about 3:30 on Tuesday afternoon.

Q Or Wednesday a.m.?

PAUL BECK: It will be released after 3:30. That would be a.m.s for certain people. It would be for radio and television, it will be at 3:30.

A And that night I'm going to try to explain to the

people we think that it is in keeping with the things again that we promised them for the last two years. It is too easy in government to say, well, the people can't understand the budget. Well, we are going to try and explain it.

Q Will your additional funds include anything for the so-called urban factor, that is to help the big school districts meet their special needs, urban problems?

A I know that there are increases that we have included that have to do with the -- the special, the disadvantaged as well as the exceptionally bright pupils. I couldn't right now -- I couldn't break it down as to what all is included there myself.

Q Governor, I want to go back to the gas tax increase. One thing occurred to me, if you find it necessary to put on a temporary gasoline tax increase, do you feel that would be a violation of your pledge of no new taxes?

A Well, technically, I suppose you could say it would, but I think that this would be one that would stem from the fact that no one could anticipate a flood either. This would be an emergency, but I am very hopeful that that isn't necessary, that I really am not seriously contemplating having to do it. I think we can make it without, but I -- and I will say this, that my pledge about no new increases in taxes is going to make me hang tight as long as there is any chance of doing it any other way.

Q During the conferences yesterday, Jim Moe estimated that the -- both the state and the local damages combined might run as high as 40 or 50 million, and what you are getting from the federal government and the state is about eight or nine million.

A Oh, no, you are talking about the federal grant so far is just an initial grant. This was just to get us started, because of the nature of the emergency, to move fast, and this does not reflect the monies that we can make available out of highway funds.

Q You think it would be much more that's available?

A Yes, but also you want to make awfully sure when

You start totalling up the damage, you know, that it isn't like the fellow with the bumped fender, he decides he may as well get a new bumper and a fender, from the insurance company.

Q How does all this acceptance of your federal funds jibe with your much publicized campaign statement of do it ourself, these catastrophes?

A Well, yesterday those who went along heard me talking about do it yourself at great length. In the campaign as is usual in any campaign, there were certain misinterpretations, let's say, of what it was I was trying to explain with regard to the floods of recent years, and this was interpreted to mean that I said government should just stay out. Well, this is ridiculous. This is why you have a disaster office. This is why you have a national guard, to prevent looting and so forth. But what I was trying to point out and yesterday all day was pointing out, that a great deal of the distress and the loss and the suffering among people who technically do not qualify for any of the government programs, and it isn't enough to just stand back and say, well now we have made small business loans available from the federal government, the small business administration, by declaring this an emergency because a great many people to get those loans either have to perjure themselves or -- well, let's just say they have to perjure themselves in some instances because to get them you have to come in and testify that you cannot get credit anyplace else. Well, some man has lost his home, has a small business, is hardly in a position to publicly go on record to say that he's unable to get credit. This is not a good business practice, and yet this man has had a grievous loss, one that will probably be the rest of his life trying to overcome. These are people who can't even ask for and wouldn't ask for charity. But I try to liken it is the thing we seem to have lost in this country of going back to the idea that everybody gathering around to build a fellow's barn

When the barn burned down. They get it up in a matter of a few days. The areas that have been devastated are comparatively small in view of the over-all community. Therefore, if the community would marshal its forces and would supply as they could on a volunteer basis manpower, equipment, various building, construction companies, and so forth, the facilities in repair and rehabilitation that are normal business for someone, but that he could afford to do on a different basis for the individual who has just had this total loss, to say nothing of fund raising as we used to do up to a few years ago in catastrophes of this kind, we could alleviate a great deal of this suffering. For example, we had pointed out to us in one county a dozen families living in an area where there was an access road and a bridge that actually and technically is private. It isn't a public bridge, yet this bridge is gone, the road is gone, and you got a dozen families that between them are in no position to construct a bridge or build a road. Well, this is one, and yet legally there is no way that any of the public funds can do this. Well, this is one in which I think that a total community effort could have that bridge up in a very short order.

Q Governor, would you like to see the laws changed so government can help individuals like this?

A I don't know whether the -- I don't know whether you really can do that. The lines you'd have to draw would still have to be based on -- on need and the -- I remember a greatest example of this was a few years ago in the Bel Aire fire. Here was in a better district of the city where the bulk of the people were upper middle class to wealthy brackets, and yet these people, 495 homes totally destroyed and it is a -- sometimes all the help they need from their neighbors is a temporary help, a kind of A Bundle for Britain thing we had in World War II, someone who stands there in the street with nothing left in the line of possessions other than what he has on his back, well, you know, it might be no more than giving him a

topcoat if the weather turns cold.

Q Specifically, how are you going to lend the way of the Governor's office towards this private community effort?

A Well, I have told in the local communities that if there is anything in persuasive power the Governor can do in approaching people or asking people of the kind who can get such a thing organized, I'll do it, but in the meantime urging them at the local level and when I left those communities they were already talking about their own plans for organizing and I might add in those communities it isn't a new thing. There were people already on their own who had started this. Some of you fellows were along know that we got a cup of coffee in the school down there at Carpentaria from the women who had been there 24 hours a day, just neighborhood women helping people who were refugees in the community.

Q Governor, are you going to have any proposal in the near future to change or modify our state taxes in any way?

A Well, we are still involved in the study for tax reform. Temporarily, in the meantime, in our budget message we are going to make some proposals for adding rebate, to cut, squeeze and trim, and giving some money back to the people, but that isn't permanent tax reform. That is simply money that's on hand that we believe should be returned to the people on a one-time basis.

Q How will this be accomplished?

A Well, there again you get --

PAUL BECK: Friday it will be announced.

A You'll know that Friday.

Q Governor Reagan, what is your reaction to Senator Dymally's charge that the California National Guard is a haven for white middle-class draft dodgers?

A Well, I second what General Ames said, we will welcome investigation of the national guard any time. I don't know of any -- I don't want to criticize some

of the other states, just let me say this, I have a tremendous pride not only in the guard, and what it -- what it can do, and has done here in our state, I don't know of any guard in any state that is superior to it, and let me also add as long as you opened the subject here, let me add in the basis of yesterday's trip also and what's been going on in the last few days, that pride extends to the state agencies that are involved now in this present disaster up to and including the guard. I think everyone in California should be proud. There was almost immediate response. It was wonderful to go into the local communities and have instead of criticism and having a pounding on the door for us to get out of the plane so they could ask us questions to find out that the first things that the local -- the supervisors and city officials, county officials wanted to say was to tell us how great the cooperation has been and how swiftly the agencies have been moving and how grateful they were, and it is -- it is a source of great pride, but I think that Mr. Dymally, if he wants to investigate, he can, but I think his charges were very ill-founded, and somewhat irresponsible.

Q He's asked for a racial census of the guard.

Are you going to conduct that?

A I'd have to check with General Ames to see what they are going to -- going to do on that, but that isn't so much the question. The guard is a rather voluntary thing. You've got to check how many people wanted to get in it. Now, if he could present any evidence the people are being turned down on a suspicion of being turned down for any -- for any reason other than the normal qualifications for the military, let him come forward with those charges, but I don't think he can make such charges.

Q Governor, on another topic, there is a feeling in some quarters that the Navy is apparently out to make Commander Lloyd Bucher the scapegoat in the Pueblo affair. Have you given any thought to that charge and what are you --

A Well, being interested in this from a personal standpoint, I was once in a picture with Commander Bucher,

I knew him years ago, he was executive officer of a submarine we used in a picture, so I've been interested in this case from the moment they were captured. I don't think Commander Bucher is on trial. I think the United States government is on trial because if there were any sins of omission or commission in this whole incident they were on the part of the government, first for the manner in which the craft was put there, and the shortcomings that became evident with regard to handling it and secondly for the fact that 83 young men could be put in a position of government orders and then literally abandoned by our government. I think the government failed in its responsibility as it does to any citizen when it refuses to risk the possible consequences when someone's individual rights are being presumed upon. This is government's sole excuse for being and our government didn't fulfill its reason for being.

Q Robert McNamara in particular?

A What?

Q Robert McNamara in particular?

A Oh, I've just made it pretty general. I wouldn't -- I wasn't in the inner circles up there. I don't know who made the decisions, but wait one second.

Q Governor, on this, you mentioned this tax rebate. Is that -- is that the income tax proposal that you mentioned earlier or is this a different one?

A Well, that one and the continuation of relief for the property tax owner.

Q Governor, I was wondering if you shared the same feeling that the United States government's reputation was also on trial regarding the mutiny-court martial that currently started in the Presidio in San Francisco?

A Oh, you know, you've got me, one I haven't -- I haven't caught up with that one yet, so don't let me comment on that.

Q Governor, in the Assembly Education Committee yesterday it was brought out that you limited the emergency

fund in the budget last year to only a million dollars regarding the 575,000 for state colleges. Why has it changed from the past when it's usually been about 7 to 10 million dollars in emergency fund?

CAP WEINBERGER: Oh.

A Somebody here is more anxious to say. Cap, what were you going to say?

CAP WEINBERGER: I'm sorry, Government^{er}. The emergency fund has been held at a million dollars by the Legislature for several years. They do not want to entrust the executive branch with more discretion than a million dollars. We used 800,000 of it in emergency fire fighting in the fall, and when the state college or enrollment crisis brought on by their own under-estimates came along, why we had no money left, and an urgency bill is the only solution.

SQUIRE: Any more questions? Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---