

# 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 –  
10/26/1971, 10/27/1971, 11/17/1971, 11/22/1971

Box: P03

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library  
inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at:

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

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

10/26

October 26, 1971

GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT IN CABINET ROOM TO PRESS - 11 a.m.

Good morning. Some of you were downstairs and when I came in this morning and I made a statement and it just seemed to me to be fair that I ought to give the rest of you a crack at it. The reception, of course, had to do with the vote of last night at the United Nations, ousting the Republic of China and seating mainland China in the UN. I was asked my opinion and I said and will repeat to you that I was deeply shocked as I think most Americans were last night by that vote. I was also disgusted and very frankly I think that it confirms the moral bankruptcy of that international organization.

Q. Do you think we should get out of the United Nations?

A. I don't think it is for me to say what the options are and I think that would be an extremely drastic move because there are several service organizations to the UN who are doing many worthwhile practical things particularly in the less developed parts of the world. But I don't think the United States should simply sit there and take this without some kind of action and just take it as another vote on an issue and one which we were disappointed with the outcome. I don't think the American people will hold still for that.

Q. What action do you recommend?

A. Well I think there are other alternatives than to outright leaving of the UN. I think for example we could sit there and continue membership but not participate in the voting, which would be one.

Q. Withdrawal of financial support, do you think Congress ought to do that?

I think there should be a review of the organization of the United Nations to see whether you could not place more power with those who actually have the responsibility for the course of the world....the major nations. It just doesn't make sense any more. Frankly I used the term this morning and I still stick to it--- it is a kind of kangaroo court.

October 26, 1971

GOVERNOR'S REMARKS TO NEWSMEN IN BASEMENT

Q. What is your reaction to the vote in the UN to admit Red China?

A. I was deeply shocked and I was disgusted and I think it confirms the moral bankruptcy of that organization.

Q. Weren't you asked what reaction you had received to the Two-China policy?

A. I know we are going to have a press conference tomorrow. Anything or any discussion on the trip before we get into it and open it up is ....it's an entirely too long a subject. Why don't we wait until tomorrow.

Q. How do you judge the reaction of a two-China policy among the people you met? Have you made some comment already?

A. There was a great understanding in most of the countries I was in as to the reasons for the trip to Peking and there didn't seem to be any upset about the tour, they seemed to think that was inevitable.

Q. The vote last night did not come as a surprise to you then?

A. Oh yes it did. I was convinced, as I am sure everyone else was that while it was going to be close the U.S. we thought would have the votes to go for the two-China---since we couldn't prevent any longer Red China coming in---we didn't have the votes to do that. But the mood of the U.S. had been to assure them of the continuation of Taiwan, so this was a great shock and I think they saw a chance for a parliamentary maneuver when they made that first vote. No one expected the vote to come that early.

A. Well I am quite sure that Congress has some ideas of that kind. They have made that known already that they have been considering, even before this vote, they have been considering the somewhat disproportionate share the United States seemed to have been paying for the support of that particularly when some nations such as France and Russia are so far behind in their support.

Q. President Nixon said he had the vote. Why do you suppose he was so far in error?

A. Well, I have sat downstairs here myself with the legislature upstairs and thought we had the votes on some issues too. I don't know I do know that we knew it was going to be close but I know on my own trip that I had no hesitation about relaying the confidence that we had that we were going to be sustained in this. We have come to a point in which the United States knew it no longer had the votes to prevent the seating of Red China. This was just a fact of life, and we had to face it. The United States then made an effort knowing that to garner the votes for the second which was for the two-China policy, the seating of Taiwan and Red China. This was what changed our position from what it had been over the last twenty years. As I say everyone was confident and I am quite sure it came as a great shock to everyone concerned.

Q. The new direction in which the UN is voting?

A. I don't know if there is a new direction or not. I think the United Nations had in its beginning organization plans for a subsequent period in which they would review the structure of the United Nations having set it up to begin with they recognized the possibility of error, the possibility of changes being needed. I think it is high time they review an organization in which nations totally less than 10 percent of the world's population can actually make decisions affecting the entire world.



Q. Anywhere in your tour did you try to influence their thinking on the two-China policy to get votes?

A. Yes, I discussed that. Even a non-member of South Korea was working very hard to persuade nations to support the U.S. position.

Q. Do you think your trip, in part, was to persuade some these nations /of

A. I was not under any orders but knowing the attitude of the U.S. when I saw an opportunity I took it.

Q. Do you think it seriously weakens what our support should be for the U.N. concept?

A. I certainly think the U.S. should give very serious thoughts to what its position should be because this is nothing but a ridiculous debating society---it has been for some time.

Q. Do you think we ought to withdraw financial support to the U.N.?

A. That is up to Congress, from all indications they are certainly going to do something.

Q. Do you think we should withdraw from the U.N. itself?

A. I don't know whether to withdraw totally from the adjuncts of the United Nations. You know the service organizations surrounding it are doing good work. I don't know whether it calls for that but certainly I do not think the U.S. should be still there and go on business as usual after a slap in the face by what was nothing more than a kangaroo court.

10/27



PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD OCTOBER 27, 1971

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's press conference is furnished to the members of the Capital 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: It isn't time to get up yet in Tokyo. I haven't gotten back on this schedule yet, so don't take advantage of me today. Let me just say before I start, there is a copy of a telegram or a cablegram being passed out to you which I sent to President Chiang Kai-Shek and Madam Chiang yesterday, and that the United States -- United Nation's vote, a copy of it.

Q Governor, this is not on that subject if anybody wants to ask on that.

A No, I just wanted you to know that that's what was going down the rows.

Q Yesterday Los Angeles Chief Davis was highly critical of your administration with respect to your administration's Corrections in the aftermath of the shooting of the policeman that was on 72-hour furlough. As I understand it, the Chief said that long-term incarceration has been virtually eliminated and that because of the prison population has declined under your administration there's dangerous inmates being turned loose in California. Can you respond to that?

A Yes, I can respond. I read that Chief Davis found it necessary to send such a letter and I'm sure upon reflection he'll realize that he hasn't been exactly factual in this. No one regrets the death of a policeman, any policeman, more than I do or any other citizen who is murdered. And this administration has done more than has been done in a great many years in this state to try and give the local law enforcement officers more tools with which to work. At the same time we have been very progressive in our approach to rehabilitation. Now, in the 72-hour furlough or pass, this is given in the last 90 days that a man is in prison before his release, in order to help him get re-adjusted to go out and have time to find

a job and so forth, and it's been in effect since 1968. I could tell you that just in 1970 and '71 there have been and are projected by the end of this year some 24,000 of these. More than 20,000 already have these passes, have been granted, and this was the only case of this kind, the only murder, back in 1968 there was a case of -- of vehicle manslaughter with one who was on furlough. Obviously you can't be perfect, and I think the Chief himself has admitted that even in the selecting of his own personnel you can't bat a thousand per cent and be perfect. But we have been -- we are leading the nation in rehabilitation. We have reduced the rate of parolees who commit crimes and go back to prison. We have cut it in half under our present procedures. Naturally we are going to take the Chief's letter and we are going to refer this to our people who are in charge of these things and of the probation system to see if there is anything we can do to improve the situation. But I think it is decidedly unfair of the Chief to suggest that this administration has increased the danger to his personnel or to any other citizens. As a matter of fact, we have passed more than 40 anti-crime bills in the last few years and in California more than in most other certainly in all other major states the rate of increase in crime has been drastically reduced.

Q Governor, another kind of reform, the other side of the coin that some people talked about, is the high cost of trials because of all these pre-trial motions and so on in the Angela Davis trial, for instance, as a prime example of it, do you have any thoughts about doing anything to tighten up on this sort of thing?

A Yes. As a matter of fact, we have asked the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court and he has been conducting a study and there are studies and proposals for experiments on hand right now that are going on with the idea of speeding up justice. This is a very -- a very real problem and I think probably one of the great problems that has to go with crime is the lack of swift and immediate and certain justice.

Q Have you any thoughts as to how you might tighten that up, make them swift?

A Well, Ed, I don't know what reports have come in from the Chief Justice.

ED MEESE: We have two groups, the Commission on Trial Court Delay in the judicial area, and the Attorney General is doing

research on this also, so we have two sets of reports which have not yet come in.

Q When were you first aware of the tentative recommendations of the Kildgord report?

A Well, what you call a first tentative recommendation is -- well, I couldn't pinpoint the date at which I knew. What has -- is being called the Kildgord report are the work sheets or the reports of paid consultant firm and from more than one individual which were then turned over to the Board of Corrections and they in turn have not come back to me or have any finished their study of their own consultants' work and their reports. And there has been no changing or alteration or difference as has been charged by some in any of these reports. What has happened is someone got their hands on one of the consultant's reports, the consultant himself has stated on several occasions that there has been no falsification or no alteration of his recommendations. But these are now being studied by the Board and later this fall they will come -- they will finish their summation and their report.

Q Governor, the question was along the lines of when did you first get wind of some of the recommendations coming from those paid consultants? June?

A Well, as I said, I don't -- I don't recall anything other than as a casual knowledge of it because I knew the process, and I -- I'm waiting for the report from the Board.

Q Were you surprised with some of the recommendations that you heard, such as doing away with the parole board or victimless crimes and that kind of --

A Well, with all that's been going on, as I say, you have to kind of compartmentalize things in your head here and you wait until your board comes in with the summation and the recommendation and then we will take it up as a matter of business. I've been dealing with other priorities.

Q Governor, another kind of reform, tax reform. I understand that you've been briefed by your staff on what's happened during your tour and that you may be meeting with Assemblyman Gonsalves on his latest offer. Can you tell us about that?

A Well, I'll <sup>e</sup> meet with Assemblyman Gonsalves, I would with anyone else on a piece of legislation who wants to consult with me. Whatever he wants to propose, I'm quite sure he wants to discuss his

bill. He must know by now having participated in those 16 days of discussions pretty much what my stand is and what I think is acceptable. And I'll be very happy to meet with him or anyone else on this subject.

Q It was not planned to meet with him anyway?

A I don't know if it's been scheduled as yet, but we are going to have the meeting.

Q Governor, Speaker Moretti said after he was defeated in the assembly last week he thought the tax reform in this session was dead. Do you agree with that?

A Well, I have to say that my optimism has been cooled quite considerably. There was no question but the outcome of all of the negotiations that we had revealed that there was a great difference over our belief that if you were going to have tax reform you had to have guarantees written in that the individuals who have their property tax reduced and who in turn, along with the other citizens, accepted increases in other taxes, to pay for that property tax reduction, that that reduction was going to be guaranteed, that it would be permanent. And we were shocked to find that there was a difference of opinion on this and we -- we think we have had a couple of experiences that teach us that unless you write in such guarantees tax reform is meaningless. When they -- the first sales tax was passed in California, it was passed on the promise that it would reduce property tax. It did nothing of the kind. Property tax, of course, is many times higher than it was at that time -- at that point. When we gave the \$750 exemption, it only took 18 months for local government to raise property taxes up above what they would be and it does little good to say to someone yes, but your taxes would be that much higher if you weren't getting the exemption, and so we have insisted there must be such guarantees.

Q Well, back to the question, is tax reform dead?

A I'm going to meet with him on this. As I say, we came as far as we could go in a compromise in an effort to get this and the meetings fell apart on the issue of such guarantees and without such guarantees, yes, tax reform is dead until the legislative leadership on the other side and the legislature itself is willing to agree that any tax relief we give to the property owner must be made permanent and guaranteed.

Q Have you been briefed on what is imminent, what the Gonsalves measure has, and his latest thing, and you think that could be a

starting thing?

A Well, a starting point for what? We went through 16 pretty weary days and very frankly if there had been a real intent to have legitimate tax reform it could have been accomplished in 16 days. As a matter of fact, it would have been accomplished before June 30, had there been some leadership in the legislature.

Q Do you think -- is there any leadership now?

A Pardon?

Q Is there any leadership now?

A You'll have to ask them.

Q Are you talking about both parties?

A What?

Q Talking about both parties?

A No, no, I'm not. When I talk leadership, I'm talking those in charge of the legislature and appointing the committees and naming the chairmen.

Q You are talking about Democrats?

A That was the word --

(Laughter)

A That was the word I was looking for.

Q You used to be one.

Q New subject. O. K., Governor, last week in Washington Senator Magnus's bill to legitimize the El Paso gas monopoly was heard. Now it is my understanding that you had favored the bill. Last week the Attorney General came in and favored it with two amendments and California PUC apparently wasn't responsive. Can you tell me the administration's position now?

A Yes, let me clarify that, it seems to be a little misunderstanding. I have never written any letter favoring the particular legislation that is now being discussed. After an investigation here I wrote a letter to Senator Magnus -- I guess more than a year ago and there was no legislation, there was no bill, but telling them our position here with regard to wanting something that would assure the people of California an adequate supply of natural gas at the lowest possible figure to the consumer. The best interest of the consumer. Now, his legislation is evidently the result of this same type of thinking. I'm not going to say it was the result of our letter, but this is what we had suggested. And the amendments that have been proposed, yes, we believe -- that have been proposed by the Attorney General, we believe those amendments are for the



Good of the people of California, we support them and I think they were favorably received by the committee in Washington.

Q The U. S. Justice Department opposed the bill, does that give you pause?

A Well, I don't know the basis for their opposition to it.

Q Nor do I?

A No, I only know that what we are interested in in California is, as I say, an adequate guaranteed supply of natural gas for the consumer in California at the best possible price. A fair price.

Q Governor, earlier you vetoed a bill by Senator Rodda which was extended, allowed districts to use permissive override tax to finance school lunch programs for pre-school children attending pre-school programs. And you said that there must be an end to the practice of bypassing the voter in matters affecting financing of programs at the district level. While you were gone, Governor Reinecke signed a bill by Senator Deukmejian which allows the Long Beach school district to use a permissive override to finance a regional occupational program, isn't that a 180 degree contradiction?

A Well, your --

Q I know it is specific and -- but it is the principle I'm asking you about.

A Well --

Q Both affecting the -- concerning the permissive override.

A Well, I don't know if the principle is violated and I would have to -- you'd have to give me a little time to look into this and see what the details were of the -- of the two bills.

Q Governor, on another subject. I wonder if you can tell us what you think of the concept of changing the names of some state colleges to California State University.

A Well, this is one here -- this problem, I -- it's got some pros and cons and it is a very difficult one. I have many times said in effect, if a college is indeed a university, is in fact a university, it certainly should be able to use the name. On the other hand, there is great concern in educational circles that with the name might indeed go some alterations to where we would have a competitive situation with regard to research and post-graduate degrees that is now being handled adequately by the university system, and that we might find ourselves drifting away from -- to the original concept of the state colleges. It is a difficult situation and I can

understand some of the colleges that have reached the average university status wanting to have this name, I just have to tell you that I haven't resolved the issue in my own mind yet as to just what is fair and what we can do. I would prefer to wait on the study that we have and our own coordinating council of higher education may have on the master plan and see what their recommendations are.

Q When -- excuse me, Governor, when is that study?

A When is that study -- I can't tell you exactly right now.

Q You vetoed Assemblywoman Fong's bill on venereal disease education. She has said that she thought due to because you have not been properly informed on the bill staff. Now, if she gets that bill back to your desk and can get it back to your desk, will you reconsider your position?

A Well, I take issue, a little bit, with all due respect, to Assemblywoman Fong, about the idea that I was not properly informed. I think there's been a great deal of misinformation about the bill and the reasons for vetoing. First of all, right today in California and evidently some teachers and administrators in schools aren't aware of this, there is no hindrance whatsoever in the way of instituting and maintaining classes and education with regard to venereal disease. The only thing is that today in instituting or putting into effect such classes the school must notify the parents that the child is being taught this particular subject. There was really no need for the Fong bill. It is not necessary to institute courses in venereal disease education. All that the bill did was remove the necessity for the school notifying the parents. Now, I made a technical error in my veto message, I said consent of the parents. It isn't consent, it is notification. Then if a parent -- there are several reasons for this, if a parent has any objection, religiously or whatever reason, they can withdraw their child from this class. But mainly it is also so that parents can inform themselves and when the child comes home and starts asking certain questions the parent can have some knowledge or idea of what is being taught, familiarize himself with it if he wants to go to the school, and do so, and thus be able to help at home, in this education. And I vetoed the bill simply because my belief that there is too much government interference in the family relationship in too many areas now. And that there was no reason to remove this necessity of the school notifying the parent. I am in favor of



the schools giving this kind of education and I am asking -- have asked for a meeting with Superintendent Riles and with our public health people to sit down now and stimulate and have more of this. Lieutenant Governor Reinecke signed a bill with regard to VD education that carries it a step further, although in the school, but involving legitimatizing information on this while I was gone. Two months ago I signed another bill that made it more possible for us. There is an epidemic situation, we do need the education and this bill had nothing to do with making more education possible. It just simply, as I say, removed the necessity for the schools notifying the parents they were teaching these courses and I just didn't think that was right.

Q With too much government interference in family life, do you think Willie Brown's bill should pass, the one on consenting adults, whatever their sexual relations, and get the government out of the bedroom?

A Well, it is hard for me to speak objectively because I've never felt the presence of government in the bedroom. I --

But it is there?

A Yes, we know that --

(Laughter)

A I just have to say I have -- I have no comment. They disposed of the bill and it didn't have to come down to me for any particular treatment, so -- no comment on Willie Brown's bill.

Q Governor, I wonder what your reaction was to the disclosure this morning on the wires that an agreement had been signed several years ago between Mr. Livermore and P.G. & E. regarding the Point Arena Nuclear Powerplant and I wonder if you were aware of the agreement at that time and if so, if you think it was correct and what your thinking behind it was.

A This seems to be the day for clearing up misunderstandings. I've seen an AP story, I don't know how many others there might be, and with all due respect to Associated Press, let me clear the docks on that one. I have boasted many times that this administration did not wait for the great furor about environment and ecology, that this administration in the first few months we were here started in to do such things as -- as trying to protect the environment and trying to find arrangements whereby we could ensure that some development even -- even a state development or project did not destroy the environment. In this instance, long before there were any laws on the state books about this --

a contract or signed a deal, but into an agreement and at the request, I might add, of the utility companies who had just gone through the Bodega Bay experience, that we would work with them and they agreed to work cooperatively with us about any sites that they might have for powerplants, that we would work with them on a study of the ecology -- the environment and so far they have been most cooperative on that. So what has happened is that the one company has put up money, actually, to finance a study by our own fish and game people and our environmentalists in the government on this particular site and there's no such agreement. If -- in other words, if new evidence comes out in this study that would warrant us objecting to that site on ecological grounds, the company is aware that we will -- that we will present that evidence. And since that time, of course, there's been the federal law. As a matter of fact, this agreement and this cooperative effort on our part was the pattern for the federal government's subsequent law. This was looked at with great favor all over the United States by what we were doing.

Q Governor, is there an agreement by the administration not to oppose that Point Arena powerplant?

A No, there is a statement, as I understand it, to this effect, that as of now we have no evidence -- we have studied this completely and there is no evidence against placing the plant there, but as I say, a study continues to go forward and if new evidence is introduced -- in other words, if we find new facts that suddenly change us, and we say wait, there is something we have discovered that we didn't know before, the utility is aware that we will present that evidence.

Q By presenting the evidence -- you mean you are keeping your options open to oppose that plant, is that correct?

A That's exactly what it amounts to.

Q But does the agreement permit the state to prevent construction of that plant?

A Yes, because by now we have the laws are on the books now.

Q I mean does the agreement itself prevent that?

ED MEESE: There is no agreement. This is merely a statement of our analysis of the environmental impact of this particular site.

Q What about the thing which is headed "agreement," and it is signed by Mr. Livermore and Mr. Bonner of P.G. & E, is that or is that not an agreement?

ED MEESE: It is an agreement to cooperate in the study.

A A letter of understanding.

Q The burden is on the state to show damage?

A Well, that's --

MR. MEESE: The burden --

A That's our business, the environmental control area, but as I say, they have put up the money to finance the -- the examination or the survey.

Q Governor, who makes the study, Governor? Does P.G. & E. make the study or the state?

A Oh, no, we make it, our fish and game people, our ~~environmental~~ environmental people.

Q If the findings of that study are adverse, what effect does that have on P.G. & E's plans to go ahead or not build the power plant?

A We will take the adverse information to them and object to the location.

Q Can you stop them on the basis of that study?

A I think notice -- yes, we can.

Q Yes, Governor, if I can just interject, the Public Utilities Commission and Atomic Energy Commission both require the statements on environmental impact before they grant the permits and that's the purpose of this.

Q Change of subject, Governor.

A All right.

Q I'd like to go back, since someone brought up the Kildgord report, and the Department of Corrections, the House Judiciary Subcommittee held a hearing in California Monday after touring both San Quentin and Soledad. The subject of the Kildgord report came up and the contents and context of the independency of that report. It seems that Kildgord in putting a report together submitted raw data, the task force reports, to state officials, Mr. Procunier, Mr. \_\_\_\_\_ and so forth, for comment. The feeling of the committee is this was to be an independent report in that the federal funds were used. And state officials exercised apparently great control over their own comments, some of them very harshly worded comments, with respect to the opinions of the task

eventually came down to us is a toned down version, if you will, from the original data prepared by the task forces. This criticism came out in the latter hours of that hearing. I wonder what your comment to the procedure is, specifically.

A It seems to me that the procedure is very plain, very evident. You refer to task forces. The only information that has come in so far have been from paid consultants, people that -- the task force itself hired. And they now have the responsibility of coordinating this and judging and looking for factual error in all the information that has been brought in by the paid consultants, and what has caused all of the talk is evidently one copy of someone's of one of the paid consultants, some copy of their reports to the committee. And the committee or the task force has not finished its compilation of all of this information.

Q Well, the point was you feel then that state officials should exercise input into independent federal studies like this?

A Well, I think if I go out and hire a consultant to help me on a decision that I have to reach, that I've hired him and it is my responsibility then not to just without reading it hand out his paid consultant's report, but to take this now, put it together with all the other information I have, and what my responsibilities are, and then come forth and say here is my recommendation, and this is -- this is all that's being done.

Q Governor, I'd like to ask you a question about your telegram to Chiang Kai-Shek. You said, "I've told the President of my displeasure." How did you tell the President and when you did tell him did you make a report on your trip?

A No, because this was a phone call and I'm looking forward to a meeting with him to discuss the entire trip which I visited six nations, but -- yes, I called him and he returned the call yesterday morning, and when I told him of my great unhappiness and displeasure at this --

Q Governor, what did the President --

Q Did the President ask you specifically to tell Chiang Kai-Shek that, in effect, there would be no problems, that Nationalist China would retain a seat in the United Nations?

A No, no one could guarantee that, but all of us who had any information, and myself, judging from talking to them or talking to our own people, we were all optimistic. As a matter of fact, this is, I'm sure you recognize, came as a great surprise while we knew

the vote would be fairly close, we believed that we had the vote in the United Nations, and those people that I met with in Asia, they themselves were dealing with other governments in the U. N., and lobbying for an approval of the United State's position, and there was a general optimism that this was not going to happen, that we were going to win. The plain truth of the matter is we were double-crossed by some nations that switched their votes.

Q Governor, --

Q Governor, Assemblyman --

Q -- introduced a bill to have the United States withdraw from the United Nations, would you support such a bill?

A Who is that?

Q Assemblyman Burke from southern California. Do you think that this was out of his jurisdiction to ask the U. S. to withdraw from the United Nations? Would you sign such a bill?

A I don't think it is -- well, I'm not in a position to sign such a bill. I think that -- I don't think there is any question but that he is voicing the sentiment of a great many Americans including myself, that all alternatives should be considered from withdrawal to reduction of funds to whatever, to show our indignation at what has been obviously nothing but political expediency in the United Nations. I voiced my disgust yesterday at this, my feeling about it. And I can't speak too strongly about it. I don't think there was any morality in the action that was taken at the U. N. whatsoever, and I think if the U. S. government does not take some action that shows its displeasure the people of this country are going to be very angry, indeed.

Q Governor --

Q I notice in the telegram here you referred to the immoral action of the General Assembly in kicking out Formosa. I was wondering if you considered at all immoral the United State's action for several years of keeping mainland China with 700 million people, that are represented in this rural nation?

A No, I don't think it was immoral, and I think it is somewhat immoral today, the wording of the Albanian resolution, to suggest that simply by taking over a people by force to never giving those people an opportunity to -- by referendum to vote and agree that this was the government they wanted, to hold them in bondage literally just over a passage of time makes that government automatically the



legitimate government of the 700 million people. I think the question still remains as to whether the government in Peking is the representative of 700 million people or whether it is holding in bondage 700 million people.

Q Do you see any contradiction, for example, to support a country like the Union of South Africa, the white government doesn't support or obviously represents its people, and not in the past support the mainland China?

A The charter of the United Nations makes it very plain that the United Nations cannot interfere with the internal problems of any country. So the charter itself prevents what you are talking about. But, again, we had recognized for many years that Chiang Kai-Shek's government is the government of China, and it was on this basis that we -- that we took our stand. Now, the plain and simple fact is that this year it became apparent that we no longer had the votes and could prevent the action with regard to the seating of Communist China, so the U. S. took the position then of, all right, we would agree to that providing that both Chinas were retained in the U. N., and this left still the internal matters of -- between the two contesting governments as to who was the legitimate ruler or government of China, and this is the matter upon which we lost.

Q Governor --

Q Governor, you said --

A Wait a minute, he was interrupted earlier.

Q Governor, what did President Nixon say to you regarding the U.N. situation?

A Well, I think that any questions about what he said to me, you don't quote the President. I think that -- I don't think he'd mind if I told you that when I told him I didn't sleep very well the night before after the decision, he said he hadn't slept very well either, but beyond that I think you'd have to ask the White House what --

Q Meanwhile back in California.

Q Wait a minute. Wait a minute.

A No, wait a second.

Q Stay in the Orient a second. Could you give us a brief summary of your trip, any impressions you received or anything you might have changed your mind on or, you know, how the -- how did the trip go?

A Oh, well, let me -- I'm not going to pose as an instant expert, I don't like people that go there for 48 hours and suddenly know how to run the show. But I will say this, first impressions and a lasting impression, in all of the six nations that we visited is that we better shorten our lunch hour. It sounds strange to talk of -- of a pioneering atmosphere when you were in a country that has a civilization and a history that is thousands of years old and yet that was the only way to describe it. It was -- it was like an American in a younger day. The energy, the drive, the progress that they are making and usually Americans have gone abroad, I suppose, with the idea that we have some know-how to impart to them. I want to tell you, I came home wanting to impart some know-how here at home. On some of the things that I saw, from the great ship building yards in Kobe to Singapore which to those people who were concerned about the environment, Singapore, I swear, must be the cleanest city in the entire world, bar none. And this -- this extends not only to litter and to cleanliness, but to even the elimination of -- of pesty insects, and so forth. But every country that -- the drive and the progress that they are making is so fantastic, when you compare the growth rate and productivity of Japan last year was 14.2 per cent and in the United States it was only 1.9 per cent -- I think that sometimes perhaps some of the hierarchy of organized labor in this country should take a trip abroad.

Q How did you like the food, Governor?

A What? It was wonderful, and I even mastered chopsticks. I have a secret to tell you, I didn't really have to wait till I went there to master them, I had to learn to use them in a picture once.

Q Governor, if you think the U. S. doesn't take some action the people will be unhappy, do you think if President Nixon fails to take some sort of action that it will harm his chances for being renominated next year?

A I'm not going to comment on this in the context of politics or anything, I'm only going to say that I think the U. S. government should reveal its understanding of the fact that the United Nations has not lived up to the great dreams that we had for it some years ago.



Q Governor, you said --

A And certainly, among other things, a reorganization is necessary. And you have a situation in which, as I said yesterday, more than 50 per cent of the nations who can win a vote -- now this was not true in this instance, in this particular vote. There were major nations involved on the other side, but you can actually muster a better than 50 per cent vote among nations that represent less than 10 per cent of the total population, of the world.

Q Governor --

Q Governor, it is a political context to what we are talking about, because in the -- there is an election coming up next year, do you think that it will have any effect on President Nixon's chances for renomination or re-election?

A I just want to wait and see if we aren't going to take an action.

Q One question on the United Nations. In the future, as in your years as Governor, will you sign any proclamation declaring United Nations Day in California?

A Well, you say any time in the future, they might have that reorganization. If they put one on my desk right now, no, I wouldn't sign it.

MR. RODDA: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---

11/17

OFFICE OF THE WHITE HOUSE PRESS SECRETARY

---

THE WHITE HOUSE  
PRESS CONFERENCE  
OF  
RONALD REAGAN, GOVERNOR  
OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA  
  
THE BRIEFING ROOM

AT 12:35 P.M. EST.

MR. ZIEGLER: The President has just met with Governor Reagan for an hour and a half. They talked about the recent trip Governor Reagan took as a personal representative of the President between the period of October 9 to the 23rd, to Asia. The Governor was the personal representative of the President to the Republic of China's national celebration on October 10.

The Governor will give you a rundown on their discussions and take your questions.

Governor Reagan.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: There is nothing in the line of an opening statement except to continue the remarks of Mr. Ziegler and tell you that this finally was my report to the President on that trip and my meetings with the various Heads of State in the six countries we visited.

So if any of you have questions, go ahead.

Q Governor, did you also talk about any of the problems you have expressed that you have with the agencies like HEW?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, I reported to him the state of our welfare reforms, for example, and where we are with regard to those areas where we must have waivers from HEW.

Q Governor, how would you characterize your report? Are things looking good over there for us? What did you tell the President?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I told him, as I am sure you can all realize and as we well understand, that when I was there, what with the Peking visit and all, there was an occasion to reassure the people in those countries that this country had no intention of abandoning its alliances or its friendships or treaties with those various nations.

For example, in Taiwan, and the President himself has confirmed, this Nation is still committed to its alliance with Taiwan.

MORE

Q Governor, did you get the feeling that they believed what you were saying or were there still questions in their minds about that?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I had a very distinct feeling in each place we left that there was a reassurance and they were easier in their minds, because we would usually segue from that kind of talk into one of the things I was interested in, particularly from our own California standpoint, as well as the Nation's as a whole, and that was the expansion of the trade that already exists between us and the commercial relationships, and we had good meetings on that score.

Q Governor, was there anybody else in this meeting this morning besides yourself and the President?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No, I was reporting to the President.

Q Did the subject of domestic politics per chance come up?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, no more than some chit-chat between us over coffee about the recent dinner with the closed circuit television, and comparing notes of what it was like at our dinner in Los Angeles and what it was like at the dinners he attended.

Q Governor, a number of conservatives in this country are supposed to be unhappy with some of the things that the President has done, such as the Peking visit. Do you think there is a way of getting through to these people and explaining? Are you trying to explain this or do you agree with the President's position?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, as a matter of fact, and that yes is to all your questions, that there is a way. There is no question but that based on our past history and the record of things that you refer to as the conservatives disagreeing with, all the way back to Yalta and Potsdam and some of our international relations, that these people would be concerned with the announcement that a President of the United States was going to Peking.

I have found already, in pointing out to them that there might very well be reason for that concern, if someone else were going to Peking, based on the past record of performance, but that this President has certainly revealed throughout his entire public career, an awareness of the great fundamental differences between our philosophy and that of the Communist nations, and that he has said only that he is going to try and establish communication to try and take us a step further away from confrontation, and that he has made it perfectly clear that he has no intention of abandoning old friends or breaking any of our alliances with our friends. I have found when it is presented to them in this way, that most people who were disquieted by this announcement see it in a different light.

I am sure after he has completed the trip, they will find that their fears were groundless.

Q Did you discuss this in this context with him this morning.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, only in the sense that it figured in the report. Naturally there were, in the countries, audiences--for example, with President Chiang Kai-shek there was this concern about was there any possible change in American policy--and I was authorized to reassure them that no, there was not, and yes, we were still allies and we intended to be that way.

Q I meant in the context of American politics and the possible discontent of conservatives here. Did you discuss that with the President?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Oh, no, there was no need for that, because we have had conversations about that before.

Q Governor, back to this welfare question for a minute, did the President give you any kind of assurance that the waivers necessary to carry out your programs in California would be granted?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, Lou, let me just answer it this way and tell you that the President from the very first has approved our approach to the welfare reform and the experiments, for example, in the community work forces, the experiment of seeing if we can recreate a community work force out of people who are on welfare.

He has approved that and approved that and approved such an experiment in California. He did so in San Clemente several months ago, and he hasn't retreated from that position at all.

Q Governor, are there other issues the conservatives are exercised about, policies of this Administration?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No, I don't think so.

Q Governor, when you called the President the day after the U.N. vote expelling Taiwan, what did you say to him?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I expressed my great regret and told him I hadn't slept very well the night before, and he confessed to me he hadn't slept very well either. I said I was sure that the people, a great many Americans, were going to be disturbed about what had happened, and he also was disturbed about what had happened.

Q Governor, when you meet with Senator Buckley this afternoon, are you going to try to enlist his help in rallying the conservatives around President Nixon?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, I don't know whether that will be necessary. Jim Buckley and I aren't as well acquainted as Bill Buckley and I are, and it was just that being here, I wanted to touch base.

We had met in California recently when he was out there. He came out to do some chores for us, politically, and I wanted to meet with him and exchange views and tell him a little about the trip I was just on.

Q Governor, in a larger sense, do you think the President has any serious problems with the conservatives in this country, politically in terms of their support of him?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: None that cannot be resolved, for example, by the outcome of the Peking trip. I think this, and then coming on top of it, the affair at the United Nations, has been disturbing, and as I say, I think it is disturbing to many Republicans. I won't even use the label conservative.

It has been disturbing because in the past history there has been a case of appeasement here and there in our dealings on the world level, but I think it is easy to point out that this appeasement has usually taken place under the opposition Party, and I think when they find out that the President has no intention of going and bargaining away anything that is of value to the United States, they will be reassured.

Q Governor, would you give us some examples of this sort of appeasement you are talking about in the past?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, I think in Yalta and Potsdam, the agreement we made with the Russians. I think in the so-called Cuban missile crisis, we never claimed our part of the agreement for the settlement of that so-called dispute. I think the fiasco in the Bay of Pigs, the tragedy there was certainly not to the credit of the United States, and very frankly, I think ~~that~~ the whole matter of the whole Vietnam war, up until this Administration, when it was just a kind of aimless pouring more and more men into the mill in Vietnam, with no solution in sight, and unwillingness to win, and yet no ability to get out, was an example of foreign policy that was misguided.

I think the fact that this President is winding down the war and winding it down in such a way that South Vietnam is not going to be deserted by its allies, but is going to be in a position to take care of itself as a nation, should indicate the difference between a policy that just went from day to day hoping that a miracle would happen and somebody who had a plan and an idea.

Q Have you been asked or do you intend to go out and speak in defense of whatever policies the President may have invoked that seem to disturb the conservatives?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Oh, no. My participation in that sort of thing has already been resolved. I have been getting a number of requests from around the country to speak to Republican groups, as we get close to a campaign year, and we turned all of those invitations over to the National Committee and let them make the choice, because I can't accept them all.

So we let them decide which are the ones they think I would be most valuable in, and that situation still maintains.

Q Did you discuss with the President the California primary, particularly the prospects of a slate opposed to the one you plan to lead?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: That never came up.

Q Governor, what impact do you think today's developments in Thailand will have on that part of the world and America's role in that part of the world?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, I am afraid a two week trip to the Orient did not make me an Asian expert. Some kinds of people become experts on that kind of a trip, but I am a slow student.

I would only just hazard this: I doubt that this means a very great fundamental change in the picture in Thailand

Q Governor, what would you advise the President today, now, in respect to the United Nations and the support of it, both financially and morally?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, now, Governors don't usually advise the President.

MORE



Q You did have a conversation with him at the time of the vote?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, I think that the United States is keeping an eye on our relationship there in that body and where we should go. Perhaps I might have a position that would be one of some immediate changes. I think that the United Nations -- and this is not a new position since the vote, I said this at the time of their anniversary when many of them journeyed out and there was quite, as you know, an affair in San Francisco, the scene of the birth of the United Nations -- I said at that time I thought that part of the United Nations Charter or rules that it provided for subsequent review for the U.N. after it had been in operation for a while to see if changes should be made. That it was high time they had that review and I think there are changes that should be made.

I think perhaps a more realistic membership balance to overcome the fact, that today nations containing less than 10 percent of the world population can actually carry the vote in the U.N., should make us reconsider as to how far we would be bound by a United Nations vote.

Q The Administration has now given up the hope of having welfare reform put into effect during this term of office. That is, it has given up on Congressional passage this year and it takes 12 to 18 months to put it into effect after that.

Does that make you unhappy?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Not at all. As long as they let us try the welfare reform that we are putting into effect and some other States have put various parts, of the same kind of thing we have been talking about, into effect, I think it is a great opportunity to do some experimenting and perhaps know more about the whole welfare problem than we know, or then we have been able to see from the standpoint of a national reform.

I do not hold with the idea in this instance, that Washington has all the answers with regard to welfare. We are out where it is working. We have to make it work. And frankly, it is probably one of the most colossal social failures that we have in our government, is welfare as it is presently organized.

Q On that point, Governor, there are reports that an amendment is going to be offered to the tax bill today which would give a billion dollars, as I understand it, to the States to help reimburse them for the very heavy welfare expenditures. Did this come up this morning and do you have a position on that?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I don't know what the details of that would be. It certainly didn't come up, anything about it. The answer in my book has never been one of finding a different way to finance it. Those States, which out of desperation, have said if the Federal Government would only pay for it and just take it off our backs. That is not reform. Because the same taxpayers pay for it.

It doesn't matter who is collecting the tax, the State, the county or Federal Government. The answer is to reform the program and in California, with only a few administrative changes and a great spotlight turned on welfare as we turned it on in attempting to get our welfare reform, beginning last winter, at the end of November we will be able to announce that for eight consecutive months the welfare case load in California has been going down. We had 119,000 fewer people on welfare at the end of September than we had in March when we started and the importance of that can be seen when I tell you that for several years prior to that, welfare in California averaged increasing 50,000 cases a month.

Q What happened to those 119,000, Governor? Did you run any spot check on how they are subsisting?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No, we have been so busy implementing these things we haven't done that, but I think some of the same thing could be seen there as in New York where the Governor in New York ordered them to pick up the checks instead of having them mailed and 22 percent of the people didn't pick up the checks. I don't know whether it is 22 percent of the people or 22 percent of the checks and the explanation of that is one of the things I think we are learning is that a great many people have discovered they can get more than one check and when they had to come in and pick them up in person, there was the fear of being caught.

Q Governor, many conservatives are very unhappy with the OEO bill that is nearing final approval on the Hill and that would shift legal services from OEO and remove your veto and the veto of other Governors and create a new legal services corporation.

Did you have occasion to discuss this with the President?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No.

Q In any case, would you like him to veto the bill should this provision remain in it?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: We didn't discuss it and let me point out in California I never discuss a bill as to whether to veto it until it actually gets to my desk. As I said, out there what starts in the Legislature as an orange sometimes comes out as an apple.

I don't know what the bill will be. Let me just say that I am in favor of a correction and a change in the present legal assistance program because for the very reason that we vetoed the rural legal assistance program in California. They are not working the way they were intended to work and the people that were intended to have personal and private help in their legal problems were not getting it.

We have some idea and we have been authorized to try an experiment in California and we are going forth implementing that to see. Just to simply take away the Governor's veto I think, is a step backwards, because once again, the Governor is on hand at the scene and able to know whether it is working or not and I think the Governor should have the authority to veto the program.

MORE

Q Do you think in 1972 the old historic rule of geographic balance ought to be a major consideration in putting together the Republic National ticket?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I wonder what you are getting at with that question. Would it be an answer to your question if I told you that the only plan I have and the only desire I have is to continue being Governor of California for the rest of this term.

Q Will you go further then and tack on the General Sherman statement -- I ask this in all seriousness -- are you at this moment ruling yourself out between now and 1972 for any place in the National ticket?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: That is right.

Q Do you believe Vice President Agnew should remain on the ticket?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes.

Q Governor, Senator Cranston says he expects you to be his opponent if he runs for re-election in 1974. Is that a good guess on his part?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I don't know whether it is a good guess or not, but I will not say anything that will relieve him of the worry for the next three years. He ought to have something on his mind.

---

Q Ron, Governor Reagan said when he represented the President on Taiwan he tried to reassure the China Government that we would maintain our commitments. In view of the fact that Mainland China now is in the United Nations and Mainland China claims absolute sovereignty over Formosa, does the President still continue his promise of military support for defense of the Government of Formosa?

MR. ZIEGLER: I think the Governor represented the President's view very clearly on the U.S. commitment to Taiwan and the U.S. position is that we stand fully behind the defense commitment to Taiwan. President Nixon has made that very clear in many statements which he has made and there is no change in that policy, nor will there be a change in that policy. The United States stands fully behind its defense commitment to Taiwan.

Q Ron, is H.R. 1 still a top priority bill for the Administration?

MR. ZIEGLER: Well, Secretary Richardson spoke about the matter yesterday and Governor Reagan pointed out to you that the President and Governor Reagan have had a very productive discussion about welfare reform and the need for welfare reform. H.R. 1 is welfare reform and remains high on the Administration's docket.

Q What about plans for this afternoon?

MR. ZIEGLER: Jerry Warren will brief at 4:00

Q Do we have a lid until then?

MR. ZIEGLER: Yes, sir.

THE PRESS: Thank you, gentlemen.

11/22

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD NOVEMBER 22, 1971

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: Good morning, I have an opening statement. It isn't -- I don't have any release on it. It's ad lib. But I would like to ask -- I'd like to ask your help and cooperation. I'd like to ask it also of the electronic media. As a matter of fact, I can almost put it on an equal time basis, but not on behalf of myself, but equal time for the young people of California. The confusion persists about the venereal disease education bill in the schools. It has been carried recently on a number of outlets of the electronic media, it has been carried recently in the press, it has been extended to a county health officer who's reported in one of the papers from Los Angeles making a statement. Let me make one thing plain. Number one, all of us should be in support of venereal disease training and education in our schools. I have made a public service television film to that extent, urging parents to call attention on the part of their own schools where their own children are going to the need for this. It is epidemic proportions. I have met with Wilson Riles. Guidelines have gone out to the schools. We have made \$200,000 of public health money available for this, and for the start of a program to indoctrinate first the teachers, a training school for the teachers in order to institute this immediately. No consent of the parents is needed. The law that I vetoed I vetoed simply because it was unneeded, and it did cross out one thing that I think is essential and should not be eliminated. It merely requires that the parents be notified that their children are going to get this training.

Now, as I say, we have proceeded, we are on our way with the program and I hope that all of you will take advantage of the opportunity to make this public and to let the parents know so that they can encourage schools to go forward. There is no way that teachers'



credentials are threatened, they do not have to get consent to have this program, and I urge the immediate expansion of training of this kind because it is a problem that is hurting our young people. It is of epidemic proportions.

Q Governor, is it a coincidence that you are making this statement, holding this press conference at precisely the time when March Fong is seeking to override your veto of her bill dealing with venereal disease education?

A No, I have just returned, I am not concerned about that at all. I am concerned when I try to keep up or catch up with the press out here that I have missed while I've been at the Governor's Conference, and discovered someone that's supposedly knowledgeable as a county public health officer giving a public address to other professionals in the field and saying that at the moment they cannot give this course in the schools. And this information seems to have been spreading more and I go by my own mail of people who want to know, people who have contacted me want to know why the state should not favor this kind of a program. Favor it, we are enthusiastically in support of it, and I would suggest that anyone who questions this can check with the Superintendent of Education or the State School Board about our meeting. I think you'll find that it is going forward and the plans are already being laid and carried out for teachers' indoctrination or training re: indoctrination with the materials and so forth that will be used in the program.

Q And after being notified the parent does have a right to say, he doesn't want the student in that class, right?

A A parent can -- yes, a parent is notified, but there is a great difference between a parent, whether for religious reasons or whatever, saying I want my child excused from that class, and a parent having to give a consent in order to train or to teach the course. And I just believe that the one thing that the bill would have done was simply remove the necessity of informing the students and I just think that there is too much of a tendency today of government to put itself between the parent and the child, and therefore this bill -- it wasn't worth it to just simply take this one factor out of notification. Good Lord, the schools can notify them every week of a PTA meeting by way of the students. It is going to be no strain on the schools and as I say, we have already --

our staff has helped Wilson Riles and last week the guidelines went out for the notification to the parents and how this is to be done. They have gone out to the school districts already.

Q Governor, under the current law can a parent remove his child from the educational course in V. D.?

A Yes. Oh, yes, and under a number of other courses also.

Q Isn't that sort of a form of granting permission to --

A Well the thing that I'm trying to correct is an inference that has been made or a misunderstanding that consent of the parents is required in advance or you can't have the course or teach the course. And I think the -- the basis of the right of a parent or the -- of a parent to withdraw a child from a class in school -- this has been a rather inherent thing where certain religious differences and so forth have occurred about certain courses for a long time. They can do it in certain areas of physiology classes right now.

Q Governor, notification of PTA meetings is often done by just sending a note home with the child. What are the guidelines for the type of notification that would be required in this case?

A Well, these were drawn up last week while I was gone, I'd have to ask Ed here exactly what they said, but I know in the meeting we had with Wilson Riles we offered that help to him, he accepted. So what has been the result, what is the nature of it?

ED MEESE: The law requires that the notice be sent home in the same manner, customarily used for sending home notices, which can be by the students, by the mails or whatever way is normally used. That's the way the law provides.

Q It is all it requires, a simple statement that a course will be taught, or is the notice more than that?

ED MEESE: It requires the statement that a course will be taught and that the instructional materials will be available if any parent wants to look at them.

Q Doesn't notify the parents that they have a right to withdraw the students from the course?

ED MEESE: I think that probably would be in the notice also.

Q Governor, concerning another veto of yours on the methadone bill, your message, you said that we should learn how effectively these programs are meeting their goals. The President of the Federal Food and Drug Administration and the Bureau of Narcotics and Dangerous Drugs have seen fit to use information from around the



country to recommend that methadone is safe and effective for treating heroin addicts. Did you use that same information or are you aware of information not only in California but the rest of the country?

A We now have a five million dollar program and it is being carefully watched. Whatever the Food and Drug people said, I can only tell you that there have been deaths from overdoses of methadone. It is an addictive drug, even though it doesn't have some of the deleterious side effects of heroin. And there is an addiction problem. There's even a problem of some individuals who go out in spite of the prescribed doses and get additional on the black market the same as they would go out for heroin or anything else. And our feeling was that this bill was premature. That we have this program, ~~of~~ a five million dollar program going. We have it being carefully watched. The program that was in the legislation, we don't know it might be too small or it might be too big. It was just premature. That if this program, when our people come back to us with recommendations, they may recommend going much farther and all out, but there are still some unanswered questions in it and we are depending on our own experts in this who are -- who are conducting the program right now.

Q Governor, how do you feel about funding the program similar to the probation subsidy where you pay the county for people kept locally rather than going to state prison?

ED MEESE: That bill hasn't come down yet.

A That hasn't come down.

Q Another subject.

A All right.

Q Governor Reagan, the other night on the David Frost show he asked, if you found yourself in the same tax position this year would you pay taxes or not? You said you'd pay them anyway because you didn't want the furor. Does that make sense? I mean, if it wasn't wrong last year it isn't wrong this year, is it?

A No, it doesn't make sense, and it didn't make sense last year. The whole fuss that was raised. But what I said to him was ~~and~~ that conversation will show, that after -- after the clouts on the head that I took I was going to tell my lawyer that if I was Simon Pure and didn't owe a dime, I was going to invent something. Make a

contribution to the state.

Q Isn't that illegal?

(Laughter)

A It might be, then it would be up to the Franchise Board to come back and force me to take the money back.

Q If they send you a refund, what would you do with it?

A What? Well, could I give it to charity, which would increase my deductions for the next year.

Q Governor, there is a group in Oregon which is involved in a letter writing campaign now urging you to become involved in the presidential campaign. I wonder if some of those letters have reached you and what your reaction to that is in Oregon is.

A That's the first I heard of it. The letters may have reached here, but as I say, this is my first morning back. No, my reaction is very simple. While at the Governor's Conference in Indiana Nelson Rockefeller and I co-sponsored a resolution that was unanimously passed by the Republic Governors supporting the renomination and re-election of Richard Nixon.

Q Speaking of bills that are on your desk, when do you plan to take action on the Priolo 18 year majority? You've favored the idea of giving the 18 year olds the duties of citizenship now that they have the right to vote.

A Well, that bill we haven't had a chance to put that through the usual process that we do in cabinet meetings, so I'd rather not comment on it now.

Q Think you'll act this week?

A What?

Q Think you'll act this week?

A I hope so.

Q Now, there is one sort of related bill that will not get to you, I wonder if you've taken any position on that, it is the constitutional amendments which will allow the people to vote on the question of letting 18 year olds drink.

A Well, I -- on that one I can tell you, as I have said on several other bills before, regardless of how I might feel about how the people should vote on it, I agree with the right of the people to vote on it, to make that decision.

Q Governor, change of subject. Will you support legislation or sign legislation which provides for the state to pick up the cost

of the Angela Dav trial?

ED MEESE: This is another bill that hasn't come down yet. Just to correct the record on the other one, the bill is down but has not yet been considered by the Gove nor on the probation subsidy.

A As I say, that bill hasn't come down yet.

Q Governor, on another bill --

(Laughter)

Q What about the one that increases compensation for workmen that are injured or killed in the course of their \_\_\_\_\_

A Wait a minute, are you talking about the --

Q Talking about Assemblyman Fenton's Workmen's Compensation reform package.

A This one, has this come down yet, I --

ED MEESE: I think it is still in the Senate at the present time.

A It is still in the Senate.

ED MEESE: At least we haven't considered it yet, Governor, in cabinet meetings.

Q Governor, there was an argument on the floor that these two bills are tied together and that you have agreed to sign both, but you wouldn't sign one without the other. That was the inference or the implication that there was some kind of a deal made with -- between business and labor that you were involved in.

A You use that word "A deal made."

(Laughter)

A I don't --

ED MEESE: Governor, this is a case of bills relating to Workmen's Compensation, and the general position taken, without dealing with specific legislation, is that the entire system should be reformed rather than merely increasing the benefits. And I think that was the discussion on the floor.

Q Governor, what's your attitude towards Connally as a Vice-Presidential contender? There's some reports that you would oppose him if he -- you know, what would -- if the President decided to take him as Vice President, what would your feeling be?

A Well, I think in politics today, and most people recognize that the President has a very large voice in choosing his running mate, at the same time that doesn't preclude people in his party giving him counsel, and even pressing for some other candidate. I've made it perfectly plain I think Ted Agnew has been a great Vice President and I am one who believes that Ted Agnew should be on the

ticket. And I think a great many Republicans - most of them feel that way. So that is my preference. It is a preference I certainly would express to the President.

Q How do you explain the sudden silence of Mr. Agnew and also the renewed speculation of change, Governor?

A Well, I can't comment on the speculation for change. People, particularly in political years, speculate on a lot of things. But I do know that the recent twenty dinners connected by closed circuit television, the President was most fullsome in his praise of Ted Agnew and the job he had done.

Q What did you think of the Vice President's remarks about Congressman McCloskey, reference to Benedict Arnold.

A Well, I think -- I got a couple of letters on my desk about some one liners that I've used in some political speeches. I think that it is nitpicking and it always seems to be one-sided nit picking. Always aimed at one particular party. He made a humorous remark. He was in a succession of the re-opening of his remarks of one liners on political matters and about potential opponents on the other side, and he was getting pretty good laughs, too, I might add, and he got on this one and I don't think there was anything in bad taste or wrong about it at all.

Q You thought it was funny at the time he said it?

A What?

Q Did you think it was funny at the time he said it?

A Yeah, I laughed.

Q Governor, new subject. On reapportionment, some one is bound to ask you sooner or later, I suppose, the County chairman in Santa Clara County, both Republican and Democrat party have urged you to veto the current reapportionment bill because it splits Santa Clara County between six Senate Districts, one of which goes to the Oregon border and the other one goes to the Arizona border. I wonder if you would comment on the Santa Clara County plan, specifically, and if you can tell us now whether you would veto the reapportionment plan since it has been merged with the Assembly bill, which gives Assembly democrats a 44 -- 33 --- 44 and 36 split.

A Well, now, let me be general on one and specific on the other because I just haven't gotten back -- I haven't had a chance to sit down with anyone on what the details are or how far we have gone toward reconciling the differences between Republican and Democrat

plans. As to Sar ( Clara County, I think we ave -- they have a legitimate complaint. I always say that reapportionment should be based on what is best for the people, not their representatives. And that you should try as nearly as possible to have districts that represent a community of interests where there is a logical reason, such as a county to have a representative and that -- not to be so divided up that the county literally has no representation, that the -- they are such a tag end, each part of the county ofve some other --of a representative's district that he can afford to make decisions without taking their interest into mind, because they do not represent a large enough segment of voters. And that's for the specific answer. I think they have a legitimate complaint just from what I generally have heard. Now to the broad answer, because I haven't seen the specifics and I haven't had a chance to meet with our leadership and see where we are, what the compromises are that are being attempted, the changes that are still being contemplated, let me just say that once again this should guide us. I am opposed to gerrymanders whether they are Republican or Democrat. ~~to~~ The people have a right to believe that when a reapportionment comes along it will be based on what is the best representation for the people, not creating a lot of districts that like Jerry Martin said, look like skinny octopuses with long sharp fingernails or is it octopi?

Q New subject, Governor. You wouldn't necessarily veto a bill ~~just~~ because it consolidated the Assembly with the Senate reapportionment?

A Oh, not on that as a principle. If -- if in an attempt to get one jerrymander passed by putting it in with a bill that they thought was all right and one that would be acceptable to me, that device won't work.

Q Governor, are you -- excuse me. Are you saying that even though the Republicans in the legislature supported this reapportionment bill, if you found that it violated community interests and have jerrymandered too far towards the legislature, you would veto it?

A I don't anticipate that the Republicans in the legislature and I are going to find ourselves soon opposite sides. They know my feelings and I must say that the plans that they have originally put forth I thought were very fair and were virtually neutral plans. Now, I want to meet with them before I give any answer, I want to find out exactly what it is and what's going on in the attempts to reconcile the differences.



Q Governor, recently a federal court judge in San Francisco blocked the continuance of a freeway in East Bay over there, and he ruled because of inadequate relocation programs for the people in the way of the freeway, and also environmental policies. The state has not yet appealed that decision but a similar case in the State of Washington, the federal circuit court, rules against the state up there. Do you feel that the rulings will have any effect on the freeways now in progress and those planned in the future in the state?

A Well, I don't know what effect they might have in the future, but the minute I saw that I have asked and so far I don't have the report yet -- I have asked for a report on this because it seems strange to me because the policy of the Highway Division under this administration has been to take into consideration not only environmental problems, but community problems, neighborhoods -- as a matter of fact, I'll recall to you that California is the state that for the first time in history made highway building funds available to relocate neighborhoods when it was inevitable that some neighborhood had to be changed by a freeway, and so I was hard put to understand just what this was all about, and I can't believe that we have in some way changed our policy and I still don't have a report, so I couldn't. I can't go beyond that.

Q In this case it was a -- federal funds were involved and relocation program did not meet federal standards.

A Well, let me find out what it is that develops. As a matter of fact, the federal government in its policy of providing fund for relocating of neighborhoods, they got that idea from us. We first brought that about to solve a problem down in central Los Angeles in the Watts area with regard to a freeway that -- it had never been done in the United States before.

Q Governor, how do you feel about the sale of rare books as a way of solving the economic problems and the university problem?

A Well, I -- once again, this is like a rerun, do I get a residual check because I think we talked about this a few weeks ago at a press conference, or am I confusing you with somebody that caught me at the elevator or something? Look, this report was nothing more than the working papers of a group of auditors who were supposed to put down, regardless of how they might personally feel, every possible area they saw that might be an alternative for



workable economies. The administration of the schools. They made this available to the university authorities, as we told the university authorities we would, before we even saw it, so that they could put their input in. It is not the report -- no recommendations have been made whatsoever, either by the auditors and certainly not by us, and I have to tell you the university administration knows this. And the Regents who brought it up know this. And they also must know if they read some of your printings a few weeks ago, know if that was an alternative presented to me, I believe the university library is a repository for such things as rare books. It is a proper place for them and I would be unalterably opposed to selling them and the university and whoever over there leaked this information and tried to make it that this was some kind of economy move by this administration knew this when they leaked it, that it was false. And we have had calls of apology about it from the president of the University who is not a part of this leak, and who has stated that he understood exactly what those audit reports were and that he did not take them as a recommendation.

Q Who was responsible for the leak?

A I don't know. I guess when a thing gets into a shop that big there's always somebody that talks to somebody.

Q Governor, have you decided what you are going to do on the State college name change bill?

A That one is on the desk.

MR. ED MEESE: That was up for discussion of cabinet today.

A That is due for the cabinet discussion today.

Q The marginal costs of running the legislature is set at about \$11,000 a day. Would you say at this point that the taxpayers are getting their money's worth?

A No.

Q Why not? Why?

A I think that everything that had to be done in this legislative session could have been done within the regular session and they could have been out of here by the end of June or early July as they should have been. I think that there has been foot dragging on the part of the leadership of the majority party. And that includes in some instances chairmen of committees. And I just say there was no need whatsoever for this session to drag on to where we might for the first time in history have two concurrent sessions running, this

one and the next one.

Q Would you say Republicans would share that blame?

A Would share what?

Q Would share the blame.

A No, there isn't much we can do. The other side calls the turn on this. Didn't last this long in the one session that I've had where we had Republican leadership. Everything got done on time.

Q Will you support legislation to limit the number of days in session next time around?

A Oh, I don't know what the approach to this is. I would hope that maybe they have learned their lesson and they wouldn't need anything like that, but if it need be, something must be done because I think this is disgraceful.

Q You said you would not support it?

A I didn't say that. I said I'd -- I said I would hope that it wouldn't be necessary, but something has to be done, to not have a recurrence of this.

Q Another subject. If they should try to go on vacation now you wouldn't call them back for a special session?

A What?

Q If they should try to go on vacation now you wouldn't call them back for a special session?

A Oh, let's not -- you know I'm not going to announce in advance where we are going to drop the bombs.

Q Another subject. Governor, what happens if they pass a reapportionment plan and you veto it? Legally, what's the situation? What are you going to do in that situation?

A There are several things. First of all, they can go back upstairs and try again, and I would hope they would. I don't think the issue has been resolved yet as to the commission, as to whether that commission is supposed to be prescribed. I believe that it does, and I would think that would be the next resort. Then, of course, there are other courts.

Q Governor --

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

Q There is a new recall Reagan drive that's under way and unlike those in the past, it is a different group organizing it and also it comes at a time when the Field poll shows your popularity is at --

at a point lower than those who support you. First, do you think it's got a chance? And what are its chances?

(Laughter)

A You -- you'd have to check on that. I don't know that I go along with Mr. Field in his poll either. I thought we had about the widest public support on the welfare reform program that we have ever had on anything in this administration in these four and a half years, and I figure that those recall things, it is sort of like the swallows coming back to Capistrano. Every time as we get on the even of an election year, whether it is for the Governor's election or not, there is a recall movement seems to spring up with regard to me, and I figure it is just part of the game.

Q A few moments ago on the subject of whether 18 year olds should drink or not, you felt that regardless of your personal opinions you endorse the idea of getting things on the ballot, or that is allowing the voters to decide. In that spirit, would you sign a petition?

ED MEESE: No.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---