

# Ronald Reagan Presidential Library Digital Library Collections

---

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

---

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

Folder Title: Press Conference Transcripts –  
04/05/1972, 04/20/1972, 05/11/1972

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>



PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 5, 1972

Reported by

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Press Release #185)

Q. Governor, the Democrats are only up there by 190 million *Budget* and the Republicans went along with them in the Ways and Means Committee. It is 190 million over what you asked for.

A. That's right, I think some of the objections, as I say here, this is one. Some of the other objections are things that I can't -- couldn't do anything about. Because I cannot put back what has been taken out and the changes that they have made in the Executive Department's ability to run its own affairs are even more grievous. But in the committee I think you'll find that the same thing followed, that I have just said will follow on the voting on the floor, that there is no sense in trying to win the battle there. The thing to do is to move it along and get it to the eventual process of conference committee. Nobody else? Well--

(Laughter)

Q. Is that it? --

Q. Governor, can you give us an example of the kind of material you deal with that requires putting into a shredder after you finish with it so no one can see it?

A. No, all I know is that this has been a standard procedure and I guess in most government offices, and it has been in ours. I don't even know where the thing is, I just know what I want to throw in my waste basket I only have to tear in tiny pieces, that it is all destroyed that way. And as I say, it's been standard operating procedure as long as I know of.

Q. Governor, on a political matter, this week-end Republican organizations are going to meet and I understand that you have had some of the leaders in to urge them to endorse Nixon, is that true?

A. I have had some of the leaders in as Chairman of the Nixon

campaign to tell them that -- yes, I'm campaigning for him and that I discussed with them what I think is some of the problems and urged them to face this issue in the importance of --

Q. Have you any --

A. -- supporting the President.

Q. -- you might not get 60 per cent?

A. What?

Q. Have you any fear that they might not round up 60 per cent of the delegates to endorse Nixon, thereby defeat what you are trying to do?

A. I don't know, I'm quite sure that there are people in that organization who have different views, but I know also it takes two thirds, I think, Squire to -- to endorse, and I don't know the count in there.

Q. But you have discussed with some of the leaders the necessity of this?

A. Oh, I've discussed with as many Republicans as I can get in -- of activists in leadership groups this way, the necessity for having unity in the party and going forth in support of what I'm sure is going to be our nominee.

Q. Governor Wallace has said that -- in advance of the Wisconsin primary, and also he thought that he did well, and the effect of that would be to get President Nixon to change the policies of the administration that are existing. Governor Wallace did very well in Wisconsin. Do you think that President Nixon ought to respond to that showing by altering his policy?

A. I don't know that the President needs any counsel or advice from Governor Wallace. I think that any President needs, certainly within his own party -- needs counseling, and the opinions provided to him from every facet. This has been one of my criticisms of the so-called conservatives in the Republican party, is that we haven't and I include me because you put me in with that group anyway -- we haven't expressed ourselves on many issues, either in support or in criticism as much as we should. For example, the President told me that with regard to the Amchitka blast, which I'm sure a great many people felt should have gone forward as a necessary part of our defense, that all he heard was pressure from those people who wanted it cancelled. He didn't hear from any of the people who supported it and believed it should go forward. And I think judging by my own position here, it is nice to know sometimes that there is -- when you are facing a controversial issue. that all of

the pressure is coming from just one group that wants it one way, that you can turn and weight against that the opinion of other people.

Q. Governor -- the point Governor Wallace was making is that he wasn't going to advise the President that he did well; the people in Wisconsin would be sending a message to the President, do you agree with that?

A. Well, the only message so far that I've gotten out of the Wisconsin primary is it confirmed what some of us are saying for a long time, that the leadership of the Democratic party is in complete disarray.

Q. Governor --

A. Here and then there.

Q. Governor, are you saying that Governor Wallace is showing -- perhaps is a valuable counterforce to the more open and more obvious comments of the liberals?

A. No, I was trying to get away from the question of Governor Wallace advising anyone and get it back to our own -- our own team advising. No, although I think anyone in public life watches everything of this kind as a measure of public opinion, what people are thinking and what's on their minds. You wouldn't be in public life very long if you didn't.

Q. Governor, speaking of advising, given the current situation in Vietnam, do you think it would be politically wise for the President now to resume the bombing of the north?

A. Well, we have around a hundred thousand Americans still left in Vietnam. All that is between those hundred thousand Americans, the majority of whom are non-combat groups, all that's between them and being overrun and captured or killed by the enemy is the Vietnamese ground forces and our own air force, and I would think that the commander in Chief, in our country, would do whatever has to be done to protect those hundred thousand men. In the process of vietnamization, I think I said this to all of you a long time ago, when this program started, that we were well aware that as we started to withdraw we would come to a point at which the American force left would be so outnumbered that they would be endangered unless there was some protection for them and this was the purpose of Vietnamization, to gauge the -- its increase and our withdrawal, to make them proportionate. Now, we know that Vietnamization for sometime to come is based on American air support, that we -- it takes a little longer to build up their forces and their capability

in the air; the training that's required, the organization and so forth, as well as the providing of planes. So I think the President has no choice but to do, as I say, whatever has to be done to protect our men.

Q. Does that include bombing the north, Governor?

A. That includes -- yes, bombing the north.

Q. Do you think the offense in the last few days indicate that vietnamization is failing?

A. I think it is a little too early to decide. I know sometime ago -- we have been expecting the offensive since the first of the year and I know in a briefing sometime ago in Washington to some of the Governors, it was explained that when this came there was no question but that like any massive offensive drive, it would have some gains, it would even capture some cities. This was expected. But there was confidence then that the South Vietnamese would in the long run be able to stop them and while they bend, they wouldn't break, and they would stop the enemy and blunt this drive. And I think in just these first few days, as the offense was launched, this is no time to make a judgment. I think also there is a tendency to report some of the doings over there the way the Tet offensive at Hue a few years ago was reported, which militarily was a disaster for the North but which still was hailed in many areas of the media as somehow a great victory for North Vietnam.

Q. New subject.

Q. Governor, excuse me, you say hailed, why would you use a word like "hailed" by media as a victory for Vietnam?

A. Maybe that was a bad choice of word, at least it was announced as that. As a matter of fact, it probably was one of the most significant things with regard to the previous President, his decline in popularity.

Q. Do you see the President in a kind of dilemma in the election year, political dilemma because of the current situation in Vietnam, because on the one hand he faces criticism for stepping up the war and criticisms in another quarter for not acting on it. Would that present a dilemma to him politically?

A. I think you've got a dilemma, there is no question. The years are just going on in a war which two previous presidents wouldn't attempt to win and apparently couldn't end, build up a place where the man who occupies the White House knows that there is no great public support for wars of containment at this time. And he has to deal with that. At the same time he has the responsibility of the



men who are still here. And it may be that there are some who would write off those hundred thousand men and who will be blind to the fact and refuse to see the danger to those men. We hear those voices all the time. And quite a bit of that kind of talk. But I think -- I don't have any question but the President will fulfill his responsibility as Commander in Chief even though it might be unpopular with some.

Q. Governor, you say you hear these voices all the time that are willing to write off the hundred thousand men over there. Who are some of these voices?

A. Well, they don't say write off the hundred thousand men. They simply say accept the enemy's word that he won't do anything to these men and that he will release our prisoners and so forth if we will just simply lay down our guns and wait on the dock for the boats to bring them home. And I just don't think that a President can take that chance. Now, most of the Democratic candidates have urged this policy. The President can't take -- as long as there is even a thousand to one chance that there is danger to our men, the President can't be as reckless as some of the would be presidents are.

Q. On a California matter, Governor.

A. All right.

Q. When the question of Perry Mulligan's firing or the point when you asked his resignation to be withdrawn -- when you asked him to resign, you deflected a lot of questions on that subject by saying your office was engaged in a continuing re-examination of potential conflict of interest cases, and that this would probably be available to reporters because of your administration. What is the status of that re-examination?

A. What is the status of that re-examination?

MR. MEESE: Agency secretaries and department heads have very carefully gone over the situation with all appointees, both full-time and part-time and are reviewing with these people any potential or possible conflicts or incompatible activities.

Q. So, would it be possible to find out about these specific cases, about the various outside employment situations and that kind of thing?

A. Well, we are in the process of review now. It isn't something that's done overnight.

Q. But it would be made available to the press?

MR. MEESE: There is some question about whether a person's business affairs will be made available in its entirety. Until we see them, I don't know, so I don't think we could answer at this point.

Q. Governor, can you tell us how soon you expect to have those findings.

MR. MEESE: It is not a matter of finding, it is going through with each individual person their situation. Mostly for them to be aware of potential conflicts so they can avoid them or handle the situation. As yet we know of no resignations or changes in status because of this process.

A. The possibility remains that a person may not be aware that some ownership he has or some activity he has constitutes --

Q. Is there a uniform policy, Governor? Do you have a written stated uniform policy in this area so that your appointees know what they can do and what they can't do?

A. Well, a general policy, yes. And certainly everyone has been pinned down on this. Then you may find that some individual, as I say, doesn't even realize that something constitutes a conflict of interest.

Q. Governor, Mr. Mulligan said yesterday that if the truth were known that most of the state department heads would be guilty of moonlighting, and he said he's aware of one state official who is on an annual retainer with a private company, in the same field in which his statutory responsibilities lie. Have you any comment on that?

A. Yes, if what he says is true, frankly I -- I think there must be some exaggeration on that because I don't think we are that blind to what all has been -- that happens with our various departments. But this is the type of thing that the cabinet secretaries are seeking to find.

Q. Governor, Mr. Mulligan also said that he wanted to meet with you again after you returned from your vacation this week to talk about his situation. Has he contacted you or do you intend to grant him an appointment?

A. Well, I'll certainly grant him an appointment, if he asked, but he hasn't contacted me.

Q. Governor, just so we can put this in proper context, could you outline briefly what your stated policy is on this conflict of interest with the department heads.

A. I think it is the obvious thing. Conflict of interest.



interest explains what it is right there. That a man accepting the position must -- must give up anything which he could conceivably make his other interest or his outside interest or private investment profit from his position in government.

Q. Under the circumstances --

A. And very frankly I would be inclined to doubt that there was anything more than here and there some inadvertent and unknowing conflict of interest. I think there are very few people that come into government/<sup>and</sup> willingly give up what they have to give up to come into government, that would attempt to do this. I think the government is far more honest than most people are prepared to believe.

Q. Mr. Mulligan told some of us that he accepted an airline ticket to Hawaii on behalf of E.S.I. and is that the reason that Mr. Meese's suggestions -- well, Mr. Meese reported to you at that interview. Was Mr. Mulligan's acceptance of the airline fare, did that figure in your call for his resignation?

A. Yes, I said it was a mistake in judgment, I think, for a man to go at the request and on the expenses of a company that was attempting to -- to arrange a contract with our own state in which he would be involved, to go and act as a kind of salesman for that company and attempting to sell them to the city of Honolulu. I said it was a mistake in judgment. I said also I didn't believe that the -- that it was deliberate on his part, that he wasn't aware-- this is one of those cases where he hadn't seen through this as the possibility of it being viewed as a conflict of interest and I made it perfectly clear it had nothing to do with the later charges which came up regarding the meeting in Honolulu and which I am delighted to say now verify my original statement about Mr. Mulligan, that they have been dropped, those charges have been dropped.

Q. Governor, under the circumstances could you consider appointing Mr. Mulligan to some other state post?

A. Well, so far there's been no request to do such a thing and I wouldn't know what that post would be right now.

Q. Well, theoretically, could -- under the circumstances and in view of this conflict of interest which you say is there, could you appoint him to any state post?

A. Well, I'd question that, whether I could or not, yes. Because, as I say, a mistake in judgment was made.

Q. Mr. Mulligan sent in a letter to your office asking that your resignation -- his resignation be withdrawn. When was the letter sent and what was the nature of that letter?

A. I don't remember the exact dates, but I had already accepted his resignation and he and I had met personally.

Q. What was the general thrust of his letter? Why was he asking you to -- to withdraw that resignation?

A. Well, he just -- simply felt that -- I suppose changed his mind and felt that he shouldn't have resigned at my request.

Q. Governor, you think -- seem to think that anything that may be going on in the Executive Branch along this line is as a result of inadvertence. What do you think about the legislature<sup>and</sup>/conflicts of interest?

A. Well, I think they have the same problems there. The legislative branch, and I'm not going to get over into their -- crossing over the lines of -- even though they may be willing to violate the separation of powers, I don't want to -- I think the legislative branch from its past has some problems that they themselves have been looking at in these last couple of years, and must look at in that they have come to a virtually full-time legislature from a past in which it was so part-time that you obviously expected your legislators to have their own private businesses or employment or whatever it might be, and they only served a few months at a very nominal salary as state legislators. It was a side-line activity. Now you also come up to the national situation in which obviously Congressmen, Senators, are full-time employees of the federal government but there has never been any restriction on them having businesses or being partners in law firms and that sort of thing. There again I think your conflict of interest is not so much over holding the job as ensuring that you never participate in anything that -- as a legislator, that has to do with some outside interest of yours. Obviously it would be a conflict of interest if the Chairman of a committee was handling the legislation that would affect favorably his own personal situation.

Q. Governor, on the legislature, but another subject. Assembly Finance Committee this week cut your \$150,000 request for the mansion to \$25,000 in order to assure it wouldn't be used as an office as well as a home. What is your reaction to that?

A. Well, my reaction is, once again they shot from the hip,

because if they have picked up the phone and called they would have found out that I am on their side as never wanting the Governor's residence to be a combination residence and office, a la the White House, or the Capitol of -- the Governor's mansion of Georgia or some others I can name. Now, the great opposition, as you know, to the site and the plans that have been agreed upon at one time under Governor Brown for having it across the street from the capitol here was that they were going to construct not only a home but it was going to be the Executive office suite of the Governor. I don't agree with that. I think the Governor should be here in the Capitol and all of the advanced plans of the citizens who had started out to raise money for a Governor's residence had been predicated on the fact and that's why they bought that land way out there on the American River -- it would be a residence. Now, admittedly, it has to be a residence of a little more capacity than the average home because of the official entertaining that must be done. It is pretty hard to get 120 legislators at a dinner in a 30-foot living room holding the plate on their lap. At the same time you try not to build some vast hotel that when you are not entertaining leaves you rattling around in it. And I think that the -- that the people who had started the idea of contributing a mansion to the state had some very fine ideas in that regard. You have to add enough bedrooms to recognize the fact that people in politics are getting younger and you may have, as we have had in the past, a Governor with several children. I think there have to be guests accommodations in a structure of that kind. But this is the thinking and there is no office suite included in anyone's planning or anyone's thinking and maybe the Senate now, if you Wellows will harrow this far and wide, will see their mistake and come rushing back in to put the money back in the budget.

Q. Governor, do you see the forthcoming primary in California shaping up as any kind of pivotal point or major election in this election year?

A. As any kind of what?

Q. Of a turning point or watershed in this election.

A. Well, I don't know which of the 19 primaries might wind up being considered the watershed with the Democratic party is concerned or whether the decision is going to be made there. I think in the Republican party it is pretty well confirmed who our candidate is going to be, the incumbent President. So I think we just have to wait and see and I don't know. There are 19

primaries yet to go. And some place along the line someone is going to emerge or they are going to come into the -- to the convention in Miami, the Democrats, with it still a wide open race to be decided at the convention. So I wouldn't -- I would think that California is one of the last of the primaries you could tag now as predicting that will be the watershed.

Q. Governor, what do you think the impact of the acquittal of the Soledad brothers would be on the state penal system? What did you think of that jury's decision?

A. Well, I think it was another evidence of the fact that our court system does work and you do get justice in our courts. And on the basis of the evidence the jury decided that they -- they were not guilty, and that's our system.

Q. Governor, the track record of so-called social revolutionaries involved in alleged crime has not been too good in terms of prosecution, the Pit River Indians hung up in a jury. Do you suppose prosecutors are going to court too soon with insufficient evidence?

A. That's possible. I don't -- I don't know, I've never analyzed all of them. I know that a very healthy percentage of the -- all of the cases to the rash of violence in the Black Panthers, the overwhelming majority of those were either dismissed or found not guilty or resulted in hung juries, and this would indicate to me that some place they evidently couldn't tie up their case beyond a reasonable shadow of a doubt.

Q. Governor, do you think Congressman Ashbrook should withdraw from the race?

A. Well, of course on the side I'm on I thought he shouldn't have entered.

Q. But do you think the handwriting is pretty well on the wall now, that he's creating maybe divisiveness between the party?

A. No, if he is -- if he is still of the mind that -- when he entered this race in the first place, to indicate that there was dissatisfaction with some of the procedures of this administration on the part of some elements of the Republican party, I think he's made his point. Back there.

Q. There have been some reports that your administration is considering removing Mr. Hearn as the head of the department of Industrial Relations. What is the status of Mr. Hearn at the present

time?

A. No, there is -- there's been no decision of any kind on that. I suppose rumors of that kind come from the fact that as we move and as some of our people return to civilian life, and so forth, we review first our own shop system, as utilizing our own personnel or transferring or moving them into some other department. But I know of nothing of that kind.

Q. Governor, did you have a state income tax liability for 1971?

A. Well, maybe on the basis of the orders that I've sent to my taxman, that I've got to have a state tax liability. He hasn't sent it to me yet, so I don't know.

Q. Governor, what is your reaction to the federal government's announcement that they will expand the use of funding of methadone within the next year?

A. We ourselves are expanding this as we have gone forward under a controlled program and to identify, classify as correctly as possible those people. We are continuing to research it and so I would think that would be fine. I think that every branch of government is involved in this whole problem of the dope culture -- drug culture, and --

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

A. -- and support it.

Q. Yes. Governor, in supporting the Senate Rules committee killed the equal rights amendment, the federal use equal rights amendment, what is your reaction to that?

A. First, I've heard about it is what you have just said, so I have no comment here. I don't know what the reason was.

Q. You don't have a position on that amendment on the equal rights issue.

A. I just -- I'm not even familiar with what was in the bill or in the amendment. I don't know.

Q. Equal rights for women, that's the bill.

A. Well, the one thing is I would hate to have to see them give up their superiority. I've always liked that kind of -- seems kind of comfortable this way with leaving them on top, I'd hate to have them come down to our level.

Q. Governor, would you comment on the merits, if any, on the baseball strike?

(Laughter)

A. Well, I regret to see it and I -- I ! I how think it was --  
I think it is ill advised.

Q. Governor, the State architect has suggested that the whole  
capitol building maybe in some imminent danger. Now, <sup>an</sup> Assemblyman  
with some background in the field has suggested that this building  
too is unsafe. Do you feel any apprehension? You are sure you  
don't want office space in the mansion.

A. No, but you want to tell you, I haven't felt very safe in  
this building since I came here.

(Laughter)

A. But I don't know that it has anything to do with the founda-  
tion or the walls.

Q. Governor, do you still plan to sponsor a coastline bill  
of some sort?

A. Yes, I think there will be legislation from us within --  
with regard to this line.

Q. Any timetable?

A. No.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---oOo---



4/20

PRESS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 20, 1972

Reported by

Beverly Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, we have some journalists here, I understand, some students from Contra Costa College. Maybe afterward we can have a few questions from them, when you finish. Welcome, observe and think of some questions yourselves.

Q. Governor, tax reform has become somewhat of a small issue again in this session of the legislature. There is a bill that the Speaker and the county supervisors are pushing. What are your plans insofar as tax reform this year are concerned.

A. Well, we have been -- we have been having meetings on this and we have some continued meetings we hope that we are going to come up and we want to come up with a proposal ourselves. It isn't a case of lack of interest. It is a -- I suppose this happens on both sides in the legislature, it is a case that over these three years we have run into so many road blocks, so many things, that seem to be insoluble that the problem gets more complicated, not less. The more we learn the more things we know are unacceptable to -- to some sides and some people in this. We hope we can -- we feel now that it's been complicated that you could not discuss tax reform without taking into consideration the possibility of the Serrano decision and the change in funding for education. This has complicated things very much.

Q. Governor, you don't have a tax -- there is no program for tax reform, nothing yet for no fault insurance. Where is your legislative program?

A. Well, no fault insurance, there are five bills right now in the legislature. And all of those bills contain ~~in~~ one way or the other the -- some or all of the six basic principles that we outline. We are watching very closely and working with the

legislature on this. And we are quite positive that -- what the administration is seeking in no fault insurance will be on the floor and will be presented to the legislature, whether incorporated in these bills or whether in a separate bill of our own.

Q. Do you think it may be impossible to have tax reform at this session?

A. Well, the -- the one thing that I think is very important about tax reform here, how could you ask me to predict and be optimistic about tax reform in view of the close calls we have had in the recent years, the strenuous attempts that we have made and the failure to achieve tax reform. We can't be optimistic. But I do think that the legislature has a responsibility that they should meet before the balloting, and that is with regard to the tax structure that they would foresee the tax structure the State would have to have accounting for more than three billion dollars in revenue if the Watson amendment should be passed. I think the People of California before they vote on that initiative are entitled to know exactly what the tax structure will be in California if they should vote affirmatively, because I think they will be surprised at what a tremendous shift that is going to be when you start shifting to the State level some three billion dollars in revenue.

Q. Can you respond -- I got the impression you do think it is impossible to have tax reform.

A. No, I just said that it was impossible to be optimistic in view of the attempts and the failures that we have had. Apparently both sides still believe in tax reform, but approaching it from two different angles and we are still working on it. As a matter of fact, we have another meeting scheduled today with regard to our own studies and findings.

Q. Governor, how could it be solved this year if it does indeed, as you say -- I'm not trying to argue with you on that at all, but with the connection with the Serrano decision, when there is no finality on that at this point.

A. Well, there is no finality, but the principle that has been enunciated is to find an equalization factor and the Serrano decision seems aimed in one way in a general direction at what has always been the basis of tax reform, the need to have less reliance on property tax, particularly the homeowner's tax.

Q. Governor, with regard to no fault auto insurance, various sources had indicated that you had attempted to sway the

State Bar from taking their no fault auto insurance bills to Senator Moscone, is there anything to this?

A. No, uh-uh.

Q. Governor, to get back to taxes, who were you working with? You say you are working with people. Who are you working with?

A. Well, people in our own Finance Department and our own staff and that have been involved in the proposals that we have made and have come up with the programs that we had over the last few years.

Q. Are you talking to any Democrats, like Moretti?

A. No, we haven't gotten over to anything like the 16 day experience yet.

Q. Governor, are you now taking a position for or against the Moretti tax proposal?

A. Well, I think our Finance Department testified against it yesterday, yes. The Moretti proposal, as far as I can see, is very similar to what was advanced on their side of the table in our attempt to find a compromise agreement. And lacking two -- two points. One, it is a massive tax increase contained in a tax reform and two, it still does not present any control to prevent the homeowner from -- from having his taxes increased right on back up to where they are, after the reduction is given.

Q. Change of subject, please, Governor. What efforts is your office making, if any at all, to try and save the Republican convention in San Diego?

A. Well, actually this is in the hands of the national committee. All we did was advance California because there was more than one city interested in it -- advance California as the site. We would hate to see the convention removed from California and all I know is what I have read in the papers. I have not been contacted in any way. If I was called upon and had an opportunity with regard to this, I, of course, would favor the retention of California. Anyone who would rather spend August in Florida than August in California has got to be out of his mind.

Q. Governor, if you had a bet right now, where it would be, how would you bet?

A. I'm going to bet on California.

Q. The White House has given you no assurance one way or the

other on that?

A. I have heard nothing directly. All I know is what I read in the papers.

Q. Governor, what's your reaction to the treatment accorded Lieutenant Governor Reinecke by the Senate Judiciary Committee?

Q. May I ask another question on this.

A. And then we will come back to you.

Q. You say there is some other California cities interested, are there any other cities interested at this time?

A. No, not now. Once the decision was made,--

Q. Well, if San Diego --

A. Then San Diego had our support and backing, of course.

Q. -- San Diego can't put on the convention, which other California city would you suggest?

A. I doubt if that would happen. You know, every four years there is a great pressure put on by your own employers in -- oh, mainly the electronic media, great pressure, and I can understand it. The mechanical -- the mechanical advantage and the economic advantage to the electronic media, particularly to have the conventions in the same city where they don't have to duplicate facilities and rebuild in another area, the scheduling problem that doesn't have a three-hour time difference when you switch from one convention to the other, all of these are advantages that -- I don't know what part that's playing and I don't know what -- what are the problems that are causing them concern. We have always known that San Diego was going to be stretched to the -- to its utmost capacity with regard to hotel rooms and so forth.

Q. Is your office doing anything, though, right at this time to try to keep the convention in San Diego?

A. No, because no one has asked us to.

Q. Do you think your administration fears anti-war demonstrations in San Diego?

A. Oh, heavens there have been the same threats made to the Democratic convention in Miami. I have a hunch if you are going to have those kind of demonstrations they are going to happen wherever you hold the convention. Chicago didn't turn out to be exactly Shangrila, a few years ago. No, we have no fear at all, and we have no question but what order can be maintained and any crowds that have any other ideas can be controlled in San Diego. We have perfect confidence in our people to do that.



Q. Governor, are you going to try to initiate action in your office to find out what the trouble is in San Diego if these reports you have been reading are true, you may lose the convention.

A. No, as I said, we did -- we were not involved in the decision to be there other than to do the usual Chamber of Commerce touting forth, and if we are asked for any help with regard to that we will do anything we can.

Q. What was your usual Chamber of Commerce touting about?

A. What?

Q. What was your usual Chamber of Commerce touting about?

A. Well, the usual Chamber of Commerce talking, I think that is anything that is planned any place in the country can be done better in California than it can any place else.

Q. Colleges and universities are closing down all across the country because of American escalation of the war in Indo-China. It looks like the same thing is going to happen in ~~this~~ state. If it involves state colleges and universities, what action would you take to keep them open or keep them closed?

A. I don't know, you are talking about decisions that, of course, are going to be made at the campus level. If it comes to the university, I'm not a governor there. I am 1/24th of the body of the Board of Regents. I am a Regent. If you want my opinion as to whether they should close down or not, I think that it's been a mistake in past years and it would be a mistake now. No one can speak for the university as a whole. There is a great diversity of opinion among students, among faculty, alumni, administrators on a campus and for a university or a college to chose to speak officially to some -- to any public problem of this kind is a prostitution of the -- the very purpose of the university. And it is a disservice to a great many people on the campus.

Q. If they close down would your office provide pressure to open them back up?

A. I would just have to see what the circumstances are and where the -- where, in any way, the state government is involved in that. What -- you know, what would call for official state action. I would do nothing that was simply an interference on the part of government or politics in the running of the university or the colleges, but I would hope that they'd have better sense than that. As a matter of fact, I still say that this is a time when any thinking



person should be bringing his support to what's going on. There are a hundred thousand young Americans there. The enemy has come across the border as its reply to the -- to the President's peace plan. For anyone to suggest that there is no threat, no risk to those hundred thousand young men who have no -- nothing between them and the enemy except the Southern Vietnamese with our air support, I think we should be urging the President to do whatever has to be done to protect every single American there and to continue bringing them home as he has been bringing them home. And I think the tragic misinformation, stupidity and ignorance of those who would call this aggression instead of a defense of our -- our own young men is just reprehensible, and I -- I can't express my contempt for those that would do that.

*Vietnam*

Q. Whatever has to be done, Governor? Would you include nuclear weapons, that kind of thing, that's --

A. Oh, come -- I know, isn't that always the question. Ron Zeigler, I think, gave the answer the other day, you are talking to an enemy and I think you should say to the enemy, we don't make any qualifications, we will do what has to be done.

Q. You are not concerned, Governor, about the alleged dangers of bombing Haiphong?

A. I am not a bit concerned. And I think the California Senator who is so fearful that we might be winding up to World War III is talking through his hat.

Q. Which one?

Q. Are you concerned --

A. Senator Cranston.

Q. Are you concerned about Russian vessels being hit at Haiphong Harbor, what this might do to Soviet-American relations?

A. I figure if you are in a saloon when a fight starts between two drunks and you stand too close, you got to expect to get your nose bobbed.

Q. Governor, do you think it is inappropriate, though, for the President to go to Russia when the Soviet Union has been supplying the North Vietnamese?

A. What's wrong with going and talking with somebody about it. Maybe that's a good thing to talk about when he gets there.

Q. But you don't feel it is inconsistent to have open diplomatic relations of this nature between heads of state when you are fighting against the --

A. I think he's made it very plain to the Russians how he

feels about their part in this invasion and this naked aggression that is taking place, and he's the one who has access to all the information. If he feels there is an advantage to the United States in his going there, then I'm sure he'll go, but I think -- I think his trip was planned with the best interests of the United States in mind.

Q. What about the civilian populations, Governor, in cities that are being bombed in North Vietnam?

A. What about the civilian populations in the cities that are being shelled by rockets from the north Vietnamese, that have already killed scores of civilians when they were obviously not aimed at any military target at all. Now, you hope to limit your bombing to military targets and I think our country's had a good record of that. You recognize there is a margin of error and you recognize there are tragedies to civilians who are caught in the war zone and this has been true of every war that has ever been fought.

Q. To return to the question that started to be asked --

Q. Let him finish one subject here.

Q. Well, you interrupted the question about Reinecke and Gillenwaters' treatment --

A. We still will get back to that.

Q. We are on the war here. Let me ask one more question on the war, would you favor reintroducing more American troops, ground troops in Vietnam?

A. I don't think it is necessary. The President -- the President based his withdrawal of troops when he started it on the vietnamization program, which was to bring the ground forces of the Southern Vietnamese up to the place where we could withdraw proportionately as they increase their ability. At all times it was made plain that we could not in this same span of time prepare the Southern Vietnamese to take over the air support and naval support and so forth. These highly technical branches would take longer time. But it was also made plain that this was a part of our Vietnamization, that eventually they will take that over for themselves, too. The President warned the North Vietnamese, he said, "Don't interfere with our taking the men out." He recognized there would come a point in which our forces would be so far outnumbered that they would be vulnerable to attack as they are now. And he

warned the North Vietnamese, he said, "We are taking them all out. If you let us do it, but if you interfere and you start an action that endangers them," he warned them months ago, he said, "We will do whatever we have to do to protect our men." And I think he is duty bound to protect even as long as there is only one man there.

Q. I've got one other question. Have you been in personal contact with the White House or any of the defense department on this subject in the last week or two?

A. No. Uh-uh.

Q. Governor, on that same subject. Four years ago the President campaigned on the promise that he had a plan to end the war. Do you feel that those who have lost faith in that are being impatient?

A. He's been there -- less than three and a half years. A few months less than three and a half years. In that time he has brought the war down from a casualty -- from a death toll of 500 a week American death toll to an average of two a week. He has reduced, I think the figure now is about 85,000, by May it is to be 69,000 -- from 542,000 at peak. He brought home about 2 and a half million tons of supplies along with the men. There is another -- about a million and a half tons to -- still to come. It's been orderly, it has been a withdrawal. The ground fighting has been turned over to the South Vietnamese. I would think that he's making very good on his promise. And again, as I have heard recently, these charges that he is guilty of escalation, and that this is not a defensive move in the protection of our own men, just betrays a complete lack of understanding of the problems of logistic and the-- first of all, the problem that in the disengaging from an enemy, whether it is in a patrol action or in an army, is the most difficult military action and maneuver that there is. And he's been doing it.

Q. Governor, on that same subject, do you think that the abandonment by the President of his present course of action would be too high a price to pay to assure that the Moscow Summit would go on as scheduled?

A. I don't think the Moscow Summit is as important as the hundred thousand young Americans and the war prisoners that are there. Now, we have tried President Johnson -- I don't recall whether any of the bombing halts were under Kennedy, I think they all came under Johnson -- I think there were 18 different bombing halts were

offered to the enemy in which we voluntarily stopped the bombing and plead to the enemy to come down and sit at a table and legitimately negotiate for peace. All 18 of them were failures. This President has now said in defending these men, I think has indicated to the enemy that if he wants the bombing stopped it is very easy, stop the invasion and come sit down and once and for all talk peace.

Q. Governor, when you say you have nothing but contempt for efforts of a students strike, are you implying that their concerns are not legitimate?

A. I am concerned that they have been fed so much misinformation that they honestly -- a great many of them sincerely believe that our men could suddenly now just wherever they are in their various places, drop their arms and stand there looking at the sky waiting for American plans to take them home, and that this enemy who has broken every rule, who has broken every humanitarian rule, who has violated his word back all the way to the 1954 accords, that that enemy would do nothing to our men, would not capture them, take them hostages or kill them. He's lobbed rockets into their bases, right now, and he knows that the bulk of them are non-combat personnel. I think this is just stupid, to accept that this is a chance that a President could take or a commanding officer could take with regard to his men. I think you have to face what is the worst thing that could happen to these young men and you must guard against that. And this is all that I think the President has been doing and I think the American people ought to let him know that those young men are that important to us. We are not a country that's been in the habit of writing off thousands of men for the convenience of the rest of us, because the rest of us might fear some trouble. We have been based back through our history on a principle that if there is one American unjustly imposed upon some place in the world, the rest of us will go to his rescue and I think we ought to keep that principle.

Q. Governor, what if the President could safeguard our men and get our prisoners back, but at the same time face the prospect of South Vietnam falling to Communists, do you think that would be worth it?

A. Well, this, of course, is the -- the victory that apparently some in government and some out of government seem to really be hoping for. I think that if a great many of them when they talk peace

today, really are talking North Vietnam victory, but I think in the program of Vietnamization I think the course we are following is a proper one, and honorable one. And if you mean a double cross, that if some way the enemy would bargain with us, we will give you back your men, you let us dump the South Vietnamese, no, I don't think we could do that. On the other hand, once the withdrawal is completed, if Vietnamization is not a success, I think it's been made plain that that would not be our problem.

Q. What's your response to Pete McCloskey's position and would you rather than continually discussing the subject in this kind of situation, consider a debate with someone like Congressman McCloskey?

A. No, I don't think there would be any point in it. And besides, he's a Congressman and he's in the federal government and that's where the war policy is made, I've been expressing some opinions of my own here. California can't stop the war, we didn't start it. It is a federal problem, so he's acting as a Congressman, I suppose. I think he's tragically wrong. And I -- I think he should know better. He knows and has had experience in the military -- he knows that many of the things he asks are totally impossible. If he wants to continue for whatever personal advantage he sees in it to carry that torch, why, that's up to him.

Q. May we return now to --

A. Now, if it is the other subject, he had his hand up first.

Q. The hearing before the --

A. What's that?

Q. The Lieutenant Governor and Mr. Gillenwaters got a pretty good going over at that hearing, especially from the Senator \_\_\_\_\_  
perjury  
in which the term/was used. I wonder what's your reaction to that.

A. I think it is pretty obvious that this entire matter and what took place the other day is political harassment and I have perfect confidence in the Lieutenant Governor and in Mr. Gillenwaters. And I know that they were speaking the truth. And I know that the stories that came out that admittedly have to be briefed down over the many hours that were spent there, do not reveal the just over and over and over again boring questioning from every angle trying to find some meat to stay on the front page. I think this has been revealed a long time ago as purely political. I think the Lieutenant Governor was telling the truth, absolutely. I



haven't been to Washington as many times as he has, because he has been there representing California and brilliantly, in some of the successes we have had in aerospace contracts and things, but even in the limited times that I've been there, if you suddenly ask me at which meeting did I meet with the President or the Secretary of State or the -- the Attorney General or whoever it might be, I would not without actually looking at records -- I would not be able to tell you. They all run together when you have that many trips, and I think the Lieutenant Governor tried to make this plain to senators that know he was telling the truth, but it is profitable to them not to admit it.

Q. Governor, it seems --

A. Now, wait a minute, I said he could be next.

Q. Actually, that was my question.

(Laughter)

Q. Same question, it seems that by the Lieutenant Governor telling the truth, it seems the Attorney General was not. Because ITT he said he never talked to him about it at all.

A. I remember the first question that was ever asked of the Lieutenant Governor on this weeks and weeks ago, and the Lieutenant Governor described accurately that at the close of a meeting on other problems with the Attorney General he made some remarks about this, that he thought the Attorney General might be interested in hearing. And at the time he was asked what was the Attorney General's reaction, and he said, "Well, there wasn't any reaction, he listened to me," and this has happened to me also in meetings in my own office, if it was something that was not particularly in the Attorney General's mind I'm quite sure that he could legitimately and honestly not remember that in the closing remarks of a meeting he held that this report was given, and the Attorney General never pretended this was a discussion in any way calling for give and take with the Attorney General.

Q. Governor, you said if you were suddenly asked to recall such things as what did you talk about, how many times did you go and talk to John Mitchell and so on, that you couldn't recall. Well, suddenly we have been asking those questions for about a month, such basic questions as how many times did you talk to John Mitchell. Those are pretty fundamental questions.

A. Well, it is a pretty fundamental answer, and I've been very



consistent. The Lieutenant Governor had two visits there in April and in -- in September. All right. Asked offhand did he ever talk about this, he said yes, and they said in May. He was -- he had believed the April visit was in May, when he saw the Attorney General. Now, when he checked his records he found out no, that what he was talking about was a meeting that took place in September but yes, he was there and the meeting was not in May, it was in April. Now, this was a perfectly legitimate correction and one of the Senators questioned him -- questioning him had great lapses of memory about an incident that involved him sometime ago, and I think should be well able to understand that -- that a man can forget the details of one meeting to the other.

Q. Are we going onto another subject? Can we go onto another subject?

SQUIRE: Wait a minute, one back there on this thing.

Q. Yes, Governor, there's been a number of demands recently that you fire Mr. Carlson. This morning you said --

Q. Wait a minute --

A. -- Mr. Hall. Do you anticipate any further departures or shakeups in welfare and is there any chance that will hurt Mr. Carlson?

A. Well, it is a shakeup in welfare only to the extent that it is a great loss to this administration, Mr. Hall's leaving. It is a thing that's happened in several occasions in the past in this administration. The young men that have come in and contributed these several years to us had great opportunities on the outside. They are not men who want government careers and Mr. Hall has such an opportunity. He has discussed it with me, we have discussed it at great length. He's staying through June with us. He is going to be very -- very difficult to replace. As far as Mr. Carlson is concerned, Mr. Carlson was equally involved in the success of the welfare reforms that we have had. I -- there is no limit in my confidence in Mr. Carlson and Mr. Carlson is going to be staying there and doing that job just as long as I can possibly keep him there.

Q. Governor --

Q. Same subject. Governor, on the same subject, welfare, will you sign legislation to reduce the old age security payments back to their original amount before welfare reform, relative to

responsibility ~~con~~tributions that were increased.

A. Oh, that's a --

MR. MEESE: Legislation hasn't come down yet.

Q. If it comes down and it is already on the floor of the Assembly, will you sign it?

A. Now, again, you fellows know I won't comment until that thing gets there and I see what they have finally done with it and what they have in mind.

Q. Do you have any comment about the controversy ~~that is~~ caused among the relatives who are having to pay more? They have written you and communicated ~~with~~ you.

A. I'm quite sure that there are people who resent and resist and perhaps here and there as in any major program there are individual cases of injustice that should be corrected. But I for one find it very difficult to be sympathetic to people who have the means and who would throw the support of their own parents or grandparents on the taxpayers when they have the ability to at least contribute to that support. I'm thinking of one recent lawsuit some -- well, recent, some months ago, of a young man who actually sued the county to avoid paying \$20 a month to the support of his mother and his own income is \$800 a month. An unmarried young man. I don't feel sympathetic to someone of that kind.

Q. Governor, can we go to smog for a minute?

Q. Still one more on welfare.

A. We have had smog in here all --

Q. Why would Mr. Hall be so difficult to replace when you have Mr. Uhler standing right there.

A. Well, because Mr. Uhler is already doing an important job. I -- there are a great many men that would be hard to replace and just shifting them around like checkers on a board does not make up the fact that you have lost one in manpower and in very excellent manpower.

Q. Is Mr. Uhler sort of indispensable where he is?

MR. MEESE: I would think that we don't comment on personnel matters.

Q. Governor, on your speech on environment at Long Beach recently you said you would probably submit to the legislature next year a program for mandatory automobile inspection of antismog devices,

following the recommendations of the task force that you just appointed. Now, does this mean that you would be -- that it would be un -- that you would disapprove any action on this subject by the legislature this year as the Assembly has already done by putting ten million dollars in the budget.

A. I didn't specifically -- specify mandatory inspection. I said that following the report of the task force we would -- we would undoubtedly present legislation. This is -- this is a complicated problem, mandatory inspection, for smog. It is dependent upon the cost of the inspection, the ease with which it can be done. It is also in California, we found, that the Highway Patrol feels that on a spot basis the theory being that if you stop every "x" number of cars and check them the rest of the people without waiting to be stopped go in and have something -- some corrections made with regard to their vehicle, that this has enough ratio of success that it -- it would be the law of diminishing returns if you switched from that to total mandatory inspection. Now, whether that's going to apply all the way through to smog and do the job that we want it to do, that remains to be seen. Whether the added cost is worth total mandatory inspection or not.

Q. But basically do you oppose any action this year by the legislature until your task force report has been made? That's my basic question.

A. Well, let me say --

Q. Because there are bills moving now on that.

A. Let me say that every one of those bills will be looked at carefully and if it is a bill that we believe is -- is based on incomplete information and that we might have more knowledge later when we get all the information from the task forces, then I think it would make good sense to not accept legislation based on --

Q. And also the ten million dollars added by the Assembly for starting its mandatory smog control program in the Los Angeles basin, would that be unacceptable?

A. Well, let me look at that when it comes down to my desk.

Q. Governor, do you think the legislature should ratify the women's equal rights amendment?

A. The women's equal rights amendment. Let me apologize to you. The last time when you asked that I didn't realize that we were talking about the California senate, I was confused, thought we were talking about something taking place in Washington. I made,

I'm afraid a facetious reply. As I understand it, the problem with this legislation is not an opposition to the concept of women's equal rights, everyone is in favor of it, but it is a little bit like when we passed that citizenship role at 18, age 18 and then discovered a great many technical problems that hadn't been foreseen. It is my understanding that this was what was of concern here to the senate, that they would suddenly have problems that would be problems that would actually discriminate against women that would be created by just such a simple single line amendment. Now, whether those problems can be signed by additional legislation as we are trying to do in the 18 year old thing, that's up to the legislature to find out. But I don't think anyone is in disagreement with the concept. If there are inequalities in the treatment of women, certainly those inequalities should be erased. On the other hand, I think there is some privileges that accrue to women that all of us would like to see retained. Special privileges to sick leave for pregnancy and so forth. I don't think you are gaining anything in equal rights if you cancel some of those things out.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

Q. No, no.

SQUIRE: Are we going to stay here all day or not, what is it. You have a chance, get in there, damn it.

Q. The other day --

A. What?

Q. -- at a news conference Senator John Burton was asked how many law makers he thought smoked marijuana or have smoked it, and his reply was, he heard some stories down in Malibu in the old days about some of the guys down there were some of the movie stars that are now in the Capitol.

A. Oh, boy. You know, I always think that I have probably got my opinion as low <sup>of John</sup> as I can get it, and then you come up with one like that. I don't even smoke the other kind of cigarettes, and haven't for years and years -- well, as a matter of fact, I never did smoke them -- cigarettes of any kind. So, as a matter of fact, some of the kids have found a poster of me advertising a cigarette. And this was back in the days of Warner Brothers when they had it in your contract that they could use your likeness for endorsements of products. And you'd be interested to know that that cigarette

in that photograph was painted in. They just took a picture of me, I never had one in my mouth for the picture.

Q. You've been seen with a -- photographed with a pipe in the old days.

A. Years ago I smoked a pipe.

Q. Governor, maybe Mr. Burton was talking about another former movie star that works in the Capitol, who might that be?

A. I don't know. I don't know, are there any former ones up here? Well, there is Charlie Conrad, and I don't think Charlie has ever been suspect of that.

Q. A couple of would be --

A. Now, for whatever you want, you can do what you want to do but I said that I thought the young people out there ought to have a few minutes of throwing some questions at me.

Q. The California marijuana initiative is trying to get on the ballot. Trying to get enough signatures to put the petition before the voters, to have marijuana use decriminalized. What is your stand on that?

A. Well, I'm in opposition. I'm in opposition because right now, and to some of the legislation introduced, because right now California has some of the most flexible penalties of any state in the nation, giving a judge wide discretion as to what he does about it. I'm also opposed because I -- I do not believe in the legalizing of marijuana, and I think that there is an increasing body of evidence with regard to its -- its harmful effects and I think until the jury really totally comes in on this that we should err on the side of caution and not on the side of recklessness, and in a time when we are having virtually an epidemic drug problem I also resist anything that psychologically would seem to be endorsing any leniency in this regard when we are marshalling all our forces to fight the total drug problem.

Q. Even after all of the evidence from the past studies, the study that Mayor LaGuardia had in New York and all the other studies that tend to indicate that marijuana is not harmful or not addictive that your stand is still against--

A. Well, you see --

Q. -- decriminalization?

A. You see, this is it. You take some body of evidence and



proven there is some, and we study that as well as the other. But somehow so many of you seem to ignore that there is an -- as I said, an ever increasing body of evidence coming from the other side that is refuting this. Now, if you have got these two bodies and reputable men on both sides, I think that as long as there is that much controversy we still should, as I said, err on the side of caution instead of just saying I'm going to accept this fellow's opinion and not that fellow's research or his opinion, and he may be right. We are being a little foolish now, I do know this, that in almost every country and I think every country in the world -- to my knowledge, I may be wrong, there may be some little countries here or there in Asia, the Orient, or Africa, but every country that down through the centuries has had this legalized has in recent years turned the other way and has gone far beyond anything that we have gone in its strictness, including the capital -- the death sentence for even the selling of marijuana, because over the centuries they said they found it terribly destructive and harmful to their people. Now, why should the United States with all our ability to research until we have a final answer -- why should we fly in the face of those nations that have had a century of experience or centuries of experience with it and who have now finally outlawed it. Anybody else?

Q. You stated, I believe, that you have nothing but contempt for students who participate in the students strikes and you felt they were misinformed. And that perhaps they didn't care for the welfare of the United States soldiers, is this what you were saying?

A. Well, I think --

Q. That they don't care.

A. If I was, I -- I know I used some strong language there. I suppose my real anger and contempt is for -- for those who lead and organize and inspire this type of demonstration. My -- I have equally strong feelings whether they are that harsh or not, about students who have accepted one viewpoint on this problem without looking at the other side of the question. And as I was asked the other day by a student at UCLA, do I think you have a legal right to stage such a demonstration. Yes, you do. Legally you have that right. Morally I question whether you have the right. I question whether anyone, if there is any doubt at all, has the right to take an action that lends comfort and aid and encouragement



to an enemy that at the moment poses a death threat against our young men. And I would think that all of us should do whatever we can to say if there is any risk to even one young man we are not going to take that risk. Now, the enemy has made it very plain these are going to be greatly encouraging to him. These demonstrations. These are going to encourage him to continue this aggression, this invasion of South Vietnam which is endangering our young men. And therefore I would think that young people morally should stand back and say, "Do we have all the information that the President has." I would think that young people over a long period of time in a search for truth would say here were three presidents, Kennedy, Johnson and now Nixon, totally diverse views. No two of the three were in agreement on a great many things or philosophy. And yet these three men having access to all the information and all the facts all felt it essential for the United States to be involved as we have been in Vietnam. And I would think this would -- that this should cause all of us to think a little bit and say unless we have all the facts they had how can we say that all three of these men were wrong. Now, I criticized President Johnson greatly, not for involvement in the war or escalating it. I did not know the things he knew when he said it is now necessary to increase the number of men. I never criticized President Kennedy for sending the first combat soldiers in there. My criticism was, however, that once in there and once you are going to ask young men to fight and die, then I think that the cause should be worth winning. I always was critical of asking our men to fight with one hand tied behind their backs in which they were told, "You can defend yourself but you must do nothing to end this war or go forward and through a victorious drive end it." But now this President, and I think susceptible to the influence of the people and the war weariness of our people, has made it plain that he believes that our role in combat should be lessened, we should get out and he's trying to do that. But, again, he knew there would come a time when the men left there were so far outnumbered they could be overwhelmed. And he knew that we had to be prepared if that time came and the enemy showed an indication to do this, to protect them. Well, how much does he wait for? They crossed the border with tanks and artillery support in an all-out full scale invasion. They left only one division of their entire military force in North Vietnam on guard duty, the rest is in

South Vietnam in violation of everything that they themselves have claimed all these years. He can't ignore that and say that our men are totally safe, that no one is going to touch them. Again, even if they lay down their arms and stand there they are in the position of that fellow I mentioned in the saloon fight, in danger of being killed.

Q. How do you feel about legalizing black holidays for the entire State of California, Martin Luther King Day.

A. Legalizing the black holidays?

Q. Yeah.

A. Oh, I think we are talking again -- I think we are talking of something at a national level, aren't we, in recognizing those national holidays.

Q. I mean just for California.

A. Well, then it would have to be a statewide holiday. I'd prefer it national and we have a history in this country of recognizing people who have made great contributions to this country, and I would think that certainly there are people who deserve the same recognition. In the meantime I don't think there is anything wrong with -- with people of various ethnic groups and backgrounds from having their own holidays, such as the Scandinavians recognizing and celebrating a day for Leif Erickson, whom they credit with discovering America instead of Columbus. So this can go forward. But I'm -- I have no -- no opposition to such a thing.

Q. Governor, how do you feel about space exploration?

A. About what?

Q. Space exploration as a priority over --

A. Well, I think that in government and I know from our own experience in state government, you do assign priorities. And certainly our priority in the area of social reforms has been established. It is the number one spending item in the whole nation. I am in disagreement with those people who say we shouldn't explore space. They somehow remind me a little bit of the same people that stood on the dock and told Columbus that he was crazy, that he shouldn't try it. When you stop to think, if you want to make a selfish analysis, the actual value of the spinoffs from our space research, in medicine, in construction and transportation and everything, have been -- I think far outweigh and certainly in their future outweigh any expense that we have made. But there is something even beyond that. That here we are on this one little marble,

this spaceship and every bit of scientific knowledge we have tells us that some day a generation of human beings is going to face extinction because this spaceship is either going to freeze to death when the sun goes out or it is going to blow up or have a collision with someone, and for the first time we have established a lifeboat. The first man that set foot on the moon said -- now potentially just as when Columbus set foot on an island in the Indies down here, we have the start of the ability for human kind to go some place else if this earth should require our going there. If it should disappear and I -- I think it is such an adventure that all of us ought to thrill to it and to be glad that we still can produce young men who are willing to go. as to see the next fellow step

W. SQUIRE: If we are going to see the next fellow step on the moon, we better get out of here.

A. That's right. I think we are going to have to. I wish we had more time. Thank you. Some good questions and I enjoyed answering them.

---oOo---

5/11

HELD MAY 11, 1972

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 think I speak for everyone of us in here. How sorry we are to hear of the very untimely death of Rod <sup>Beard</sup> Bowdry (phonetics) of the Capital Press Corps. We always have sympathy for his family, and as I say, I know the sorrow we must feel over this. I have some statements here that will be in print a little later, or some words here, on the failure in the Senate with regard to the -- two votes of the initiative with regard to capital punishment.

(Whereupon the Governor read Press Release No. 285.)

And so I would hope that these petitions would get the required signatures and so that this could be on the ballot for the people's decision.

We have as visitors here in the press conference this morning journalism class from Consumnes River College. Welcome and maybe we will have a minute or two when this is over and all of these gentlemen are rushing for the phones, yelling "Stop the press," that you can ask a few questions.

Q. Governor, <sup>Cyrus</sup> Saurus (phonetics) Johnson, the Ventura Republican State Precinct Chairman, was quoted as saying that the Republican party last year decided not to go after the 18 to 20 year old vote because they are not our kind of people. That was the quote attributed to him, and they are of no advantage to us. He also said that the Republican party had not gotten into bipartisan vote registration drive because they help the Democrats more than they help the Republicans. Can you comment on that?

A. Yes, if that's a correct quote and he said those things, he wasn't speaking for the Republican party. He had to be speaking for himself. First of all, with regard to the 18 to 20 year olds, I have said repeatedly that if they would open their minds and take a look at the philosophy of both parties and what both parties actually



represent, I think the 18 to 20 year old young people would find out that the Republican party has been in favor of much of what they have been in favor of for a great many years. That ours is the party that wants more individual freedom and less government control and dictation and less gigantic impersonal government. And therefore my own desire has been, and I've been trying to implement it in the last few weeks, is to try and carry the message to as many young people as we can, As to registration, of course we want them registered. We want all the people registered regardless of which way they are going to register. The only way to make this system of ours work is when you have a greatest percentage possible of eligible voters voting. So there aren't any people that I rule as not our kind of people with regard to politics.

I think as I have said before, there is a great philosophical difference in the land today and on one side is a determination to preserve and enhance individual freedom, and on the other side are those people that have lost faith in the citizenry and who believe that only a few geniuses in state and national capitals can make all the decisions on behalf of the people. And I'm opposed to that.

Q. Governor, were you urging the citizens to sign this death penalty initiative, does that mean that you have given up hope that -- or given up working for passage of the Deukmejian bill in the Senate?

A. Oh, no, it just means that if I get on a boat I'm going to make sure they got lifeboats. No, I hope that -- I know that this is still open up there for reconsideration. And I hope that they can get the votes, save a lot of time and trouble. But with a deadline date for signing the petitions, you just can't take the chance.

Q. Are you doing anything to help him out?

A. What, upstairs?

Q. Yeah, Deukmejian out.

A. Well, so far I -- I have a meeting scheduled with Senator Deukmejian. You know, usually you wait to find out if there is something you can do and let someone who is on the scene conducting the fight tell you what it is and then of course I'll be glad to cooperate.

Q. Will you personally sign a petition, Governor?

A. What?

Q. Have you personally signed a petition yourself or do you intend to?

A. I'm trying to remember, you know, I get confused. I'm trying to remember whether when they first started I signed one of those some place, and if I didn't, I bet I'll sign one at home because Nancy greeted me with one last night, but I don't want to -- I don't want to suddenly be hailed as a cheater who signed twice, and I'm wracking my brain trying to figure out did I sign one of those some place along the line or not.

Q. Is your wife circulating the petitions, Governor? Is your wife circulating the petitions.

A. She's managed to secure a few friends that agree the people should have the right to vote on that.

Q. Governor, using the line of reasoning that you did on the capital punishment initiative, that the people should have a choice at this point or be able to decide for themselves, will you apply that same standard to marijuana initiative, that they should have their choice?

A. Look at everybody signal for that. I told a group of students in a high school yesterday afternoon that yes, if something came to my desk that -- I don't know whether that's the course that would be followed, to require this to become an initiative on the ballot, I would sign it from the standpoint of permitting the people to vote, but I made it very plain to the students the way I would vote myself on that initiative.

Q. You would sign it to get it on the ballot?

A. Yes, I respect the people's right on an initiative vote.

Q. Governor, you mean you would sign the petition or you would sign a bill putting it on the ballot?

A. Sign a bill, that's what I mean.

Q. Governor, Senator Deukmejian was hoping that the -- that he would have Senator Biddle with him today and -- to help him with the death penalty thing. He doesn't have Senator Biddle or anyone in that scene. Are you going to go down and help Mr. Biddle in that runoff campaign and also in the Assembly Pete Schabarum?

A. I'm going to do everything I've done in office here, as far as time from my duties will permit, I'm going to support all the legislative candidates of our -- of our party.

Q. Governor, where would you draw the line on where the people should decide these issues that come up? Should they decide every bloody issue that comes from the Legislature?

A. No, I think there is -- there are a great many things that should properly be decided by legislation. But when the Legislature

itself takes the action of putting something on the ballot with regard to a constitutional provision, then I think that decision has been made by the Legislature. I think that there is a danger, yes, that --- too many times things that are being considered by the Legislature force us to start to work to put them on the ballot. I think Proposition 9 is one of those examples, and I think there are things of this kind that -- our representative government can handle. But I think we were talking about in these instances here -- we are talking about constitutional amendments that can start with the Legislature.

Q. Well, if I may just pursue that one more step. For example, the majority of the present pro tempore of the Senate suggested a popular vote today to determine if the Legislature should ratify the proposed women's rights amendment to the constitution. To the federal constitution. More and more we seem to see legislators and other people in public office saying, let's let the people decide. Well, are we going to have representative democracy or not?

A. No, but I think the idea of the initiative and the idea of the people, in the general referendum, has always been that when -- it is again one of those safeguards in our system -- that if government fails to resolve some issue or solve some problem to the point of aggravation of the public and it begins to look hopeless, then the people have the right of regress. They have the right to take the action themselves.

On the other hand, our changes on our constitution, such as this death penalty referendum, this of course has to be done by the people.

Q. Governor, the Chairman of the United Republicans of California resigned, saying that the organization was taken over by the members of the John Birch Society and of course your office has endorsed Congressman Ashbrook. Is there an internal problem of some proportion developing within the Republican party because of John Birch activity?

A. No, not at all, and I would not think that -- UROC is a recognized volunteer group within the party. I wouldn't suggest that that is representative of any gigantic split. Actually, I question some of the statements that have been made about the size of it. I think we are talking about a very few thousand individuals who have banded together under that particular charter. I was a little surprised myself about the whole thing of the Birch Society. It's been so long since I heard the word I thought they'd gone the way of the buffalo.

Q. Governor, on Congressman Ashbrook's challenge, he said in San Francisco the other day, "Governor Reagan is like Zsa Zsa Gabor's fifth husband, he knows what to do but he doesn't know how to make it interesting."

A. You know something, I shall rest on Zsa Zsa Gabor's answer. She said she found me very interesting.

(Laughter)

Q. Governor, just for a point of clarification, would you support the people voting --

(Laughter)

Q. Would you support the people having a public vote on equal rights amendment for women to the federal constitution as was proposed this morning by Senator Mills?

A. Now, what I'd like to do, I'd like to sit in the office with some of my legal advisors and get refreshed, again, on what it requires to change the constitution of the United States. I'm not a lawyer and of course as a citizen I know I should be totally familiar with that. But this again reveals that many of us don't know all we should know about the government. I can't actually remember what it takes to -- to amend the constitution or at what point it goes to the people.

MR. MEESE: It takes ratification by three quarters of the state legislature. But in this case what Senator Mills is proposing as I understand, is that because the legislature appears split on it that they get an advisory vote of the people of California as to how the legislature should act.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Then this is the legislature's problem. Here's one in which the representatives of the people, at least one of them, is suggesting that the legislature does need the help of the people.

Q. Do you agree?

A. What?

Q. Do you agree?

A. Separation of powers. Ask Senator Mills and ask the other legislators on it. I disagree with enough things they do.

Q. On separation of powers, you freely talked about your position on capital punishment, and that doesn't -- didn't seem to bother you as far as separation of powers.

A. Why --

Q. Originally there seemed to be some conflicts here. One,

when you objected to the Supreme Court's decision on capital punishment. You said you felt that they had gone from the judicial branch into the legislative branch.

A. Yes.

Q. Very clearly you've expressed your position on the bill that's now before the legislature on capital punishment. Also you have expressed yourself about the initiative position which is supposedly for the people to be devoid of the executive branch of government.

A. No, I don't -- I think you are coming to an assumption that is not quite correct. The bill before the legislature is not one with regard to capital punishment, it is one with regard to allowing the people to make that decision. And you had to have an initiative that says one thing or the other. So an initiative that calls for it will be placed, if the legislature decides, and if not by petition of the people will be placed before the people, which is the only way you can settle this in the State constitution. And I don't see anything wrong with that. I expressed my belief, there's been no secret of how I feel about it from my own experience and the knowledge and information that comes to me in my present position, I happen to believe that capital punishment is a deterrent. I happen to believe that it is a protection of the law abiding citizen, and I have taken positions and campaigned for or against initiatives prior to this time. And if I tried not to I think any of you would recognize that you couldn't possibly have an election campaign that every candidate for office is not asked by the voters to express himself, and take a position on -- on the issues that are -- that are on the ballot. This is why sometimes in elections there are people running for office that wish somethings weren't on the ballot, they don't want to publicly have to take a position.

Q. Governor Reagan, would you then take a position on equal rights for women? What is your position? What do you believe? Would you --

A. Well, I have to tell you that with all that's been going on I have been aware and you asked the first question, and the first time you asked it I thought you were speaking about the United States Senate, not the senate here, and so I didn't give a very intelligent answer. I don't know that I have one now. I haven't paid too much attention. I realize just from the little I've read that there are some actual technical problems, the same kind of problems for example that we ran



into with the 18 year o. situation when we discovered that by making them -- giving them full citizenship we had ignored certain problems like the matter of member of the family on welfare and so forth, that had to be corrected. I recognize I don't know what all those technical problems are. I also recognize that there are still certain discriminatory things that have come down from the past with regard to women working overtime and that sort of thing that could be corrected. Now, whether this requires a constitutional amendment, I'm inclined to believe that we could legislatively correct the inequities and not go through the process of passing a simple constitutional clause, and then having to go back and legislate to correct all the things that we didn't intend to change with that clause.

Q. Governor Reagan, that usually happens aftermost legislation. You can't anticipate all the problems.

Q. Would you be in favor --

A. No.

Q. Senator Mills says Congress copped out when they sent it to the states. Do you think they did?

A. Well, I think that that's where the legislation could have been developed to correct the things that are still inequities. And to insure that the things that should be preserved are preserved. Yes, they could have done that. And again, that's all I say. I think that to approach this from the constitutional angle is again to put something in a constitution that is a single line that is open to interpretation by courts, a dozen different ways, and could lead to a chaotic condition, and would lead eventually to the kind of legislation we should have right now, the states that would then say, well, this particular thing with regard to the difference in sexes still prevails, this one still prevails and so forth. The same kind of mish-mash that we got into up here with, as I say, our 18 year old.

Q. Do ~~be~~ they have corrected 18 year old vote inequities, haven't they?

A. Well, I don't think we have, or whether we have caught up with all of them or --

ED MEESE: There's still legislatinn.

A. There is still legislation pending.

Q. Governor, has your office made any plans or received any court requests for law enforcement as a result of anti-war demonstrations in California?

A. Have we received any requests with regard -- no. No. You mean like calling out the Guard or anything? No, no, there's been

no such requests.

Q. You weren't here yesterday when several thousand young people streamed by your office.

A. I was down in Santa Barbara where several thousand young people -- it was several hundred here and only about a thousand down there.

Q. I'd like to hear what you would have said had you been here and I'd like you to assess the political effect on Mr. Nixon's campaign in California because of it.

A. What I would have said, well, I was saying it down in Santa Barbara at the same time. First of all, I think that a great many of those young people are tragically misinformed, uninformed. I think they have a very incorrect perspective on the history of this entire tragic situation that has been going on now for virtually a decade. I think that a great many of the young people are misinformed and they are misinformed by some in their midst who are not misinformed but who are professionals who know what they are doing and whose interest is not peace, but it is -- their interest is the good fortune that they hope the enemy will have. I think the President took the only course he should have taken. I think if an American President had taken that course several years ago the war would have been over a long time ago. Now, this nation has every right legally and morally to be involved. Whether -- first of all, South Vietnamese and the United States never signed the Geneva Accords of 1954. And they did not sign them precisely because the South Vietnamese were asking that any election to determine the future government of South Vietnam be internationally supervised by the United Nations. And the North Vietnamese refused this and it refused such international supervision to this day. But I don't know the reasons why President Kennedy put troops in there on combat in the first place. It was in violation of the American policy that we would not get ourselves involved in manpower in a land war in Asia, again. But he put the first combat troops in. He alone has access to all the information that is necessary to make such a decision. So I can't -- I can't question, I can't challenge unless I have that same information. When Johnson found it necessary to escalate the war and send in more troops, again, I can't fault him on that. I have criticized President Johnson because once having done that, once having subjected young Americans to dying for their country, I think he and the rest of us had a moral

obligation to turn them loose, to get that war over with as quickly as possible and he didn't do it. It was fought over the years to no purpose. And this was one of the things that has caused the great lack of morale now and the spirit that we have in this country. We are not used to sending young men out to die when there is apparently no -- no end purpose and no goal in sight. And the President, I think, has taken an action after 18 appeasing gestures that have been made by previous Presidents of halting the bombing and asking and begging the enemy to come and sit down and settle this across the table, and now he has taken this action. I think it is proper. And I think the young people out here in the sunshine and ease of California are staging these demonstrations and thinking, for example that they can settle the war and influence people by breaking the windows of a little restaurant and the book store and a few offices and buildings up and down Telegraph Avenue, and other places, are ignoring the fact that 60,000 of their own age group plus the prisoners are over there at the scene of danger and I would like to ask them if they have given any thought to what they'd do if they are wrong in their idea, and if indeed those -- those men would be endangered by capture or death if we did not take the action we are taking. And I think that the President, as Commander in Chief, has that responsibility. I think he enhanced himself politically because I think the bulk of Americans have wanted for a long time to have some decisive action taken that would bring this to a halt.

Q. Governor, you said you thought the youths were led by professionals that know what they are doing. Are you speaking of what, communist agents?

A. I'm speaking -- I don't know whether they are communist agents, I think -- just think there is something phoney about a peace march that usually takes place carrying flags of the enemy instead of peace flags. But I think that men like Mr. Dellenger who can hardly now in his 50's be called a student leader, and yet who's one of the men who has been in the permanent organization of this peace coalition and others like him, I think these men are not really dedicated to peace.

Q. Governor --

Q. Governor, each time the -- President Johnson or President Nixon have escalated and they have promised that this is going to be it, this is the way we get our boys home, and it never works. Now, what happens -- what do we do next if this doesn't work?

A. Well, I think to lump the two of them together and say each time they escalated, that this is what's happened, this is an unfair teaming or pairing. As I said, my criticism was that under President Johnson we got up to more than a half a million Americans there, and yet those half a million Americans were prevented from ever doing anything but standing on defense waiting for an invitation and waiting for attack and fighting them off when they came. They were prevented from assaulting the enemy. Now, we did bomb enemy supply lines and installations north of the demilitarized zone under Johnson. But 18 times under Johnson he called off that bombing and said to the enemy, "All right, I'll call it off, I'll show you that we have no aggressive intent." We have made it plain we will never invade. The enemy has been able to operate from a sanctuary. He has no one left at home on guard. He knows that his home territory is safe from any inchon type of landing such as we had in Korea, and it is just -- it is unfair to ask men to fight and die under those circumstances. So I've been -- I've been critical of that. Now, President Nixon came in and discovered that there was no plan whatsoever, not one plan to -- to ever get our men home. There was no plan that would -- to make the South Vietnamese able to replace them and defend themselves. And he started the program of vietnamization and he informed the enemy that as the South Vietnamese were able to take over our troops -- proportionate numbers would be withdrawn. Well, the proof is in the numbers. He has brought home more than 500,000 men. We are down to 60,000. He urged the enemy to let's do this and he said on the other hand, if our forces are so reduced that they are vulnerable that they have nothing but a South Vietnamese between them and being overrun, there is no defense for our men to stand there and say, "Hey, fellows, I'm just waiting for a boat home." He said if the North Vietnamese make any move to interfere with this withdrawal and to jump on our backs, then he said we'd have to take action and would take any action to defend our men. And this is exactly what's happened. Their response was this invasion. And I think that as long as there is one man there he is the one person in the United States, the President, who has the responsibility for the safety of that one man.

Q. Governor, as I understood the thrust of the question was though, if this doesn't work what are the next options for the President? If this thing does not work.



A. Well, I don't think I'm in a position to be able to answer that and I'm quite sure that the President if he -- that the President would not answer it because, again, this was one of the previous faults of this war. We literally told the enemy our location and our intentions and what we would do, where and when. And gave him an advantage that he shouldn't have had at the cost of American lives. And I would think that the President would be well within his rights to keep totally to himself and to his advisers what future steps he will take in the defense of our young men. But he's made one thing plain, that we are going to defend those 60 thousand men while they are coming home and we are going to get our prisoners back and we are going to do whatever is necessary to accomplish that.

Q. Governor, when you talk about people who are tragically misinformed, can you explain what you were talking about? a couple weeks at your press conference in this room, when you said that the North Vietnamese had violated the Geneva agreement by \_\_\_\_\_ and certain kind of order, do you remember that?

A. Yes, if someone will only take the trouble to read in succession the events that have taken place since 1954, even before for that matter, they will discover that the Geneva Accords were nothing more than an agreement that the military forces headquartered in Haiphong, the Ho Chi Minh forces which was the only army in North Vietnam, that that army and the French, neither would increase their forces, that in a two year period of '54 to '56 the French would withdraw and by 1956 the people of Vietnam could by election determine the government that they wanted to have. But they also drew a separation recognizing that Vietnam has not been a unified country, that South Vietnam for 2500 years has never come under the rule of North Vietnam. Actually, they maybe should have made two divisions, because Vietnam's history shows that there is a North Vietnam, a Central Vietnam and a southern Vietnam, and all three have been pretty much autonomous and separate. They drew the line right through the center. They then said that for 300 days the people of North or South of that line would be able to go either way, wherever they wanted to live. Under Ho Chi Minh in the north or in the South Vietnam where a government was to be created to replace the French rule as the French took two years to dismantle and get out. And a million people went from the north to the south. But before the 300 days were up, because of that exodus, the North Vietnamese inviolation of



the accords. they signed, they set up barricades, their own kind of Berlin wall and turned back any more people that were trying to escape North Vietnam who did not want to live under communism. The second violation was that the North Vietnamese left in the south several thousand of their own regular army units, to foster and promote the Vietcong activity in the south. Now, all of this is a matter of record. It is a -- the whole record of Ho Chi Minh is there and plainly for everyone to see, and if there's been a violation, that has been the violation. And there could be no violation of those accords by South Vietnam with regard to elections, they refused to sign unless and until the North Vietnamese agree that there would be international supervision. The only election the North Vietnamese ever held was an election in which you voted on the street corners on the sidewalks, on the tables, with no secret ballot and the tables were manned by members of Ho Chi Minh's army.

Q. O, K., then you remember -- I assume you read the Geneva Accords, right? I should ask that question first.

A. Let me say I've had to read them as they have been presented in various documents. I have not actually read verbatim the Accords.

Q. O. K. Then President Nixon -- President Eisenhower was to have you know, said that there -- there were not going to be elections involved two years later because he felt Ho Chi Minh would be elected.

A. Well, this has been taken out of context a great many times. What President Eisenhower -- when he made that remark was referring to was the fact that without international supervision was one thing, and this was one of the reasons we didn't sign, but the second thing was to hold an election early and I don't think he specified by '56 was the fact that the only person on the scene for the South Vietnamese as yet was the puppet emperor Bao Dai, and he had no illusions about it. They knew that Bao Dai had to go. He said no one would vote for this man who has been the puppet of the French for all these years while they have been free, fighting for freedom of the French. No one is going to vote for him. So the only other character on the scene would be Ho Chi Minh.

Q. Governor, can we get back to a state matter. What is your reaction --

A. I just like giving you a history lesson there.

Q. What is your reaction to the State senate holding up three of your four nominations to the state college board of trustees on

the charge that they do not accurately reflect the population?

A. Well, I think that here again that the Senate -- here's another violation of the separation of powers. The Senate confirmation of Governor's appointees is supposed to be based on the Senate, if it discovers some evidence of wrongdoing or something that I had either overlooked or was ignoring. Now, malfeasance of some kind, moral turpitude and that reason the Senate could refuse confirmation. But here is a simple case of the Senate now for the first time that I know of in the history of this State, some senators refusing my nomination -- my nominees because they agree with my philosophy and not theirs. Well, I didn't think I got elected by the people to come up here and find out just what it was that the opponents wanted and give them everything they wanted.

Q. You are not going to withdraw or make any changes in those nominees then?

A. No.

Q. Governor, do you have any comment on the -- the Republicans who are asking you to withdraw the name of the appointee -- Hubbard to the Board of Education because he's for busing?

A. There have -- I have satisfied myself as to Dr. Hubbard's views and have met with him for some hours. And this holds true for him as well as for others. I am satisfied with the appointment and I know that there has been -- there have been some people who out of the bitterness of the controversy in Pasadena after that court decision a few years ago are disturbed by his nomination. But I am satisfied with that and that he would be a good member of the Board of Education.

Q. Governor, some of these people are getting ready to leave, can you get one more and out of here.

Q. On the coastline, are you going to have a bill or are you going to support one of the bills that are up there or are you just going to wait for something to come down?

A. Well, we have legislation that we are going -- we are either going to amend into or have someone carry it on a pre-spot bill, our own coastline legislation.

Q. Do you know how soon that will be?

A. Anybody got a date?

ED MEESE: Depends on how things develop upstairs.

A. Well, depends on how things develop upstairs. That can

leave it wide open.

Q. Governor, I was wondering, last week in Los Angeles at a meeting you made some comments concerning underground radio, saying that perhaps it lead people down the path to revolutionary action or perhaps drugs or something like that. I was just wondering, where you got your information. I was a little concerned because you live in Sacramento and the station I work for is the only station of that particular format here, and whether or not you thought that was some action that ~~AZAP~~ was involved in or the stations you listened to.

A. I didn't identify any. It is kind of a national phenomena and I was talking to a national radio and television group, the heads of independent stations and I was pointing out again that there were these stations that were going beyond the bounds of what most radio and television stations go, in the electronic media with regard to pornography, open advocacy of the drug culture and revolution. And I said that I thought that through their association that the industry should take upon itself the responsibility of policing itself.

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

Q. Governor, do you support the proposition on the ballot in June which would require the State Senate to approve the appointments to the Board of Regents, this is in reference now to the State --

A. No, I think this is unnecessary from the simple fact that when we start toying around with this -- that system has worked for 90 years and it has created -- how many disagreements you may have -- has created the greatest public university system in the world today. The highest prestige, and I -- if we were faced with some kind of breakdown and failure at the university level, then it might make sense, but I don't see any reason to start toying around with the manner in which this great institution has been built up.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

Q. No, one more question. One more question.

SQUIRE: Get it in early.

Q. Governor, in your speech last week on the bias in the news media, you failed to spell out any names. Who are these people who are biasing the news with arched eyebrows and skeptical expressions?

A. Well, I tell you, I didn't point out any names because I only had 20 minutes to speak, and I didn't want to just stand there and read off a list of names.

Q. Are you now prepared to do so?

A. No, because S. 're says that this meeting's over also.

(Laughter)

Q. Next week. Come in next week.

A. Listen, you young people back up there, you fellows can rush for the phones -- you young people, you don't mind, I don't have very much time, but would you like to fire away with a question or two that you might have now. Student journalists.

Q. You said that -- you said when Nixon mined the harbor that he enhanced himself politically. Don't you think this is what he was trying to do? To enhance himself politically?

A. No, no, I think that if -- you want to make a case for politics, of course, getting out of the war would be political expedience. What I think is that he had the courage to make the statement he made and take the action he has taken. We are discovering that it did indeed enhance his chances, that the people of this country were waiting for and wanted that kind of decisive action. I think that he probably had -- in fact I'm sure he had political advice to the contrary. That he had a great many people politically urging him that this was a dangerous thing to do and yet he ignored that advice and did what he knew he had to do.

Q. O. K. If President Nixon's latest actions in North Vietnam fail, would you support his use of nuclear weapons at all?

A. This question always comes up and again it is a question that really -- no one can answer except the man in charge who has access to all the information, what is the danger to the United States. I would have to say, and I'm sure the President would agree, I don't think there is any reason or any need for nuclear weapons in Vietnam and I'm quite sure that the President and no one else in the world today wants to see them used. And what I have said many times is this, though, I've said again that I don't think you ought to go out of your way to assure the enemy that you won't. I think that if you are -- if you are fighting with someone, if he's -- if he's apt to get nervous and worry that you might do something like that, let him be nervous and worry, it is not a ping pong game, it is a war.

Q. Yes, sir, Governor. I read where the utilities are getting another raise. How come people like the State workers and teachers aren't getting raises?

A. Well, all the State employees this year, beginning in July are getting a five per cent raise across the board. We now are sure that we are going with the savings that -- unexpected savings that

we have made in our welfare reforms that we are going to have some excess funds. Our only reason for holding down raises to state employees has been money, no disagreement about their deserving them. We have said repeatedly, simply not having the money. Now that we are recovering and we are getting more money we have been meeting with the State Personnel Board and we are going to -- once we know the figure we have we are going to start on a program not of broad across-the-board raises over and above the five per cent, but using the additional money we have to correct some inequities that have grown up over the years. We have certain departments that are more out of line with their counterparts in, say, the federal government or in private industry than others. And we are going to try to bring specific departments up and one of those top priorities are those few hundred employees in the water system. That because they are way out of line with people doing the similar kind of work.

Q. Governor, -- to --

A. As to teachers, of course, that's local. If you are talking about public schools, these are -- these salaries are determined by the local school boards.

Q. Mr. Reagan, have any dates been set for the raising of tuition fees in state colleges and universities, yet? This is of concern to a lot of students.

A. No the State university, there's been no talk of any increase in their tuitions. The state university has a \$300 for a three-quarter year tuition. The state colleges trustees cannot -- the trustees have voted that there should be a tuition at the state colleges. This however, in their case, must be voted on by the legislature and the legislature so far hasn't done that. We think it is out of balance to have the universities with a tuition and the state colleges without. But generally the thinking of the trustees was a tuition that would be roughly about half what it is at the university, about \$150, because the comparable cost of educating a student at the state college is roughly about half what it is at the university. Not because there is any lower quality, but because the university prorated out has a much more costly graduate programs. So that would be the extent of the tuition. But I would think -- I know my own vote as a trustee would be that with such a tuition must come the same provision that we succeeded in getting at the university, that any student who has real need and for



whom that would be a hindrance to his getting an education, that that student should be allowed to defer all or part of his tuition until after graduation and pay it back in his earning years.

Q. Governor, you say that President Nixon's action is supported because he has a moral obligation to the 60,000 remaining in troops. Does he have any moral obligation to all the people that live there as ending the conflict as soon as possible?

A. Yes. The Vietnamese people have been at war for more than 2,000 years. Fighting one conqueror after another and fighting within themselves, as I said before, south resisting domination by the north Vietnamese. And in spite of all the propaganda to the contrary, people have tried to point out the South Vietnamese, 17,000,000 if they have made it plain they do not want to live under communism. A million of those 17 came from the north to escape living under Ho Chi Minh's military dictatorship. Now, I think the reason that America was invited in the first place, when I said it was legal as well as moral, was because Vietnam was adjoined in with SEATO, Southeast Asia Treaty Organization. And they asked for the help of their fellow treaty signatories which included the United States, Australia, the Philippines, Korea and all those other countries furnished manpower for this conflict to aid them. And I think when you -- the thing that seems to be ignored by so many today who are so hostile to this war is the great record of brutality and murder of innocence by the Vietcong and by the North Vietnamese in their attempt to terrorize.

Now, I know that difference -- at your age, in just several years, and that back at the beginning of this war I doubt that you were of an age where you were really concerned with it, and therefore dim in memory are the repeated atrocities that were coming out of Vietnam back in the beginning when we only had a few hundred men in civilian clothes there helping the South Vietnamese try to organize for the first time an army. But the terror in which school playgrounds, schools, movie theaters were the target, just for indiscriminate tossing in of bombs, the killing of children, school buses were the target more than anything else for the bombings and the killings. Village leaders elected in their village form of government, in the night the leader -- anyone who dared accept the election to leadership and the teachers taken out and usually they were tortured throughout the night so the people in the village could hear their screams and then

in the morning they were found there in the village with their heads cut off, as the end of the torture. Just this morning's paper carries the story that evidently well authenticated -- that as the North Vietnamese advanced they have already crucified two catholic priests that they found in one of the villages who refused to leave and who stayed with their parish in this village. Now, it is -- it is all easy to feel sorry and say that someone may be killed by a bomb in North Vietnam, but somebody has -- is being killed very horribly. Right now the total civilian casualty in South Vietnam, in this invasion alone, in the last two weeks, is 20,000 civilians, just by the indiscriminate shelling by artillery. Believe me, the rolling barrage of artillery can still make the air force pump to try and equal it.

Q. Because these atrocities have been committed in the past and are being committed now, this makes it morally all right to go ahead, just keep on going then because all it does is prolong the war, right?

A. No, the President's plan from the first has been to prepare the South Vietnamese to the place where they can choose and have the ability to defend themselves, so they can make a choice as to the form of government they want to have, make their own -- their own decision in that regard. And I think that there is a -- I think this is highly moral on the part of the United States, to help them do this. We have seen the idea of North Vietnam, they conquered Hue in 1968. They held it for two months before we drove them out, and after we drove them out we found the 5700 people who had been executed during that occupation, purged, many of them buried alive. Now, I think this is an indication of what's going to happen if the 1700 are suddenly just turned over to the North Vietnamese. There will be the same kind of blood bath that has followed the takeover, whether it was by the Nazis or by the Communists in Russia when they entered Poland and Czechoslovakia.

Q. Do you feel, Governor -- you made reference to, you know, atrocities by the North Vietnamese. Do you feel that as far as the Americans are concerned, the American's atrocities are basically isolated incidents and what do you feel about American atrocities because we are also guilty of this.

A. I suppose you are talking about a My Lai type of thing. No one denies that in war and when men are in combat and in war that things happen and men behave in some instances in ways that they shouldn't.

Basically they have been isolated incidents, incidents in a great fever of emotion. I wonder how many of you who have read the accounts of My Lai have read the book by the war correspondent there who wrote from another side and wrote how inevitable My Lai was because he described what had happened to this particular outfit and how in reality that outfit should have been pulled out of the line because they were in a normal frame of mind to be normal. That they had gone through quite a horrible experience and a blood bath themselves. They deserved to have been replaced in the line and that -- it was in that emotional frame that they hit My Lai. But these are limited as are individual cases of rape that takes place in war. Things of this kind. This is a little different than a planned policy of terrorism in which an enemy officially with government sanction says this is going to be our policy. At least you have to say this, in every war for the United States army, we have the utmost in severe penalties for men on our side who practice atrocities. We do our best to keep war as civilized if war can be civilized as it can be.

Q. Governor, with the mining of Haiphong Harbor, how do you think it will affect Nixon's trip to Moscow and relations with Russia, -- with Russia in general.

A. So far it hasn't been called off. I tell you something you probably find hard to believe. I have believed for a long time and I think that I've done a certain amount of studying in this particular subject, ranging all the way from having been a member of a Board of Directors of a few Communist Front Organizations and -- in earlier years, from then on up into Russian practices -- I believe that when it suits the Communists to have a confrontation with the United States, when it is to their advantage to have one, they will have it, whether we do any provoking or not. It won't depend on anything we may choose to do. If they are not ready, and it is not to their advantage to have that, there is nothing we can do in provoking them to do it. And therefore, I don't believe they are ready for that confrontation right now. And I may be proven wrong, but it is just my hunch that the meeting will be held and there will be no -- there will be a lot of rhetoric in Pravda and Tass about this. But I don't think there's going to be any nose-to-nose or threat of nuclear holocaust. I know we are running out of time, I have to take some who haven't spoken.

Q. Why in this 2,000 years of fighting between the North Vietnam and the South Vietnam have the North Vietnam not yet conquered the South Vietnam?

A. It's been back and forth, it is not only just between them. They have been overrun by the Chinese. Southeast Asia has been a target for conquerors down through the ages. The history of South Vietnam in these 2,000 years is very fascinating and most people who have ever gone into it -- I can't claim that I have, I haven't had the time to do that, although I'd love to -- but from the little that I do know, I know that most people find that you can understand much better much of what's going on if you understand this -- this history. For example, Ho Chi Minh under a different name back in 1925 was an employee of the Russian Consulate in Canton, China. And the Soviet Consulate, and in that capacity he used to invite nationalist leaders from Vietnam to come up there for indoctrination and for training and so forth, supposedly for help. And then getting them there he would sell them to the French Secret police. He was eliminating the nationalist leadership that even back in 1925 was fighting for freedom from the French. And when he finally had -- was responsible for so many deaths that they no longer -- they were onto him, he died. Officially died under the name that he had. And then a few years later he reappeared as Ho Chi Minh, which was his real name, and his record has been one of the similar kind of thing.

When he finally came back into North Vietnam he formed a nationalist coalition, but once he formed it then to get control of it from within he purged. He had one incident very similar to what the Soviet Union did in World War II to the Jews in the ghettos of Warsaw. I don't know whether you've had it in history, but when the Russians were ready to retake Warsaw they got the word into the ghetto and they said, "Rise up, sticks and stones against the Nazis and we will come in -- you keep them busy and route the Nazis," and the Jews in Warsaw and the ghetto did, they fought with their bare hands and the Soviet sat outside, and never made a move until there was no more fighting. Then they came in and drove the Nazis out, but they didn't have any Polish leadership to worry about. Well, Ho Chi Minh with young people your own age, several thousand of them that he put into Hanoi to fight the French, and promised that he would bring his army in to help them. And he sat on the outskirts of the city until all of these young men were killed off. And then his army came on in and drove the French out.

Q. Governor, do you think that any President or any leader of our country will be able to stop this fighting after the -- after the 2,000 years?



A. I think what the President is doing makes so much sense. We have tried the other way. We have tried to hold out the carrot and get the enemy to talk peace with us. Pretending or maybe believing that the enemy really wanted peace as we wanted peace. Now, there's only one way to get him to that table. You have to make it so painful not to come to the table that he will come and sit down. And your question about nuclear weapons, let me point out something. When President Eisenhower became President of the United States, we were still having men killed by the thousands in Korea, and yet they had been sitting there for two years at Pan Mun-Jong (?) supposedly in a peace conference. Now today it can be revealed that Eisenhower planted with Krishna Menon at the United Nations, an Indian who was anti-American -- he leaked some information that Krishna Menon thought he had found for himself and the information was that the President of the United States was considering the use of nuclear weapons in Korea. Now, this was a deliberate leak of false information. Within 48 hours the North Koreans said, "O. K." The two years of this useless talk is over, let's really settle it and we ended the war in Korea. We ended it with a threat that they could not count, a threat they couldn't face, and I don't think the President had any intention of dropping any nuclear weapons, but who said two years of talking peace is enough, it is time to get down to basics.

Q. How long do you think the United States can continue to play world guardian to small countries like Vietnam?

A. I don't think -- well, in a sense, when you say world guardian, we are guarding ourselves. I realize that today it is unfashionable to pretend that there is some kind of an international chess game going on. But there is. And I will never forget standing or sitting in an audience in Los Angeles and hearing Golda Meir when she came here last year from Israel and hearing Golda Meir tell this audience of Californians, she said, "Don't talk to me about the danger from Egypt." She said, "The enemy is in Moscow where he has always been." Now, if the United States just bugged out and let the 17,000,000 be taken, what a tipoff and a signal this would be to the Soviet Union that they they could proceed by way of Egypt to Israel. I think West Berlin would disappear in a minute, and a half. You could shove the spots around the earth that would disappear. And then you've got to go back to Lenin's strategic plan in which Lenin said -- and he said, "We will take Eastern Europe, we will organize the hordes of Asia, then we will



move on Latin America." And he said, "Eventually the United States, the last bastion of capitalism will be surrounded and we won't have to take it, it will fall into our outstretched hand like overripe fruit." Now, those who have the intelligent information, those who have all the facts are those who advise and have advised three Presidents of the United States with regard to Vietnam. And three Presidents who have nothing in common. Kennedy, Johnson and Nixon, Obviously had nothing in common with each other. And yet faced with the facts all three of those Presidents felt that it was necessary for the security of the United States that we be involved in Vietnam. And I would think that this would give less-informed people pause to think. If it had been a succession of one philosophy of President that had followed through on this plan, you might say that philosophy was wrong, let's try something else. But three men, once they had the facts and the information have made this decision. And I don't think any of us can actually say that our decision would be different than a President's decision unless we knew the facts upon which he made that decision. And it is not a case of policing just the world out of great generosity. We made a lot of mistakes out of our generosity, but I think it is a case that we are in a world that is not at peace. You young people and all of those who demonstrate for peace, there is -- you think that we don't love peace? Do you think that those of us who went through World War II and that blood bath did not come out with an all consuming desire for peace? But it takes -- it only takes one to start a war unless you are willing to become enslaved. And if the young people would direct their attention not at us, as if we are against peace, but if this generation could start directing itself to the young people their own age in the other countries, then we might have a chance for peace. But there is no chance unilaterally to say the United States should fly a dove up here and be the only peaceful one when in China, in the first few elementary grades they are teaching kids how to throw hand grenades and use a rifle and bayonet, and when in Russia young people are being indoctrinated in school to believe the noblest thing they can do is give their life for their country. And why don't we start an international type of thing? Why is it always the United States that must lay down its arms. What about those other fellows putting theirs down, too, and this could be quite a target for young people in the world today. He's going to kill me if I don't go.

Q. One more question from somebody.

A. Well this young lady right in front of you.

Q. Concerning the equal rights amendment. Didn't your own commission on women recommend its passage?

A. You know, I can't remember whether they did or not.

ED GRAY: I don't remember.

A. I don't know. Believe me, I -- if you are trying to pin me down on unequal rights for women, I happen to be one who thinks already that you are so superior I'd kind of hate to see you come down to our level. Now, if it wasn't for you, really, we'd all still be carrying clubs.

ED GRAY: Thank you.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

---ooo---