

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 –
04/04/1974, 04/16/1974, 04/23/1974, 05/01/1974

Box: P04

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library
inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at:

reagan.library@nara.gov

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

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 4, 1974

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

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

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: I have an opening statement. Good morning.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Press Release No. 216)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: These are going to be the authors and I'm very appreciative of their authoring the bill.

ASSEMBLYMAN BAGLEY: Let me just say mechanically as soon as I leave this room the bills, the three ^(revenue-expenditure restraint) bills and the constitutional amendment will be introduced this morning, so it is not a matter of we are going to do it right now. The only other happy thought I wanted to express to you, Governor, and I mean it, and I don't think this has been said, in the last seven years because you weren't leaving office, but in the generation of politicians no governor other than you have left office without leaving a legacy of losses. And I mean that, sir. These bills, hopefully, put the constraints into the law books to help future governors and legislators carry on that tradition, and I thank you for your effort, sir.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Thank you very much.

Q Another subject? Another subject?

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No, John would -- go ahead.

: SENATOR STULL: I was just going to comment that ^{the} bills will be introduced at the Senate today.

ASSEMBLYMAN BAGLEY: Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Thank you both very much.

Q Governor, in 1969 you picked Mr. Reinecke to be the No. 2 man in state government.

A That's right.

Q And he was subsequently elected in 1970. But in 1969 you picked him.

A Yeah.

Q Do you still feel that he's qualified to be the No. 2 man in California state government?

A I see nothing to indicate that he isn't, nor did the people. Because they elected him by an over -- re-elected him by an overwhelming majority in the 1970 election.

Q Governor, this -- this is a question that addresses itself to your perception of the political consequences of the indictments and does not ask for whether the man is guilty or innocent. What impact in your own personal view, as an astute politician, do you think these indictments will have on the Lieutenant Governor's candidacy?

A Well, I -- I have no way of judging that. I think it is an unprecedented situation. I have no way -- I think all of us have to be reminded of what I said yesterday, and it is about the only statement that I can make now under the circumstances, that an indictment is an accusation only and there must be the presumption of innocence, on anyone so indicted or accused, unless and until proven guilty beyond a shadow of a doubt.

Q Yes, but, Governor, beyond the presumption of innocence, though, there is a political question there. Whether he's --

A Yes, and I said, I have no way of judging that. I really don't.

Q Don't you have any feelings -- You haven't chalked up the kinds of votes that you have over the years and attracted the kind of support that you have without having some kind of political acumen. I'm just wondering what your personal feeling is about the impact on his candidacy and even on the Republican party by these charges.

A Well, again, there is no way to answer this. Your own news services and the television news last night made it very evident that the speaking engagement subsequent to announcement of the indictments, there was no questioning the enthusiasm of the people present in his behalf. So I don't know how you are going to judge this.

Q Have you had a conference with the Lieutenant Governor since this happened?

A No.

Q Do you plan one?

A Unless he requests it, no.

Q Have you talked to him?

A What? Yes, I called him to express my sympathy for what had taken place.

Q Another subject. Do you think Patty Hearst is a member of the SLA?

A I think that what Mr. and Mrs. Hearst said last night was the absolutely correct thing to say and I hope it will be repeated very many times. I think that first of all Patty Hearst, regardless of the statement made, is not in any way constrained by law from being able to move where she wants to. If she is free as has been -- as was stated in that tape, and I think that Mr. and Mrs. Hearst are absolutely correct in saying that until she walks in the door and tells them personally that she is a member of the SLA, common sense then dictates that you have to accept that she is still being held prisoner, by the SLA. If she is not there is no reason in the world why she cannot come and make this statement in person and walk back out the door as her parents said she could.

Q Governor, what should be the role of law enforcement at this particular point, with this new dilemma?

A I think the role of law enforcement is exactly what has been stated already by law enforcement authorities. As far as they are concerned she is the victim of a kidnapping.

Q Can she walk into the door, though, without being subject to perhaps prosecution or being part of an extortion plot?

A The only thing I know is I've read a statement that -- by law enforcement that no, she is not wanted for anything. She was very obviously carried out. Her first plea on tape in her -- her own voice was asking to be rescued and saved. Now we are being asked to believe that she has made a statement of her own free will that she no longer feels that way and that she has decided to join those who kidnapped her. But, as I say, until she says that in person, I think it would be folly to believe that -- that she made this of her own free will. Anybody else?

Q Can I ask you something else?

A Yeah.

Q Your appointment yesterday of Pat ^{Gayman} Gamon, as Director of the Consumer Affairs marks the first woman appointment you made as a department head during the seven years of your administration. Why did you wait so long?

A Well, it is just those male chauvinists that surround me.
No, no --

(Laughter)

A -- we have made a great many appointments . There have been a great many women appointed to positions and we forget sometimes that while in one area such as department heads it's just fallen that way, that ours is a commission form of government and if you check on the very many commissions that have a very important place in -- in California state government, we have made a great many appointments of women and have done our best to increase the number who are judges, also, in California. So we think that she's eminently qualified to do this and this was a good appointment. As a matter of fact, my only concern was who we are going to get to take her place in what she's been doing.

Q Governor, do you envision her as merely presiding over these various boards and commissions over there, or do you envision her as an active consumer advocate?

A I view her as doing the job in the philosophy that should be done and that is that the consumer -- consumer agency there or department is set up to protect the consumer from those who would take unfair advantage of them, from those who would cheat. At the same time I think that that department has to recognize and help the people to understand that the overwhelming majority of people who are doing this business are honest and above board. And therefore there will be not only the cheats, but there will be legitimate cases of error or mistake and many of those are corrected, frequently by the department.

Q Governor, on another subject, do you believe the state Regional Water Quality Control Boards are doing an adequate job of enforcing regulations designed to prevent pollution of San Francisco Bay?

A Yes, I do. I recognize in view of what took place in the recent strike the concern, but the concern must be much longer ranged than that with San Francisco. It has a pervasive pollution problem. Now we have already committed \$560 million dollars in State and federal funds to update the sewage treatment in that one area, and we expect to spend another 750 million. We have committed two billion dollars already statewide to this problem across the state. And we need another two billion. And that's why I'll get in a plug for Proposition 2 -- why it was placed on the ballot, the Clean Water Bond

Act that will be on the ballot in June, and that will be the most effective thing that we can do to take care of this problem. Now, the San Francisco Regional Board has initiated 25 court cases in connection with San Francisco Bay. They have won 11. The remaining are at various stages of preparation and litigation and we are currently reviewing and have been for sometime all the waste discharges over there, setting tighter requirements and that task will be finished by the end of this year. We did play a vital role in reopening the sewage treatment plants that were shut down. By law there are obviously certain restrictions on what the state can do in invading local autonomy, but where this approach to health problem we were monitoring the water to the bay, bacteria count, and the possibility of a health menace. We then sent people over there during the strike to tell the governmental leaders in San Francisco that the state was going to quarantine every foot of beach in the area around the bay. We also were seeking personnel -- this is not easy, you can't just put anyone in a plant of that kind without running a very great risk of damaging the machinery and thus creating more of a pollution problem during the weeks and months of repair. We sent -- we were scouting throughout the entire country and with the help of EPA in Washington to find technicians who could go in and reopen that plant or those sewage plants. Now, let me give a little lecture here for just one added second. San Francisco has a problem that could cost billions and billions of dollars to totally alleviate this condition. It has -- and I guess it is about the only city we know in California that has single sewer pipes to handle both runoff water from the streets and rooftops and so forth as well as sewage. And every time it rains more than a few tenths of an inch in San Francisco you have raw sewage going into the bay, because it is going -- accompanied by that water the sewage/plants ^{disposal} can't handle it. The total answer to the problem would be tearing up every street in San Francisco and adding another sewer pipe to handle just street runoff as separate from sewage. They -- right now are exploring the idea of some great underground cesspools that would temporarily hold this in time of rain, hold sewage and then have it later be pumped through the plants. Whether these are going to be effective or not, I'm not an engineer, and they are still under study, I don't know. But it is a very difficult problem and it is a problem that must be met because I think we are all agreed that we cannot go on every time it rains -- someone said in San Francisco once that every time it rains even the droppings of the

elephants in the zoo wind up in the bay. Now --

Q Governor, another subject.

A Yes.

Q Recent incident, the Department of Veterans Affairs involved the disclosure of details of individual loan files to the public by employee or employees. Do you have any comments on that?

A Well, yes, we are having it investigated and have asked for an investigation of that. I don't know the results yet. I just have to say philosophically I am opposed with government being more and more involved and more and more individuals' lives and sometimes unnecessarily so, but many times necessarily so, with some of our social programs. I am very concerned, I think most people are. We will take every precaution to ensure the confidentiality of records that government holds.

Q Would you favor a law that would make it a misdemeanor for an employee in that department to make public details of veteran's files? Now they have, of course, additional loan files, the medical and military records of veterans.

A Yeah. I'll go beyond that, I'll say that I favor -- I favor whatever action is necessary, not only in that department but in others, to ensure this confidentiality.

Q Now, one other point, Governor, conversely, do you think that a veteran has -- should have the right to review his own personal file, loan file, in that department?

A Well, I certainly would think so, yes.

Q It is not the case now?

A Well, -- then we will see if we can't get it corrected.

Q Can -- Governor, a couple of years ago an appointee of yours was involved in a situation in Honolulu. You wasted no time asking for his resignation and yet he was only accused in that situation also. Now Lieutenant Governor Reinecke is indicted and he's presumed innocent until proven guilty and yet there seems to be a lack of consistency. Now, I don't think there is a lack of consistency. In one case we are talking about an appointee of mine.

A No, I don't think there is a lack of consistency. In one case we are talking about an appointee of mine, and we are talking about a situation that, as I explained at the time, that there was bad judgment involved regardless of guilt or innocence. That there was bad judgment in his even being there under the circumstances that he was there, and that in those cases and where our appointments are concerned, I think we have to have -- we can't even afford the

appearance of wrongdoing. But in this other case, you are talking about a man who was elected as a constitutional officer. He's not an appointee of anyone and therefore he makes any determination that is made about his tenure of office.

Q But -- I realize that he's a separate elected officer, but isn't the point the same for best serving the public interest in a question like this?

A Well, no, I don't think so. Because the other one involved a man in which the question concerned his judgment with regard to the task that he was presently performing. It wasn't as if he had been arrested for speeding or drunk driving or something of the kind, and therefore you had a case outside the job that he was performing. But his misjudgment involved the work that he was doing in the area of conflict of interest.

Q Well, governor, if Mr. Reinecke says that he went to Washington to help -- help California and do -- do things that were right for the state in his role as Lieutenant Governor, to get that convention in San Diego --

A That's right, he had -- he was in charge of seeing if we could not bring the convention to California.

Q Don't you have the appearance of misconduct here in the performance of his job, as in the case of Mr. Mellison ?

A No, I don't think so.

Q Governor, did he ever tell you about his conversations with Mr. Mitchell?

A No.

Q Did you ever discuss it?

A What?

Q Did you ever discuss with him the probability of the \$400,000 ITT underwriting with its hotels in San Diego for the convention?

A When the Sheraton Hotel made that proposal, which was not an offer of a contribution, it was an offer to underwrite that amount if they couldn't raise it, if the Citizen's Bi-Partisan committee that was trying to get the convention to San Diego and which was willing to raise a million and a half dollars -- that was more than any city in the United States had proposed raising to lure a convention there. At that time, very frankly, when the news broke that the Sheraton Hotels, who had a new hotel opening and were going to coincide their opening with the convention, were willing to do this, I very

frankly -- and I happen to know that this is true of many, and others didn't even know it was a subsidiary of any other group -- I just all my life have known the name Sheraton Hotels and just assumed it was a hotel doing this. As a matter of fact, the same hotel chain spent a million dollars on their own for their opening of a hotel in Honolulu, and subsequent to this time, as I understand it, they did not come forward with \$400,000, but long before there was any -- any involvement or news of any kind it is my understanding that the Republican National Committee, which was the one who would make this decision as to where the convention would be, they rejected that contribution or that offer of underwriting as being too out of line from one contributor.

Q Well -- that wasn't the question. The question was, did you share communications with him regarding his discussions about the whole thing?

A No.

Q You never talked to him about it?

A No, since then he's talked and he's expressed to me his belief in his innocence, as he has stated publicly, the same things.

Q Presuming that the Lieutenant Governor will be on trial, which he says he wants during the late spring, early summer, and fall months, is that going to preclude you from leaving the state because he will be on trial? Do whatever political things or governmental things you might undertake?

A No, because under the law if -- if he is not here in the state then the line of succession falls to the President Pro Tem of the Senate, who has on a number of occasions taken on that assignment and done very well.

Q You are confident in his abilities to carry on?

A Yes.

Q Would you favor Lieutenant Governor Reineck's call to bring the trial in here to California rather than Washington?

A Well, now, I can't comment on things of that kind. The idea of the defendant wanting to -- a change of venue, that goes with what is best for his own defense or what he feels and again with this now before the law, I think I reached the limit of what I can comment on this case.

Q Governor, what's your reaction to the Assembly Revenue and Taxation Committee investigating President Nixon's question of

whether he owes state taxes or not?

A Well, if the legislative committee is legitimately seeking an answer to this, I'm certainly -- certainly they are entitled to any information that they want to ask for. The situation, however, has been misstated, I think, by the Speaker of the Assembly. That nothing is being done. Now, the normal process is that the -- the Tax Franchise Board asks Martin Huff whether he is pursuing this matter whenever a question is raised about someone's taxes. And he is pursuing the matter and said that he was going forward with a review of this case. Now, I think this should also bring up the very fact of what this situation is and why it came before the Tax Franchise Board in the first place. It is not unique. Here in California on the basis of rulings handed down by the Board of Equalization sometime ago, the custom was established that when an individual with residence in California maintained that residence for voting purposes, but his position, his duty, or his work required him to be absent from the state on a more or less permanent basis for at least three years, that he then was not a resident for tax purposes and that has applied to other individuals. And this is the basis for the non-payment of state income taxes, and -- by the President. And incidentally, I think the Speaker of the Assembly might be interested to know that the Board of Equalization for some time has been predominantly Democratic, so you could hardly inject partisanship into those rulings.

Q Governor, Senator Moscone has criticized you for ~~not~~ spending the money to -- that was put in the budget to air condition Pacific State Hospital. Is that true? And if so, why not? And what's being done about it?

A No, it is my understanding that air conditioning is being carried on and is going forward at Pacific.

ED MEESE: Construction of it is.

A Yes. The construction is going forward.

Q Governor, let me interrupt you there, it was disclosed yesterday that the contract has not even been let yet for that project, even though the money has been in the budget for almost a year now. Is your office going to intervene and attempt to expedite the situation?

A I'd like to find out why it was --

ED MEESE: You have already asked the question.

A The question has been asked.

Q Do you intend to support Earl Brian for Republican nomination

for Senate?

A I intend to be neutral in all Republican contested primaries.

Q Governor, the Senate Rules Committee has held up the confirmation of Dr. Stubblebine as Director of the Office of Aging. Are you going to pursue that at all?

A Yes, I hope that this is not just political fun and games going on up there, on the part of the Senate Rules Committee. We asked Dr. Stubblebine to take on this assignment, believing in his expertise and that he could in the reorganization going on in that department make a great contribution. And this is the same Dr. Stubblebine who has already been approved by the same Rules Committee previously for Director of the Department of Health.

Q The committee, though, doesn't think he's qualified for this particular job.

A Well, we think he is and as I say, I'm very concerned that there are some games being played politically up there by the Rules Committee, and I intend to find out from the President Pro Tem if that is so. I have spoken to him once already on rumors that were coming down that such games were going to be played and he gave me his pledge that he would not permit such a thing.

Q Governor, I think two more counties were taken off the gas plan yesterday, I think.

A Yes.

Q What does that say about the availability of gas in California?

A Well, it is exactly -- the availability is exactly what we have stated. And we reluctantly, as you know, made that emergency provision available to counties to halt what we said was panic buying. And unjustified panic buying. Now, the counties -- in those particular counties have evidently believe that panic buying is over and the people have realized the availability of gasoline, the amount that we have, and I hope they haven't been precipitant but I'm delighted this is justified and look forward to removing more. We, as you know, regretted having to -- to follow such a plan in the first place. We said that it was unnecessary if people would simply not be panicked. And so the counties are making that decision. And --

Q There is no more gas, but people would just stop panic buying?

Q Governor, I believe there's two positions open in the District Court of Appeal at the present time. Do you have any indication when you ^{will} fill those positions?

A No, we are reviewing candidates right now and hopefully make a decision as soon as possible.

Q Governor, back to Dr. Stubblebine for a moment, what was the price that was asked -- the cost of approving him? You are suggesting that there was a quid pro quo offer?

A Oh, no. No, just -- there were rumors that had come down stairs that because this was my last year that there might be difficulty in getting any appointments to any approved --

Q Have you started to notice a lame duck syndrome among the legislature about this Stubblebine thing?

A This is becoming more -- this is the only area in which I'd had that concern.

Q Governor, our sports desk is interested since you are a Man of the Year in Washington Touchdown Club, do you think too much free enterprise is ruining the national football league?

(Laughter)

A Well, I don't know -- no, I don't think too much free enterprise is ruining it, but it is like in any other going business, sometimes the prosperity of those in the business attract others until they finally satiate the market or they overproduce and then there is a leveling off. Now, whether -- whether we can stand another league and whether it -- there is a market for it or not, only time will tell. But it goes on in every business and including the sports business. Now, I understand that major league baseball is talking about a possible third league, but this is -- I don't -- I think you just have to wait and see. Are there that many customers and having been in show business also I worry sometimes if some of them recognize the danger of overexposure.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---000---

4/16

PRESS CONFERENCE HELD BY
GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

at

Greater L. A. Press Club
600 North Vermont
Los Angeles, California

Commencing at 11:00 A.M.,
Tuesday, April 16, 1974

Reported by:

V. Allison Webster, C.S.R.

Proceedings of Press Conference

THE GOVERNOR: Ladies and gentlemen, I have no opening statement of any kind.

QUESTION: Governor, would you comment on the latest development in the Patty Hearst case in San Francisco, the bank robbery yesterday.

THE GOVERNOR: Well, I don't think there is any comment other than what has been said already by others about this. I still don't think that there is conclusive proof that she is not under coercion, and the answer must be her safe return before we will know.

QUESTION: Governor, the law enforcement agencies have been operating on the assumption that she is not a participant. Do you think there is any reason to change their approach because she may be a participant?

THE GOVERNOR: Well, this is what I meant about agreeing with the statements that have been made already, where they still say now they would like her as a material witness, but they have reason to doubt -- or to question -- whether she is actually operating as a free agent as a member of the group.

QUESTION: Governor, do you think that the law enforcement agencies are doing their job properly in that these people are able to go up and down the streets, like, for instance, going to the bank yesterday?

1 THE GOVERNOR: Well, this is the first time, to my
2 knowledge, that they have actually appeared. One of the
3 problems up until this time has been that that inner group,
4 some of those individuals who were identified through the
5 photos yesterday as being there, had been completely out of
6 sight. There was just no clue or ability to follow or
7 know their whereabouts.

8 I think that Attorney General Younger yesterday in
9 his statement said it all. It was a brand-new experience,
10 and I think everything is done; that now as he said when you
11 look in hindsight that it could have been handled better,
12 and I think among the things that -- Well, I remember I
13 remarked about some things of this kind at the beginning
14 about those people who accepted the food. As he made clear
15 now in looking at hindsight this was participating, further-
16 ing the felony, and would not be allowed in the future. But
17 we have nothing to go on. It was a brand-new experience
18 for everyone.

19 I think this is something -- I think there are
20 other things that we have to study now as to how to take
21 any possible advantage or profit out of kidnapping. For
22 example, I think we should study very seriously the idea of
23 making it a criminal offense for anyone to attempt to
24 ransom a kidnap victim.

25 QUESTION: Is it now time that we change our approach
26 in this case, or law enforcement change their approach?

1 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I wouldn't be qualified to answer
2 that because I don't know exactly what the policy has been.
3 I know that everyone has been dedicated to one end: To
4 getting her safe return. And I think that is still the
5 mission. But I don't feel that I can comment on what
6 specifically law enforcement should now do, and even if I
7 had awareness of it, I don't think it would be wise for me
8 to comment on it.

9 QUESTION: As Governor, are you going to urge law
10 enforcement agencies to be more aggressive now in light of
11 recent developments?

12 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I haven't had an opportunity to
13 meet with the Attorney General since he made that statement.
14 And, again, as I say, this is actually within the jurisdiction
15 of local law enforcement, not the State.

16 QUESTION: Governor, do you want to make it a crime
17 to attempt to ransom an individual?

18 THE GOVERNOR: I said this is something to study. You
19 see, you can't expect --

20 QUESTION: But this is short of kidnapping --

21 THE GOVERNOR: No. You can't expect the family, of
22 course, of a kidnap victim, you can't criticize them for
23 wanting to do everything they can to get back the member of
24 their family. Therefore, maybe the law must take a place,
25 or a part, in taking profit out of kidnapping. And, as I
26 have said, I think it is something to study, and I really

1 mean something to study. I do not have a fixed point on
2 this, myself, as yet, is whether we should make any attempt
3 to ransom, take it out of the family's --

4 QUESTION: Well, how does this separate from kidnapping?
5 That is what I don't understand.

6 THE GOVERNOR: No. You would take it out of the hands
7 of the family, and the kidnapers, themselves, if this should
8 prove practical, would realize that there was no percentage
9 in kidnapping a victim for ransom because no one would be
10 allowed to offer a ransom.

11 QUESTION: Oh, I see. You mean the parent who offered
12 ransom --

13 THE GOVERNOR: That is right; make it a criminal
14 penalty to attempt to ransom.

15 QUESTION: Governor, how do you feel about the federal
16 role, the FBI's role in this ^(Hearst) case? Were they also
17 snookered? Did they do the proper thing?

18 THE GOVERNOR: I have no way of knowing. I certainly
19 wouldn't criticize. I think that law enforcement is doing
20 everything they can, and they were totally without the
21 knowledge of her whereabouts; still are, for that matter.

22 QUESTION: Governor, let's face it. We have got a
23 gang that can go right to downtown San Francisco and rob a
24 bank with a kidnapped hostage and get away with it. Doesn't
25 this signify anything to you about what law enforcement is
26 doing?

1 THE GOVERNOR: Well, it signifies that crime has been
2 a problem for a long time, and we have been trying to deal
3 with the problem of crime for a long time. We have made
4 some progress. We, ourselves, at the State level have
5 stiffened our backs quite a bit with regard to parole and
6 probation.

7 We have, at the same time, not given up on our
8 efforts to rehabilitate those that we think can be
9 rehabilitated, but there is no question that crime has been
10 the number one problem for a great many years in this
11 country. I think that part of the responsibility for the
12 spread of crime has been an aura and an attitude of
13 permissiveness back through recent years. I think our own
14 recommendations that are getting no place in the State
15 Legislature, and should, such as the Exclusionary Rule
16 that we would like to see changed, I think it is time for
17 a lot of people to review their thinking about crime and
18 to recognize that the first responsibility of government
19 is to protect the law-abiding and not to protect the criminal
20 from society. I have been saying that over and over again.

21 I would like to point out that most anticrime
22 measures that are introduced here at our State level, from
23 my own experience, die in committee. There is a great
24 reluctance on the part of certainly the majority party in
25 the Legislature to do anything to stiffen our attitude
26 toward crime.

1 QUESTION: Governor, what is your response to Mayor
2 Alioto's comment that San Francisco is going to eliminate
3 the S.L.A. in six months?

4 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I think it is a worthy goal. I
5 am all for it.

6 QUESTION: Governor, could I change the subject? The
7 Los Angeles County Board of Supervisors voted this morning
8 to ask you to rescind the odd-even gas rationing in Los
9 Angeles County. Have you been informed of that yet? If
10 so, what is your response?

11 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I didn't know they voted; I knew
12 they were going to vote. My response is one of, "Fine."
13 There is no question we instituted that plan at the request
14 of counties on an emergency basis because of the panic
15 buying. We did it almost reluctantly, because we felt that
16 the panic buying was unjustified, no reason for it.
17 Evidently, the plan has proven successful. There are only
18 two counties left that have not rescinded it, and, as far
19 as I know, in the counties that rescinded it earlier, that
20 asked us to remove the emergency regulations, that it has
21 not fallen back to the panic buying.

22 My only concern at the beginning when the first
23 county asked to lift it was to make sure that they knew and
24 were sure in their minds that we had passed the emergency.
25 But, actually, I think it has been one of the swiftest and
26 best working emergency measures that has been adopted in this

1 State in the several years that I have been Governor.

2 QUESTION: Governor, do you think the emergency is over?

3 THE GOVERNOR: Well, that is what we will find out. It,
4 of course, can be reinstituted if we should revert to panic
5 buying, but I don't think we will. I think that the people
6 now have realized that there is gasoline there. At the
7 same time, I hope they realize that we still have to have
8 our conservation measures. We still are limited in supply
9 of gasoline. There is no question that we can suddenly
10 rush out and do everything that we always used to do. If
11 people will remember that, then there is no reason to have
12 any marketing plan of this kind, if they will use common
13 sense.

14 QUESTION: Governor, do you have any idea when you
15 will act officially to end the plan in Los Angeles?

16 THE GOVERNOR: Well, whatever their request is;
17 immediately.

18 QUESTION: They said they would like to have it back
19 tomorrow, is that possible?

20 THE GOVERNOR: I don't have anyone here from our Energy
21 Council, but I don't see any reason why we can't. If they
22 administer it, yes, if that is when they want it lifted,
23 that is when it will be lifted.

24 QUESTION: Governor, do you think that local, state
25 and federal law officials, officers, kind of took a soft
26 approach because the girl involved was Patricia Hearst?

1 Do you think they would have moved more vigorously if it
2 had been somebody else? Yet two people were shot in San
3 Francisco yesterday; the point has been raised here that
4 maybe this is the beginning of more of this.

5 THE GOVERNOR: Well, you have had quite a number shot
6 there, and, apparently, it is the same --

7 QUESTION: Not by this gang, though, if I might point
8 out.

9 THE GOVERNOR: No. I don't think that what you are
10 saying, that the Hearst girl made any difference. I think
11 if you will look back on all of our kidnapping cases, you
12 will find out that law enforcement's first consideration
13 has been the safety of the victim, and they have acceded
14 to family's demands. In this instance, one of the things
15 that was a first time that gave us, I am sure, law
16 enforcement problems they don't normally have -- Normally
17 when the ransom demand is made, you have, for the first
18 time, the possibility of a connection that would lead you
19 to the kidnappers. But when, in this instance, the ransom
20 demand was totally removed from any connection with them,
21 they said, "No, you just go feed some other people, we
22 don't care who they are, you go feed them, that is our
23 ransom," there was not set up that possible connection
24 where you could trace a ransom to the kidnappers, and thus
25 hopefully free the victim. This is what I think the
26 Attorney General meant when he remarked about this being

1 "a first time," that no one had ever had any experience
2 with anything of this kind.

3 But I don't think there was anything different
4 in their attitude toward acceding to the family's wishes
5 about making efforts to get the victim back safely.

6 QUESTION: Let us say, Governor, that she is involved ^(Patty Hearst)
7 in some way in this caper. Do you think that she should be
8 prosecuted to the fullest extent of the law?

9 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I think the law enforcement has
10 already made that plain. The United States Attorney said,
11 I think it was the other day, wasn't it, they said, "Yes,
12 if the evidence indicates that she actually was participating
13 of her own free will, then she would be charged like anyone
14 else." But he said that there is evidence to indicate that
15 that is not the case. But until they have more evidence
16 they are going to seek her as a material witness.

17 QUESTION: Governor, on your earlier comment, the
18 Attorney General's statement, that anyone who cooperates,
19 such as the food-give-away program, should perhaps be
20 punished in the future. What would be your assessment of
21 the role of the news media in all of this, and how it would
22 apply to such a law?

23 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I think -- I am not a lawyer,
24 and I would want to see what the legalities of this were,
25 but I think the Attorney General made the point that the
26 news media also had allowed itself to be used as a go-between

1 in the transmitting of the demands of the kidnappers, and
2 that again looking back in hindsight, he said that these
3 were all things that now if you had to do over again would
4 be done differently.

5 QUESTION: Governor, you said local law enforcement
6 agencies are handling this situation at the moment, but
7 doesn't San Francisco fall under your jurisdiction?

8 THE GOVERNOR: Well, all of the State falls under State
9 jurisdiction for those areas that are protected by the State
10 and that have not been left to local authority. Now the
11 State, for example, can enter any community on certain
12 emergency bases, but usually when the community asks for
13 the declaration of emergency, just as in the gasoline plan
14 that we were just talking about, but the State does not
15 interfere with local law enforcement, no more than the State
16 interferes with the autonomy of a local school board except
17 upon request, or if there should be a disaster of such
18 proportions that the State automatically declares it an
19 emergency.

20 QUESTION: Governor, could you turn your hat around
21 and become a politician for a moment. A number of candidates
22 for Congress are being given advice on how they should
23 campaign. Can you give us the benefit of your thinking,
24 if you were going to advise a Congressional candidate, what
25 would you tell them about how to handle the Nixon Administra-
26 tion?

1 THE GOVERNOR: Well, the only thing that I know, I
2 have been making a public statement, as you know, in several
3 addresses that I have made to Republican gatherings, and I
4 made it plain that I don't think anyone can endorse or should
5 endorse Watergate, the related incidents. It was an illegal
6 act, but it is now before the courts, and I think that is
7 where it should be settled.

8 I think in the meantime every one of us should
9 assume that those involved are innocent unless and until
10 proven guilty beyond a shadow of a doubt.

11 Now, as to whether any outside figure in government,
12 that is the President or anyone else, can be helpful to
13 a candidate, that is a decision each candidate has to make
14 for himself. We have had one here in the State recently.
15 We won a Congressional race, Bob Lagomarsino, and Bob made
16 a very conscious strategy decision that he wasn't going to
17 ask any outsider to come in, even including the Governor,
18 and he campaigned on his own, strictly on his own, and he
19 won the race.

20 Now, in 1966, if you remember, I did the same
21 thing in my race. When the candidate on the other side
22 was bringing in everybody, the tourist traffic, if you
23 didn't get out of the way, would almost trample you coming
24 from the East. And I said, "No," and campaigned without
25 asking anyone for help. That, at the time, proved to be
26 a successful strategy, at least contributed to success.

1 Whether you would always do that or not, that I don't know.

2 QUESTION: That is what I am wondering, what is your
3 thinking today?

4 THE GOVERNOR: Well, beyond the opening remarks that
5 I made, I don't think you can make a blanket statement.

6 QUESTION: Well, would you identify with Mr. Nixon,
7 and particularly a member of the House is going to have
8 to deal with the situation, should he commit himself?

9 THE GOVERNOR: Well, no, because, in the first place,
10 I think that too many Congressmen have already committed
11 themselves to the place that if they were really a jury
12 in any other kind of legal case, they would have long since
13 been disqualified. First of all, a committee has not as
14 yet declared that they have found that there was an
15 impeachable offense, and yet you have the spectacle of
16 some Democratic Congressmen announcing already that they
17 found him guilty, but they can't tell you of what, because
18 the committee has not yet reported out what they think is
19 an impeachable offense. I think that the proper answer,
20 and again if I may refer to Congressman Lagomarsino, he
21 said as a Congressman if this came before him, he would then
22 make his decision based on the evidence as it was presented
23 to him.

24 QUESTION: Governor, getting back to the odd-even plan
25 in the use of gasoline, do you think that by lifting all
26 of these plans in the different counties in the State of

1 California that motorists are going to go back on the
2 gasoline binge and lose all thought of conserving gasoline?

3 THE GOVERNOR: Well, they won't do it for very long
4 before they find out that there isn't that much gasoline.
5 But if you will remember when we instituted it, we pointed
6 out how much gasoline there was, that the average motorist
7 was only going to have to reduce about one mile out of five
8 of unnecessary driving, probably even less than that if
9 he observed the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit, and that then
10 there would be plenty of gasoline if we did this.

11 But the people were topping off gas tanks, they
12 were lining up at the oil stations, it was pure panic
13 buying. And we kept emphasizing that we had as much gas
14 every time they were doing this as they had the month
15 before when they weren't doing this. So, finally, we
16 instituted this plan at the request of the counties. We
17 announced, "Here is a plan. If any county wants to declare
18 an emergency situation, we will then invoke this as an
19 emergency measure." Eight counties did so. And what we
20 had said before was proven correct, that this slowing down
21 of calming of the panic, they found they could buy on
22 alternate days and get gasoline, the lines disappeared
23 and everyone seemed to be getting along fine, and they
24 could have even without the plan. So, now the counties
25 have said that they believe that this has passed and that
26 the people will observe it.

1 I do think that all of us, and I think that I
2 could be so presumptuous as to suggest that the media has
3 a responsibility in this, too, I think that is to keep
4 pointing out that there is nothing that has happened that
5 means we do not have to keep conserving all forms of energy.

6 QUESTION: Governor, people are driving a lot faster
7 on the freeways even though the 55-mile-an-hour speed
8 limit is still in effect. Do you think it should be lifted?

9 THE GOVERNOR: Well, not according to the mail we
10 have been receiving, the response from people in California.
11 I was very surprised to find that there seems to be a great
12 and overwhelming sentiment for retaining it, and not just
13 as a conservation measure, a great many people have found
14 out that they can talk to each other in an automobile when
15 they are not doing 75 miles an hour. And I said the other
16 day that 55 miles an hour might bring back conversation.
17 But also the safety factor has impressed a great many
18 people; there are about a hundred people a month alive in
19 California because of the 55-mile-an-hour speed limit who
20 wouldn't be alive today. Maybe when the time comes that
21 it is no longer necessary as a conservation measure, we
22 may find the driving public has a different idea. Now
23 maybe there are modifications, maybe we should retain the
24 speed limit simply as a safety factor in the metropolitan
25 areas on the freeways, but maybe on the long stretches
26 where you get out on the highway driving from here to San

1 Francisco or Fresno someplace, maybe it might be possible
2 there to ease it.

3 QUESTION: Haven't you been getting some pressure
4 from Highway Commissioner Walter Podinsky to raise the
5 speed limit saying that he is having a great deal of
6 difficulty enforcing the 55?

7 THE GOVERNOR: Well, Walt answered some questions one
8 day, and he expressed some of the natural frustrations
9 of the Highway Patrolman giving tickets to save gas when
10 in the past they have given tickets with the knowledge that
11 it is a life-saving measure. At the time we didn't have
12 all the knowledge that we have now about the safety factor
13 and the saving of lives, so I haven't talked to Walt lately
14 about it. As I say, I think it should be retained for a
15 while.

16 QUESTION: Governor, does he now feel that it is a
17 safety measure?

18 THE GOVERNOR: I haven't had a chance to talk to him,
19 so I don't know.

20 QUESTION: But he has your information now, doesn't he?

21 THE GOVERNOR: Yes. As a matter of fact, we have
22 theirs; they are the ones we depend on.

23 QUESTION: Following up on an earlier question, two
24 innocent people were shot in San Francisco yesterday. Can
25 you foresee a time when the safe return of Patty Hearst
26 might not be the top priority? Again I ask the question,

1 do you think that there should be a change of strategy?

2 THE GOVERNOR: I am not ducking that. I just have no
3 way in which I can comment on what has been the strategy,
4 so I couldn't say as to whether there should be with regard
5 to law enforcement efforts to apprehend the kidnapers,
6 the S.L.A. and to get her return. I am, and properly so,
7 not that well-versed on what strategy they have been
8 following.

9 QUESTION: Well, how about situations like yesterday,
10 how many situations like yesterday can we --

11 THE GOVERNOR: Well, we don't even want one. But
12 when they kidnapped her, they did the same thing, the wild
13 just shooting in general directions, and it was just a
14 miracle that there weren't people hit in that particular
15 episode. What we have to face, and I am sure law enforcement
16 is well aware of this, is that it is well and good for a
17 few people if they want to, like this gang, to refer to
18 themselves in kind of a romantic atmosphere as being
19 revolutionaries, they are common crooks and everything that
20 can be done to apprehend them and to get them off of the
21 streets and protect the citizens should be done, and I
22 just have to have the confidence that law enforcement has
23 been operating on that basis up until now.

24 But as I said before, with no connection between the
25 ransom demand and the kidnapers, my understanding is that
26 they were totally out of sight, that every effort was being

1 made to try and locate them, and they have not been
2 located. Now, who knows, maybe having come out in the open
3 -- Now, you know law enforcement can make mistakes, but
4 the fellows you are looking for cannot make one.

5 QUESTION: Can we have innocent people being shot
6 like they were in San Francisco?

7 THE GOVERNOR: No, and you have two young fellows
8 who --

9 QUESTION: At some point, then, the strategy must
10 be changed.

11 THE GOVERNOR: Well, as I said before, you are asking
12 me to comment on something which I don't know what strategy
13 is being used.

14 QUESTION: Well, whatever strategy is being used wasn't
15 working.

16 THE GOVERNOR: I just watched a television show last
17 night after I got home, in which the sheriff in a small
18 California town was trying to track down a homicidal maniac.

19 QUESTION: How did that end, by the way?

20 THE GOVERNOR: Well, I will tell you. It ended with
21 the sheriff, he was doing exactly right and everything he
22 could do, but the townspeople had lost patience, and they
23 wanted to go out with bands of vigilantes and do something,
24 and they didn't know what they were doing. And I think
25 the same thing, the inference that some wrong strategy
26 has been followed by law enforcement cannot be based on fact,

1 because we don't know the strategy, and properly we don't
2 know it. Law enforcement doesn't go out and advertise
3 with communiques and bulletins exactly what they are doing
4 to try and apprehend the criminals, because they don't
5 want the criminals -- they figure they read papers, too.

6 So, we know that within the State of California,
7 our law enforcement, our police force -- I think this is
8 true of this city right here -- is probably as effective
9 and more effective than you can find anyplace in the world.
10 I think we have the finest law enforcement in California,
11 by and large --

12 QUESTION: What has to happen before the Governor of
13 California becomes personally involved in the San Francisco
14 situation?

15 THE GOVERNOR: Now what has to happen, you say?

16 QUESTION: Before the Governor of California becomes
17 personally involved.

18 THE GOVERNOR: Well, the Governor of California is
19 personally involved to the extent that my office permits
20 and the prerogatives of my office permit, which is at the
21 moment standing by in liaison with these people, ready to
22 do anything if there is anything we can do to help at the
23 request of law enforcement. Beyond that, there is no
24 way or proviso in which the Governor can go in and grandstand
25 and say to the police, "Go out and find those crooks," when
26 the police are bending every effort to do so.

1 QUESTION: In other words, as Governor there is very
2 little you can do at this point?

3 THE GOVERNOR: At this point, except to let them know
4 that all of the facilities of State law enforcement are
5 there at their command if they can be of help in any way,
6 and I know that there is a liaison that is going on.

7 But, again, I respect the fact that the greatest
8 law of security is the need to know, and that no one of
9 us, even the Governor of California, should be given
10 information that he does not need to have with regard to
11 the strategy that is being pursued.

12 QUESTION: Well, Governor, if you were in charge of
13 the investigation, what would you do?

14 THE GOVERNOR: I am not a policeman. I don't have
15 their expertise and their training, and if I were in charge
16 of the investigation I would turn to the best authorities
17 in law enforcement and say, "What do I do now?" Again,
18 there isn't any way to answer specifically on the things
19 that you are asking. There isn't any way for me to speak
20 even of what I might know without endangering --

21 QUESTION: Do you know something?

22 THE GOVERNOR: What?

23 QUESTION: Do you know something?

24 THE GOVERNOR: As I said, we are in liaison with local
25 law enforcement to the extent that if there is anything
26 we can do to help we want to help. Obviously, it is

1 possible I have been told some things that someone else
2 hasn't been told.

3 QUESTION: Governor, I think what bothers us down here
4 is we have been told that San Francisco is a city pretty
5 frightened with a guy that has shot up 17 people; now you
6 have got the S.L.A. evidently running around, and I think,
7 if I might put it on the line, what is being done to make
8 San Francisco a safe city again? That is the way I get it,
9 so that is the question, if you would like to comment.

10 THE GOVERNOR: I can only tell you that I think everything
11 is being done that law enforcement can do. If you mention
12 the other case of the killers who have been walking around
13 the streets shooting people down just with no connection,
14 again you have a situation there that is unprecedented
15 virtually. Normally in a murder you start with the suspects
16 of the relationships and who could have a motive. You now
17 have in this wave of revolutionary fervor that is going on
18 around the world and we have seen it in a number of other
19 countries and it is finally here, as it inevitably had to
20 come here, you have seen the spectacle of people shot down
21 for absolutely no reason, no knowledge, when I am sure
22 the person shooting them has never seen them before, doesn't
23 know them, and there is a very difficult law enforcement
24 problem. If someone just wants to pull a gun and shoot
25 someone and take cover, and there is no way to tie them in
26 in any way, all the normal investigative procedures of

1 finding out who knew him, who were his enemies, who had
2 a reason to profit by his dying or his death, those are
3 out the window. You just have somebody who has got a
4 gun and is willing to shoot anyone if he finds himself alone
5 on the street with them. You know that a great effort,
6 the so-called "Zebra Squad" is working on this.

7 QUESTION: Let me say we ought to have you here at
8 the Press Club here in Los Angeles more often.

9 THE GOVERNOR: Thank you, very much.

10 (Whereupon, at 11:35 A.M., the conference
11 was terminated.)
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

1 STATE OF CALIFORNIA)
2) ss.
3 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES)

4 I, V. Allison Webster, a Certified Shorthand
5 Reporter and Notary Public within and for the County of
6 Los Angeles and State of California, do hereby certify:

7 That the foregoing proceedings was taken before
8 me at the time and place herein set forth, and were taken down
9 by me in shorthand and thereafter transcribed into type-
10 writing under my direction and supervision;

11 That the foregoing 22 pages contain a true and
12 correct transcription of my shorthand notes so taken.

13 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto subscribed
14 my name and affixed my seal this 16th day of April, 1974.



V. Allison Webster
Notary Public in and for the
County of Los Angeles, State
of California

(V. ALLISON WEBSTER)

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD APRIL 23, 1974

---oOo---

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's news 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, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Good morning. Who's first.

Q Governor, if you are asked by the Lieutenant Governor to testify in his behalf in Washington, will you? (Watergate)

A Well, I haven't been asked and I know nothing more than that story that appeared in the paper, and I'll abide by the law if I'm asked or subpoenaed or whatever has to be done.

Q You will abide by the law if you are subpoenaed, but what if there -- if the Lieutenant Governor just merely asks you to come back, would you?

A Well, I think that I would, yes. As I say, whatever is right to do.

Q Governor, yesterday the California State Employees Association asked you to sign a letter agreeing to arbitration of a dispute over wages and benefits. Would you agree to arbitration?

A No, I don't believe that we have the right to do such a thing in the dealings with public employees. Now, we have been meeting with them regularly and I think they have given a quite distorted position in regard to this situation. In the present budget there was almost a quarter of a billion dollars put in for increases and benefits for the state employees. Now, that nearly quarter of a billion dollars will be in the coming budget with another 127 million on top of it. And we took the recommendations of the Personnel Board completely and accepted them without any change last year, in putting that money in. But for them to propose arbitration, they work for the people and therefore in dealing with them the elected representatives of the people must be the last word other than the people themselves. And for the elected representatives to delegate

their responsibility -- someone else not chosen -- the voters is to put in one -- in some arbitrator's hands the right to make a settlement that could result in -- in imposing a tax increase on the people.

Q Do you think there is a very serious possibility of a general strike of state employees?

A I hope not. I have a great faith in the public employees of this state. I think we have the highest level, and as I have said it many times, the finest employees of any state in the union. And I would hope that most of them would be more responsible than that. Frankly, I don't think they have been given a true picture by the hierarchy, the leadership of the CSEA.

Q If a strike should take place, Governor, what do you do?

A Strikes are illegal on the part of public officials. I would uphold the law.

Q New subject, Governor. Outside of a composite sketch that the SLA or -- pardon me, the San Francisco Police Department has of this so-called Zebra killer, the stop and search technique, the tactics being used by the Police Department has produced nothing up to date. Do you still feel that the tactics should continue in light of the growing opposition in the community that this type of tactics makes racism?

A Well, I don't and can't put myself as an authority on law enforcement or police tactics, or what you use and what is an almost unprecedented situation. I think the people -- the bulk of the people in San Francisco have been remarkably patient with this. At the same time, I think that there is a great responsibility placed on law enforcement that they should use restraint and not abuse this -- this program or what they are attempting to do. But as to its effectiveness or whether it is going to help in the situation, that's a decision for law enforcement to make.

Q New topic.

A I couldn't make it.

Q New question. I'd like to go back to the previous one, the public employees. You said you'd uphold the law, just how would you do that?

A Well, the law is that at the end of five days of an unexcused absence, you assume that the individual no longer is employed.

Q And what would you do?

A And you seek a replacement.

Q That would be sort of hard to do, wouldn't it, if you had a hundred thousand state employees go out on strike?

A Well, maybe we might find out how few people you could get along with, running the state.

Q Several questions, if I may, on your campaign.

SQUIRE? Wait a minute, are you all done on that subject?

Q Governor, is there any room within your administration's bargaining position in regard to the Personnel Board recommendations on salaries, or is that a fixed proposal?

A Look, we don't have the Personnel Board's recommendation as yet. And as I say, the figures that are being thrown around by the CSEA leadership are absolutely false and distorted. They would have the people believe that they are talking about something of 190 million dollar request and that we are talking only 80 million dollars, and as I said, we went almost a quarter of a billion dollars in the present year. Now, the money that we could not give to the employees because of the ruling by the Wage and Price Commission in Washington has been held in a fund and now that a decision has been handed down they are going to get that additional money. Now, once you institute that, that means that that same quarter of a billion dollars is in the budget for the coming year, but on top of that, what it amounts to is the employees of California will be getting over the two-year period a nineteen per cent raise and that is quite different than the figures that are being bandied about by this little group over at the headquarters of CSEA.

Q When the Water Department struck, isn't it the case that your administration then bargained with the striking workers?

A No, no, as a matter of fact they came back in. We told them of the five-day thing, and they came back in at the end of the five days. And we did negotiate because we were aware ourselves --

Q Excuse me, you say you did negotiate?

A Yes, we were aware ourselves that the -- that that was one of the departments that we had discovered was far below comparable scale outside or in other branches of government. Now, we have since then have had an on-going study of the whole state, all state employees to find out where we stood with regard to the law that says

their -- their salaries and their prerequisites () be comparable to the outside. And we found in some areas we were much closer or even above, and in other areas we were much below. So what we have been trying to do with salary scales is now bring this picture up. This means that in some instances where someone was already above scale they weren't going to get the increase that another department might get where there was a great differential.

ED MESE: Governor, could I correct a misinterpretation. We did not negotiate during the strike or when the employees struck. The understanding was that no negotiations would be held until they went back to work, then there was --

A That's what I meant, I think that within the five day thing -- maybe I'm wrong, then I thought it was the five days and they went back to work.

Q They went back to work.

A That's what I was intending to say, we did not negotiate while they were out.

Q Several questions, if I may, on your campaign reform tactics. One, if you move the primary date from June to September would you also have a separate presidential primary in presidential years or would you thereby force -- since the conventions are normally in July and August, would you also be forcing the presidential election to be conducted much later as well, because you can't very well have a convention without a California delegation.

A Well, as a matter of fact, when I made the presentation to the Better Business Bureau in San Jose, I brought up that very instance of what could happen. And I said, "Since California has taken the lead in a number of other things that have ~~been~~ been -- other states have followed suit, and even the national government has -- has followed suit, that it would be our hope that they would -- that the entire -- the national elections would also change to fit this pattern because this is obviously where the greatest cost lies in -- in campaigning and where the problem is just as great as it is here." So it is our hope that we could show the way.

Q You could force the way, couldn't you, pretty well?

A Well, maybe if California is that powerful.

Q Well, Governor, have you any criticism of the fact that prior to World War II the presidential primary was held in July -- June, and the state primary was held in August?

A I wasn't aware of that.

Q I didn't think so.

Q Have you taken a position on Prop. 9, Governor?

Q Can I continue to --

Q Have you taken a position on Prop. 9?

A Marty, let me finish my question.

Q It is related.

A No, we have -- we have not had a complete study of that although I'm familiar with enough of it to know that our concern with Prop. 9 has to do with the fact that we have already passed legislation having to do with conflict of interest, and full disclosure. And in both instances, Proposition 9 would take us back to less protection in both those fields than we presently have. It would supercede the present laws. There are some other things that we think are wrong and we believe that the package we are presenting will accomplish -- we have no quarrel with the goal and the aim of Proposition 9, and this is why we have had a task force for several months that has finally come forth with this program that we are recommending. We think this program is better than Proposition 9. It doesn't contain some of the defects and in some instances achieves the same things and even in some we think a little stronger.

Q Will you take a definite position before the primary on Prop. 9 or leave it at that?

A We have not, as you know we always sit down with the propositions and go through all of them and abide by that decision based on cabinet studies, and we haven't had that yet.

Q Now, you have also suggestedⁱⁿ this package that no one but organizations -- I'm sorry, that only individuals would be allowed to contribute, not organizations, with the exception of the party, and their charter groups. Could, under your proposal, could parties receive contributions from corporations or labor unions? Would they then become funds?

A No, no, but the -- but a party could receive contributions from individuals as individual members and then use that money in the -- in support of campaigns of party candidates.

Q Will that be spelled out in the bill, that the corporation -- that no groups may contribute to parties as well as to individuals?

A Yes, this will be spelled out, the drafting is going forward now. Yes, we didn't want to interfere with the party structure, that's part of our two-party system here.

Q And the third point, in two of the different bills one would bar lobbyists and the other would bar judges from contributing to campaigns. Is there any -- in your mind any question of the constitutionality of that -- those provisions? Both Lieutenant Governor Reinecke and Controller Flournoy suggested that it may be unconstitutional. An infringement upon the First Amendment, of freedoms, to prevent anyone from contributing as an individual to any campaign.

A Well, we just happen to believe that the judge falls into a particular position of -- where he is supposed to be above all partisanship and above all bias and he has to run as a non-partisan and therefore we thought we would limit him to campaign contributions that would involve only his own campaign when he had to run.

Q Any particular judge?

A What?

Q Any particular judge?

A No.

Q That's not the moral.

A Any and all judges that have to run, as they do.

Q And on lobbyists, what's the reasoning there? Doesn't a lobbyist have the right --

A Because we don't think that the lobbyist is contributing his own money in the present system that he's contributing in behalf of his clients, so this would be organization giving again.

Q Governor, what's your realistic appraisal of the chances that your program will get to the legislature? The Speaker yesterday told us that the proposal was self-serving and he didn't like it.

A Yes. I read the Speaker's position on that. And of course I can understand his concern because now that we have full disclosure the bulk of his contributions in his own campaign apparently comes from lobbyists, corporations and labor unions, and we suggest that it is self-serving in anyway is a little hard to swallow. Now, you ladies and gentlemen, now with the full disclosure laws have full access to all the facts and all you have to do is take a look at where the contributions come from for any of the candidates and you can stand on those figures. This implication that he made that the old stereotype image that the Republicans are all rich people and the Democrats are all poor people is not borne'

out by the facts. And the plain facts are that as far back as 25 years, which is about as far back, I guess, as there is an accounting of any kind, the Republican party has outdone the Democratic party by a great distance in the amount of contributions, the percentage of their contributions that come from small donors. As a matter of fact, the figure is about five to one, and to suggest that we are the party of the powerful and the rich ignores the fact that we are outnumbered about twenty to one in the entertainment world, which is well known for its affluence and its high pay scales. We are outnumbered in the executive offices of the advertising industry. In the publishing field. In Wall Street bankers, by the other side.

The opposition has its affluent people also and right now we are having a primary campaign in which the three leading Democratic candidates have received contributions that are more than double what has been contributed to the campaigns of the two leading Republican candidates, plus which the latest reporting shows that some very hefty and healthy corporate gifts found their way into Democratic candidates' hands. So he's just blowing smoke and talking campaign talk when he tries to point out they will be benefited. I'm quite sure he objects to our plan because of the limitation on lobbyists and corporation and labor organization gifts. But I would give one last plus, what is more out of line with our democratic system than the pronouncement by the CSEA, a hierarchy, that they were going to have a half a million dollars, \$500,000, to buy a governor candidate. They didn't use the term "buy, but they said exactly the same thing, that they would give to that candidate that would do the most for them. No, that is hardly my definition of democracy.

Q Governor, wasn't that also -- that wasn't accepted at the CSEA convention, though, was it?

A Well I don't know. If you know something I don't know, I don't know whether they --

Q I understand that that proposal was rejected.

A Then that restores my faith or amplifies my faith that I expressed earlier in the employees themselves, but the announcement was made by this organization which incidentally is one of the two top spending lobbying organizations in Sacramento. The California Teachers' Association and CSEA spend more in lobbying than any other group.

Q Excuse me, how soon after a California September primary would you recommend that the national conventions be held?

A Oh, I think it could be held very quickly. I think it could be scheduled to follow in a -- certainly by the middle of September, easily within a week.

Q Governor, excuse me, I don't think you finished answering my question. In view of the Speaker's opposition, what chances, realistically, do you think your ^{program} ~~program~~ has in the legislature getting to your desk?

A Well, he's going to have a problem with that. Because he -- he's also quite opposed to Proposition 9.

Q He's in support --

A Oh, he does support Proposition 9. Well, then at least he's ~~he's~~ then against both of the proposals there, but I think he's going to find a great many legislators that don't want Proposition 9 and so they are going to -- be faced with some choices.

Q Governor, is your package of reforms that you are going to present then -- should we construe that as an effort to offset Proposition 9?

A No, as I say, this is the result of a task force that's been working for several months and we think we have a better package, we believe that, and I would think that the Speaker would agree with this, that we believe that the normal legislative process is a proper place to settle this.

Q Governor, you didn't say anything about financial disclosure in your package, and I wanted to ask you, is there any chance of you voluntarily filing the documents required by the Moscone Bill pending the Supreme Court decision on that or not?

A I haven't given any thought to that. Until this -- until the decision is made about this.

Q There are some officials who are filing voluntarily despite the legal uncertainty of the Moscone Bill, and --

A Well, I haven't given it any thought and I certainly had no hesitation about doing it if -- if the law was upheld and if the law was endorsed. I was naturally going to do it.

Q If you file one, would that be an indication that you are running for something?

A Well, now, you have given me a reason for not filing one, Squire.

Q Governor, did you pay a State income tax last year?

A Yeah.

Q Governor, on another subject. An initiative drive has started to authorize up to one thousand off-track betting places in California, plus Nevada ^{type} gambling in the Riverside County desert area. And I wondered what your position on those type of proposals was.

A No, this was the first I've heard of that. I know that the problem, and I've given thought before to it, to the idea of off-track betting. I think that the -- there are some patterns throughout the world that have been studied. I think it would -- certainly have to be in such a way as to protect the track. I know that the -- in New York off-track betting has created some very great problems because the track, to my understanding, does not share and the off-track betting has cut in very much to the place that you wonder if the tracks can continue to support racing. And offer racing. But I haven't had an opportunity to study the other -- the idea of loosening up on gambling.

Q Do you have any thoughts about bringing about Nevada type gambling, the slot machine and so forth, to California?

A Well, as I say, I normally don't, and won't comment on legislation that may be pending until it amounts to something. My first reaction is one that I'd have to wonder whether we were benefiting the State of California or not.

Q Governor, do you think that two months would be enough time for you or any other possible presidential candidate, just using you hypothetically, to mount an effective -- to not only organize a campaign, but to mount a campaign for the presidency of the United States? Two months? Less than two months?

A Seven weeks.

Q You really think --

A Seven weeks, you are talking about the general campaign. But you are also talking about the -- or you must take into consideration the fact that what would be done nationwide, we are talking about national primaries. We are not talking about -- but I mean this is general talk of something. There are now scores of primaries throughout the nation, obviously long, where the general election gets under way, the people of the United States have been well exposed to all the candidates. I think in the 1972 campaign

select a candidate, I think all of us have to admit that most people in the country were expressing their weariness with the whole atmosphere of campaigning along before we ever got to the general election. Now, a country like England, they have three weeks total for campaigning. I know ours is a bigger country and I certainly don't suggest that we adopt the British pattern here of three weeks, but I believe that seven weeks, particularly since you would come right at the heels of the momentum of the primaries -- one of the things that -- from my own experience, and my own two campaigns, that I saw and that adds to the cost, is that you have a primary and it is over in June, early in June, and then theoretically you don't start campaigning until Labor Day. So the general campaign really gets under way at that time. But what happens is you -- you just -- you stay alive during all those months from June to September, you have to keep your headquarters and your organization and so forth going, so the expenses go on. And while this may be a lull in the campaigning it still goes on and goes on. And then on Labor Day everybody pretends they are starting their campaign.

Q But, Governor, the normal presidential election, you know what happens is that -- the one who is the victor then tries to pull together the other people and find positions for them in his campaign and create some sort of unity. How are you going to be able to do that in the short span of seven weeks?

A Well, I think it could be done. I just think the campaigns are too long, I think the people are telling us they are too long. I think they tell us they get tired of it, they are weary of it. You hear that long before the campaign time, a great deal of the effort is wasted, that people no longer pay any attention. They tune out the ads when they come on T. V. and they don't read the brochures. I think that a concentrated campaign coming right on the heels of the momentum of the primary --

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

A -- could be adequate.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor.

---000---

5/1

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

Held May 1, 1974

Reported By:

Beverly D. Toms

(This rough transcript of the Governor's news 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 corps as rapidly as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Well, ladies and gentlemen, if you are ready, when the particular subject of this press conference is over I will at the close of it have an announcement on a different subject to make that I think you are interested in, also. But right now in case you think I'm simply trying to ^{intimidate} ~~intimate~~ you by outnumbering you here, I would like to introduce that here on the platform we have from the League of California cities, Don Wyle, the Mayor of Woodland.

(Whereupon Governor Reagan introduced the representatives present from the League of California Cities, the County Supervisors Association of California, the California Taxpayers' Association and the California State Chamber of Commerce.)

The statement that I have to make will follow then with a little presentation of explanation and then a statement from the Senator, and take your questions. My statement is --

(Whereupon Governor Reagan read Release No. 269.)

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Now, before the questions, Roger ^{Magyar} ~~MacDow~~ (phonetic), will you open the envelope, please. Here are just a few things. It will be Senate Bill 2133, authored by Randolph Collier, and covers ^{local} public employees except school district and transit district employees and designated management supervisory or confidential employees. Now, the reason for leaving out school and transit district employees -- and transit, they are taken care of by present law. And we have been meeting with the school boards associations and they themselves are pursuing because of differences between that sector of the public employees and regular other public employees, they have legislation that they themselves are working on to cover their particular problem. It creates a public employee relations board to administer the act, to assist in resolving procedural disputes or eliminating unfair practices and to ensure all parties, employers and employees, and the public, they receive their

rights under the law. It specifies management responsibilities which must be assumed and administered by elected representatives. It outlines the issues that are subject to negotiations. It guarantees employees the right to be represented by negotiating units, but it does not require union membership. It requires employers to recognize and negotiate with certified employee units. And it prohibits employer lockouts as well as employee strikes. It provides for mediation and fact-finding to resolve impasses. And allows continuation of Civil Service and merit advancements to prevent management or a union spoil system. Now, that is a brief rundown of what was in the opening statement, what will be in the legislation and now I'd like to present the author of the bill, Senator Randy Collier.

SENATOR COLLIER: Thank you, Governor, and gentlemen -- ladies and gentlemen. I want to say ever since Calvin Coolidge called out the militia to stop the strike between -- of the policemen and the firemen it's been brought to my notice -- maybe that's too long ago for some of you, but I long felt that the -- for the public interest that the policemen and the firemen and other public employees did not have the right of strike. The introduction of the collective negotiations act for public employment is a proposed response to those in local government who are requesting the procedure be established to permit employees to organize an approach to collective negotiations. This matter has been before the legislature ever since I've been here. In recent years it has come to the forefront and this is an attempt to carry it on and see if we can start out by bringing the local employees of cities and the counties and some districts into a system in negotiation. The word "negotiation", I believe, is important to understand because public employees service society and receive their pay through the power of taxation, not through the private business approach of supply and demand. Because the power of the tax is absolute, it is necessary that the people select representatives who are responsible for taxation, not delegate the power to tax to an arbitration board, but stand accountable for tax impacts. As with any legislation which may be offered in the area of collective bargaining, the bill does not necessarily satisfy all the interested parties, but I believe does provide for an organized approach to solve a major issue and will relieve the local taxpayer of a vexing problem that's confronted them for years.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Now, ladies and gentlemen, these -- the

presence of all these people is because we have been working with all of these who are present here on this for quite sometime, and to find an answer to the problem that is becoming more of a problem just in recent months, and ^{even} the last few years. So all of us have been working together on this and your questions can be directed to any one of us here, whatever questions you may have.

Q Governor, why are teachers, transit employees and state workers not included in the legislation?

A Well, first, as I -- well, it was very brief explanation there Transit employees are covered by existing law. The teachers, as I said before, we have been meeting just as we have met with these groups -- we have been meeting with the school boards association, with educators on this subject, and they -- there are very definite differences that would make trying to put them all into one bill extremely complicated, so they are working with Senator Rodda on a piece of legislation in the hopes of coming up with something that will achieve the same ends that we have -- we think are achieved in this. The state employees, of course here we have a more complex problem and one that also is covered by our state law. We have presently the State Personnel Board that is in existence constitutionally. We have the -- a relationship with the various individual departments. We don't have the same centralized control as we do at the local level, and here again, to try to put the state problems into this -- a bill of this kind, it would become too complicated and too complex. I don't think it would be good -- good legislation. Now we have been meeting and working with the employees organizations here in the state to eliminate problems they have or where they believe there has been inability to express grievances or -- or get a fair hearing on them, and I think we have made great strides in that.

Q Governor, there seems to be a complete absence of employee groups in this group that's here. Did they have any -- any participation in drafting this legislation?

A Well, the people who are here on the platform and who have been dealing with them have -- certainly labor's position is well known on this, and they have been dealing with them and know the problems. We also know that those groups have -- or numbers of them have taken the position, some of their organizations, that they do

believe in the right to strike. And so there is a basic difference there.

Q Governor, the Senate Majority Leader and the Speaker of the Assembly say they are behind the concept of collective bargaining as opposed to what Senator Collier said, the collective negotiation procedure of this bill. Given those political facts, do you think this bill is really going anywhere this year?

A I certainly do and I hope that it goes some place because I think it is a reasonable and responsible bill to resolve a problem that is extremely costly to the people of this state, the people of various local communities.

Q Governor, it provides for mediation and fact-finding, but no arbitration. Couldn't this really perpetuate what you have now?

A Well, now, this comes down to what I've said before about arbitration. I don't believe that the elected representatives of the people can turn to some other appointed individual and that that individual then can make a decision that is the basic responsibility of the elected representatives. Our source of ^{our} employees are the people, and the only way that I could see the arbitration of the ultimate kind could ever be legal or could be morally right where public employees is concerned, is if you turn to the people themselves for referendum. They are the ultimate authority. I don't think that any one of us who are elected by the people have a right to designate our responsibility to someone who is not behold^{ing} to the voters. The individual who could make that arbitration decision could very -- you would be giving into his or her hands, literally, the right to raise taxes.

Q Then under this bill would your elected local officials still have the final say in --

A They must.

Q -- making a decision?

A Yes. They have to. That's what they were elected for.

Q Governor, who appoints the five board members?

A The Governor, approved by the legislature.

Q How long are the terms?

A How long are the terms?

VOICE: Five years.

A Five years.

Q The Stat Board could not impose any kind of settlement on the local agency on these issues?

VOICE: That's correct.

Q So it has no real authority other than as a persuasive body?

VOICE: Unit determination.

A Anybody want to explain that? I have not seen the details of the legislation as written as yet, it is in the Legislative Council's office.

MR. BENNINGHOVEN: In response to that question, the board will resolve disputes among unions, jurisdictional disputes on unit determination. They also have -- will have the authority to conduct secret elections. They will have the authority to rule on unfair labor practices, but to impose themselves on a local decision on _____ agencies, they do not have that authority, they cannot go in there on their own motion, they have to come in on the request of one of the parties.

Q Governor, does the bill specifically prohibit strikes by public employees, or does it leave it as it is now?

A No, it specifically prohibits strikes. Right now we are -- we think that strikes are illegal, but it is by case law, it is by court decisions. This now will actually make it law that they are prohibited.

Q Will the passing of this bill make it easier for local government or the state to crack down on strikers? Would it mean -- would it mean that it is much more dangerous for public employees to go out on strike?

A No, quite the contrary, and we have a pretty classic example. A Los Angeles County happens to have a rather sophisticated procedure for employee and employer relations right now that is very similar to this bill. They support this because this bill will strengthen and make their system even better. But we see the example, they have come to the verge of a strike in Los Angeles County and because they have a procedure similar to this, there is no strike. But by contrast with San Francisco, where there is no such thing, we had the strike and we had all the resultant troubles from it.

Q I have one -- one other question. You said that it provides -- it outlaws a lockout ^{by} the part of the employer. Does this affect the provision where -- there is a provision that if there is a strike that the employee is terminated after five days similar

to the state situation.

A Well, now, this is state law. I'll have to ask again here what the -- provisions or --

VOICE: No specific.

A There is no lockout, but of course in the ultimate, if you come to an outright impasse where workers refuse to come to work and there is no further procedure, why, this would be the ultimate I guess, that local government could -- could go to, is simply recruit and hire new employees.

Q I wonder if someone could go into the subjects that would be open to negotiation, you said it was outlined --

.. What are some of them? What are they?

A Well, some of the specific things, who would like to --

MR. BENNINGHOVEN: The bill has a public mandate right section which limits the negotiations to those items that affect directly the employee, salaries, working conditions, but does not go to negotiating on items that can be negotiated under the existing law, like the number of men in a fire truck or levels of service, or whether service should be contracted out. These are management decisions and they are excepted from the negotiation process, so it is limited to economic issues, working conditions and those that affect the employee directly.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Any other questions?

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

GOVERNOR REAGAN: No other questions?

ED MEESE: Let's go on to the other --

GOVERNOR REAGAN: Yes, I have just one other announcement that I wanted to make. It doesn't have to do with this and I'll impose on our friends here for just one second, but I know it has been of great interest to you and interest here in the Capitol, and there have been many questions and there have also been rumors and stories based on rumors, up until now. And I am very happy to tell you now that I have asked Senator Fred Marler to accept appointment to the Superior Court here in Sacramento and he's agreed to do so. And I'm very happy and I think he is, too. And that's it. I' thank all of you.

Q Governor, just a little bit more on that -- excuse me, but what about a special election for Senator Marler's seat?

A Well, then -- Senator Marler -- also the appointment that he will be accepting will not come up for a while yet, because it will be to replace one of the Superior Court justices who is moving to the Appellate Court. So we don't know exactly as to the date. I'm hopeful that maybe a special election won't be required because his district no longer exists due to reapportionment and we might find ourselves having a special election for somebody to hold office for three weeks, and I don't think any of us want to go through that.

Q Governor, why did you rule him out of the Appellate Court opening?

A It wasn't a case of ruling him out on that. A great many names were reviewed for that particular post. And I never go into details about why, except that as you know we have had a process for for appointments. We have never violated the process and it's been one that has taken the appointment of judges out of politics and I think for the first time in California. And this is the way it turned out.

Q Is there any reason you appointed Senator Cologne to the Appellate Court judgeship and not Senator Marler?

A No, the situation was different at that time and the people in that particular area who were being reviewed for that -- he turned out to be the man for the job.

Q What about reports you've been under pressure from the state and local bars to confine the Appellate appointments to judges with trial experience, is that your --

A I don't know that I've been under pressure. We have certainly been cooperating with -- as a matter of fact, they have been cooperating with us at my request for seven and a half years now. We have sought out the council of the bar and the local -- the local bar in the areas where judges are to be appointed. We have taken their recommendations for this. And there is no -- no change in that procedure.

Q You don't feel you are under any more pressure to appoint a trial judge for an Appellate spot than you have been before?

A No, no. Incidentally, let me get back to the other subject here just once and say that all of us up here appreciate

very much the fact that the Dean of the Senate is handling this legislation. It was a happy wedding because we have known his views and these people here knew of his views, and it was their hope that he would carry such legislation. Mine, also. So we are a happy family gathering, and if you finished with your questions we will leave.

VOICE: Thank you, Governor.

3/2

NEWS CONFERENCE OF GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

HELD MAY 2, 1974

Reported by:

Beverly D. Toms, CSR

(This rough transcript of the Governor's news conference is for the convenience of the Capitol Press Corps, only. Because of the need to get the transcript to the Press Corps as rapidly as possible, no corrections are made and there is no guaranty of absolute accuracy.)

---oOo---

GOVERNOR REAGAN: You have lost about seven minutes of your press conference time by the Girl Scouts out there -- or the Campfire Girls out there.

Q Did you buy any cookies, though?

A What?

Q Did you buy any cookies?

A No, they were too busy doing other things to get around to that. I had a jellybean, though. Well, all right.

Q Governor, do you think the voters will vote yes on Prop. 9?

A Well, I wish the voters before they make up their minds on Proposition 9, would look at exactly what it would do and look at the legislation that we now have before the legislature. I believe that we have presented a more effective plan. I'm concerned about some facets of Prop. 9. I'm also concerned with the fact that two of the things already passed by the legislature would be weakened by Proposition 9.

Q Then you are against it, are you?

A What?

Q Then you are against it?

A Well, I was just being critical of portions of it here, but I believe that the legislation -- I think the legislation that has been presented would do a more effective job of reform than Prop. 9.

Q How would Prop. 9 weaken those two bills that were passed by the legislature?

A Well, they are in the areas of disclosure and as I understand, a conflict of interest. It isn't just as effective as has already been adopted.

Q Governor, when are your bills going in?

MR. ORR: They are in the ^{Counsel} council.

A Yes, the Legislative ^{Counsel} Council now, dotting all the i's on it.

Q That doesn't answer the question. When are the bills going in, though?

A Well, I can't answer for the Legislative ^{Counsel} Council. There are certain things that have to be done, that's the legislative process up there, before they can then go out to the legislature, and he has them to make sure that all -- as I say, the t's are crossed and the i's are dotted and so forth, and now it is in their mill, not mine.

Q Governor, do you think your difficulty with Senate Republicans are resolved now and your appointees are going to go through -- have you had conversations about that?

A I never thought that I had any difficulties with the Senate Republicans.

Q Well, they seem to --

A So far we have gotten along just fine. A great many -- not only Republicans, but Democrats, I know what you are referring to, over these weeks have come to me with endorsements and high recommendations for their colleague, Senator Marler, and they found no disagreement as far as I'm concerned. I think as highly of him as they do, and I think that they are uniformly pleased at what has happened.

Q Governor, Mayor Alioto says he feels what he terms a concerted drive by state, local and federal officials, is necessary to make sure there are not more Zebra suspects at large elsewhere in the state. But the State Attorney General says his office is merely conducting a coordinating supportive role. Do you feel there should be a much more intensive state investigation into this?

A Well, I think the Attorney General is doing all that -- that needs to be done from the state line, and I think there is complete coordination. As a matter of fact, the Mayor himself has most -- has stated that he is in touch and is seeking and taking advice from the Attorney General. And I think he's -- there is a full investigation going forward.

Q Shouldn't the state be taking the lead in this, though, rather than simply waiting for local agencies to take the lead?

A Well, I don't think that we are waiting for anyone. I think the state investigative procedure is going forward.

Q Governod, you know of any evidence at all that there is a connection between the murders in San Francisco and others that are supposed to be taking place?

A No, I do not, and I don't know that anyone actually has evidence to that effect. I think this is -- this is one of the areas that is being investigated.

Q Governor, there are repeated indications that allegedly police agencies knew anywhere from three to seven months ago of the alleged existence of a statewide or nationwide conspiracy in this case.

A Well, as a matter of fact, when you say an alleged conspiracy, not only the police agencies knew it, the public knew it. There was a story carried in the news several months ago that there were reports and it did not say whether confirmed or whether there was evidence to substantiate them, but that there were reports that there was a cult type of thing in which the killing was part of an initiation, and then since that time there has been very little mentioned about that.

Q And you don't think it would have been appropriate for law enforcement officers to move in or in any way control the groups at that point?

A Well, I don't know what law enforcement was doing at that point, from then on. I have to assume that if they had such a report that they must have been checking it out.

Q Do you feel there should be, perhaps, some sort of legislative investigation?

A No, I think it is in the hands of the proper authorities. I doubt if the legislature could -- has the facilities to come up with this kind of criminal study or investigation.

Q Another subject. Have you had an opportunity to read any of the transcripts that the President has transmitted to the House Committee?

A Only those that have appeared in the paper. I have made a request for the full transcript.

Q What was your reaction to -- how did it strike -- did it strike you the way the President hopes it will -- it will strike the people? Did his feelings come through?

A I have ' say that I was struck by e -- what appears to be a difference between now some of the interpretations of those and the verbatim transcript, the first verbatim section that was printed and read verbatim. I notice that some commentators have left out mention of things that were in that, and I think that -- I would hope that everyone would try -- I know 1200 pages is a -- that's a lot of reading, and yet I don't think anyone can make any judgment until they have read the entire 1200 pages, the verbatim ~~transcript~~, and not the interpretations of them.

Q What ~~about~~ your personal reaction? Were you surprised by anything that you read there?

A No, I was -- I was quite conscious of -- and aware of one thing in that first transcript that seems to have been ignored, as I say, a great deal by those who are interpreting them now. And that was the flat statement by Dean to the President, when he said, "Mr. President, I am -- I know from my conversation that you were not aware of these things."

Q That was the March 21?

A Yes.

Q Governor -- change of subject. You say you have high regard for Senator Marler. Why were you not willing to appoint him to the Appellate bench? What were your reasons for not appointing him?

A Well, I don't think that I should go into the reasons of why someone was appointed a judge or someone is not appointed a judge. We follow the same process that we followed on all the appointments, so far. And it is a -- it is a screening process and it is an attempt to get those that come to us with the ratings of all the various groups that we go through in the screening. And we settled upon two fine Superior Court judges, trial judges here in -- in Sacramento. And this, of course, does have a bearing, while we have appointed to the Appellate court sometimes directly from the field of law, and not from -- from the trial court, the overwhelming majority that I have appointed have been from the trial court.

Q Are you indicating that local bar -- local persons in the bar in Sacramento for some reason didn't choose to find Senator Marler acceptable?

A No, I'm not saying that at all. We have used the same process and as I have said, I think that Senator Marler is highly qualified or he wouldn't have been considered in the first place. And I think he'll make a fine judge.

Q Governor, in that connection, the Commission on Judicial Appointments apparently has yet to act on your nomination of John Vukasin. Are they leaving him to twist in the wind? It's two weeks.

A I don't know, I know that this is in the process and that's all I know.

Q Governor, on another subject.

Q Well, wait a minute, what about the State Bar's finding that he's unqualified?

A Well, I am in total disagreement with the State Bar and I understand that the State Bar's vote on whether to even involve itself, which is a highly unusual thing for them to do, was eight to seven, which hardly sounds like a great uprising of the legal profession. And, as I say, I am in disagreement with them. I have known John Vukasin for more than ten years, served closely with him now, and had him here where there was great opportunity to view him, and I think he is excellently qualified.

Q Do you think it is improper for the State Bar -- they started a policy with that appointment to rate the Appellate Court -- your nominations of the Governor.

A Well, all I can say is it was an unusual thing for them to do and I'm quite curious myself as to their motives.

Q One other thing on the Marler appointment, you said yesterday that in appointing Senator Marler to the Superior Court you followed the same procedures.

A That's right.

Q That you usually follow. Now, did you in fact submit that nomination to the local bar and to your local screening committee?

A To all of the committees except in this instance, because technically his residence is in the county from which he is elected, I screened this with the bar that was associated with him there and knew him as a lawyer in that area. Now, it is true he is being appointed to a -- a bench here in Sacramento, but he has, to all intents and purposes, physically been a resident of this area and intended when he left the Senate to make Sacramento his home, but in our process the bar that would be queried about

him would be the -- his peers in his area where he was a lawyer among lawyers. And that -- well, it was the same process, the regular process. There was the difference here that he is being appointed living in -- technically in one county and appointed to the bench in this county. So we didn't check with this bar locally here, we checked with the local bar in his home.

Q Governor, I believe you criticized Governor Brown for making political appointments to the courts. Isn't this a political appointment?

A No, I think the -- if the only way that you can say this is a political appointment is the fact that a man holds a public office to which he was elected, but -- let me again state something, and I will challenge anyone, and you can make reference to the bar or anyone in the legal profession in the State of California, I am the first Governor to my knowledge who has ever voluntarily given up his right to personally choose judges. And have submitted all applications to a process in which we get the rating of the bar from the State/^{Bar}Board to the -- to their peers in their own area, and to laymen and the judiciary, and this has been well known in the legal profession and many comments have been made about this process. We have never made an exception to it. In all of these some 600 appointments I have made so far. I hope -- I promised in '66 that I would take the appointment of judges out of politics; I have done that.

Q What about the widespread speculation for months that because Senator Marler lost his seat he would therefore be appointed to a judgeship?

A Well, speculation, it could come from the very fact that Senator Marler, like many other people, aspired to the bench, and looked to this as eventually a career that he wanted. And obviously his friends knew this. And so they kept talking. I think he's -- well, he's the second legislator that has been appointed to the bench, but when I meant the taking of -- of judgeships out of politics, I have said this publicly before and you might as well know it, that if I did not have the system that we have had and if I had not followed this totally, there have been a number of instances in which I could have been more successful in things that I was trying to do if I had been willing to

appoint judges on another basis.

Q Governor, do you feel that your appointment of Justice Richardson here in Sacramento, after his campaign involved that attorney in 1970, gave the appearance of impropriety, whether it was improper or not?

A Well, if it did someone was awful suspicious, because all you have to do is talk to his colleagues and talk to all the people in the legal profession and fellow judges, and you will find that he is held in the highest esteem.

Q Governor, on that same topic you have called for a law to prohibit campaign contributions by judges. By the check of your 1970 campaign reports it indicates that you yourself -- your campaign accepted contributions from several judges.

A Well, that's right, and the first I knew about it is when I heard this, because I didn't pay any attention to who was contributing or who wasn't in my -- in my campaign. But I think the difference, and what has brought this about now is the feeling on the part of people that there is a need for a review of the whole campaign procedures. I do think that there is a difference between an individual judge making a contribution and the incident that brought this into prominence or into the spotlight of a judge having a fund which he administered and made contributions from, but which was collected from other people. And there is no way to block such a thing without just making the blanket rule and therefore in our campaign reforms we proposed the blanket rule even though it does infringe on the individual rights of a judge.

Q Couldn't you make that distinction in law, just prohibit judicial giving? If that's how you feel about it.

A Well, maybe in the legislative process someone will discuss that and see if that will meet the problem.

Q Do you feel that the jurists who made contributions should be investigated, for example, by the Commission on Judicial Qualifications, or do you think that your legislation should be a starting point so that persons are put on notice in the future that this type of thing is clearly improper?

A Well, the judiciary has its own methods of policing its profession and whatever they feel should be done with regard to any case, that's up to them. But as far as I'm concerned, this is the starting point.

Q Governor, on a different subject. In 1971, when it was disclosed you paid no state income tax, you said the reason for this was business reverses. You were asked the same question two weeks ago in Davis, and this is the answer you gave, and I quote, "There was one year out of my entire life in which I had no state tax obligation, income tax obligation. I did not have any tax shelters. I did not have any gimmicks or devices. Now so -- also legitimate deductions which accounted for my not having a tax obligation with property taxes on property that I held that amounted to almost half my total salary as Governor. Now those are legitimate deductions." How come you shifted your explanation for this question? How do you reconcile that difference?

A That isn't a shift of the explanation, the explanation is still true. If I mentioned those, because there had been, as you know, other questions that were being asked about so-called loopholes, and I have been discussing the subject -- did discuss the subject of what constitutes a loophole, interest on mortgages and so forth.

Q Governor, why didn't you say "business reverses"?

A What?

Q Why didn't you give the answer of "business reverses" that you gave us in '71?

A Well, if you take the figures that I gave just there, I used as an example of other taxes that I paid which were deductible.

Q You didn't say anything about property taxes in 1971, you said business reverses.

A Oh, no, I told you in 1971 that three things alone accounted for the -- for a greater share or portion of my salary as Governor. And it was that, charitable contributions and medical expenses, all three of which are legitimate deductions, but the other story is true, what I was saying about no tax gimmicks. And I said it in 1971, also, because a number of you seemed to speculate that because I still owned some cattle that that was a tax shelter. And if you will remember, some of you went far afield in writing about that. Now, the truth of the matter was part of my income came from the few cattle that I owned, they were a plus, not a minus. So that could hardly be construed a tax shelter. What I'm saying is that the conversation and the talk that everyone who

takes deductions that have some kind of fancy shelter over here that involves some kind of finagling to avoid taxes. I had nothing of that kind. I had straight -- I had straight deductions of losses of expenses, such as other taxes and so forth. That brought me to the point where I had no tax obligation because I had no income over and above that ~~taxable~~ income above that. There is a great difference between saying I was involved in -- let's say some kind of investment that was designed to get me out of paying taxes, and therefore I eliminated my tax burden. I didn't have anything of that kind. I still -- what?

Q That's all right, I just want to check, has there been any change in your status of your land down there in Riverside?

A No.

Q Governor, the Highway Patrol Commissioner said a few days ago, I believe, that he could make a hundred thousand arrests for speeders a day if he had the people to do it. With this 55 mile per hour speed limit do we have a situation sort of like prohibition, people just -- it being a law the people simply aren't going to obey, and if so have you given any thought to maybe raising the speed limit?

A Well, it is a very funny thing, about this, and this assumption that everyone is simply violating it. First of all, 55 miles an hour, in all of the polls, seems to have become very popular with the people. As a matter of fact, one of the Democratic Assemblymen upstairs has found out that about three-fourths of his constituents in an answer to a news letter, now favor 55 miles an hour and not just to save gas. I think this -- I think where there is -- first of all, I think we are in a little dangerous period of laxity right now, where the people have decided because they are getting gas and they are not lined up at the gas stations that the crisis is over and it is not, and it will be right back again if people do relax and that goes for not only driving automobiles, but it goes for turning on lights and turning up the thermostat or the coolers or whatever they do. We still are in a period of energy shortage. And I think psychologically the worst thing in the world will be to suggest to people that they can start going fast. What we have discussed, and it would require legislation, is that when we can for certainty

say that we do not need the gas shortage or the gas savings that we are getting from the lower speed limit, that we should very seriously discuss maintaining the 55 speed limit in the urban areas, on the freeways within the urban areas. But then we recognize the problem of those people that have got 400 miles to go out there on a less heavily traveled freeway, like 5 up through the valley, and go back to having an in-town and an out-of-town speed limit. This, I think, could make a great deal of sense, because we have learned something else in our urban freeways. We have learned that the average travel time at 55 is better, if anything, than the average travel time when you were allowed to go 70. That the stop and go from 70 to traffic jam-ups on the freeways, has been eliminated and at 55 we have a steady flow of traffic in the urban freeway areas, and we have learned this and it is very possible that we -- when we can relax because of no longer a need to save gasoline, that we may find that we want to maintain that within the cities and it will even be more efficient.

Q But, Governor, what would you do about cars who are going through the L. A. Metropolitan area, heading for Sacramento? How do you think they should be going 55 -- 65 miles an hour?

A No, just the same as if there wasn't a freeway, you know, when you drove up on the regular highways, and then went through the towns, instead of around them. Before freeways started going around then, when you came to a town there was a sign that said the speed limit is -- and you slowed down to that, and when you got to the other side of town there was a sign that said, "Resume speed," or "Speed Limit now 65," or whatever it was. Well, the same thing would apply to the freeways. As you reached a certain point, say you were taking the San Diego freeway through Los Angeles, you'd reach a point and there would be a sign that now said, "The speed limit is 55." On the other edge of town you'd come to a point in which there would be a sign that says, "Now it is 65."

Q Governor, the president of the Union Oil Company last week said it was immoral and unconscionable for the state to try and maximize its revenues from Tidelands Oil and is very critical of you and Houston Flournoy for trying to do that. Can you respond to that?

A Well, actually this is in the hands of the Land Commission and not the Governor's office, on this. But I can understand

what he was saying, and don't think that it wasn't a problem. They sit, those who are in charge of this, and the price of oil has gone up. Now, the taxpayers of the state of California own a share of -- of Tidelands Oil, which they can take in cash or they can take in oil. Now, do they have a right to say to the taxpayers of California, "We are going to continue taking that at -- at the lower price when everyone else is now getting a higher price for them, or are they not beholden to the people enough that they have to get the best price for the state owned oil that they can get? These Tidelands funds are used for a number of things involved in education and capital construction, and -- this was the problem they faced. What would have been the criticism if it had been learned that they were taking \$2.50 a barrel and they could get \$7.

Q Governor, statistics of the motor vehicles now have disclosed that there are more people moving out of California into Oregon and other neighboring states than there are moving into California from these states. Do you have any comment?

A No, I haven't seen those figures, but seven years ago when I became Governor, I said to all of our departments, start reviewing all of the plans, those departments that had plans, for future growth because it was my own belief that as a state reaches a certain size and becomes urbanized as California has, that the things that were luring the great in-migration, go away. That we had our great in-migration when we seemed to be a rural state with great opportunities and -- and a new and growing state, but we are -- I don't know whether anyone realizes this, California is one of the most urbanized states in the nation. We have our great stretches of open country, but the bulk of our population is living on two per cent of the land, three great metropolitan -- or four, you might say, metropolitan areas in the state, and what has been happening is this decline in the pattern, that people that -- the general migration has always been toward the less developed state. It is no surprise. I don't think we are going to lose growth. As a matter of fact, our figures all show that there is still going to be growth in California at our size from our own birth rate alone. But unless something very unusual happens, I think California has passed through that stage of -- of just terrific

in-migration. The -- I'm cautious when I say that because if you look at the history of California, it's been like a heart beat. It's pulsed when we had the great in-migration, then it levels off, then it starts all over again. And I'm as selfish as all the other Californians, I hope that a lot of people don't find out how wonderful it is to live in California.

Q Do you think Tom McCall might have some comment on that?

A Well, I don't know just exactly what is happening --

SQUIRE: Any more questions?

A -- in the state up there.

Q Do you think -- just one quick -- do you think it is desirable to try and stem the out-migration from California and if so, what can be done?

A Well, I think you do your utmost to maintain a base climate in California that is conducive to providing jobs for our people. And you do your best to make -- to give California a high quality of life. And you might be interested to know that in a recent national study that was made, based on where to live and based on quality of life, California came out Number One in that, that the finest, the highest quality of living is to be found in the state of California, of any of the fifty states.

Q Governor, one last question, if I may, on this Zebra case, without getting into the guilt or innocence of the individuals under arrest, what's your reaction to this allegation of a statewide or nationwide conspiracy of this type?

A Well, I just think that anything like this has to be explored and investigated and that's why investigative procedures are going forward. You can't just ignore this. I don't care if it is -- where you hear it or what kind of a report it is that opens this subject up, it has to be looked at.

Q Do you find this very disturbing to you?

A Well, I think the whole thing is disturbing. I think this and the guerilla type activity that now seems to have come to the United States is disturbing.

Q Governor, one more last one question.

(Laughter)

A After him you got one more last one there.

(Nixon)

that John Dean lied to the -- to the Senate Watergate Committee, from what you have read?

A Well, Bill, I'd rather -- I'd rather wait until I've had an opportunity to read more than just the few -- we have only had those transcripts or they have only been released 48 hours. And there isn't anyone in that committee or any place else that could read the 1200 pages in this time that they have had them. And I think that before we start making comments on this or anything of that kind you have to see what's in all of them. And once again, as I said in behalf of the President, and I'll say in behalf of John Dean, everyone has a right to be presumed innocent until he's proven guilty.

SQUIRE: Thank you, Governor

---oOo---