

# 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:** Speeches – Governor Ronald Reagan, 1967  
[09/29/1967-12/31/1967]

**Box:** P17

---

To see more digitized collections visit:

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

To see all Ronald Reagan Presidential Library inventories visit:

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

Contact a reference archivist at: [reagan.library@nara.gov](mailto:reagan.library@nara.gov)

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

National Archives Catalogue: <https://catalog.archives.gov/>

9/29

RELEASE: 8:00 p.m. EDT  
Friday, September 29, 1967

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
TO SOUTH CAROLINA REPUBLICAN STATE CENTRAL COMMITTEE  
COLUMBIA, SOUTH CAROLINA - SEPTEMBER 29, 1967

You know it is a pleasure to be here in South Carolina, where there is a Republican senator and a chance to get another and a governor. It makes Californians feel right at home.

But beyond that I get a warm feeling just remembering that most of you, like I am, are relatively new converts to Republicanism. We all started out as Democrats but somehow the Democratic party went away and left us.

It left us when it switched to so many philosophies and policies that we could not accept, the philosophy that big government is the best government, the philosophy that Lyndon, or whoever the Democratic president may be, knows best.

It left us when it decided a few men in Washington know better than we do what is good for us and know better than we do how to spend our money.

I have been protesting the growth of government for a number of years, expressing concern lest government grow so complex as to become unmanageable and beyond control of the people.

Daniel Webster pointed out that government always justifies its usurpation of power on the plea of good intentions and that intention is to better serve the people's welfare. But, he warned, in every generation, there are those who want to rule well--but they mean to rule. They promise to be good masters--but they mean to be masters.

Government does tend to grow because there is always so much that can be done for the people. It is so easy for a dedicated public servant to see how much could be accomplished if only he had a little more authority and, of course, a little more money to back that authority.

Does this quote sound familiar?

"There are today a very large number of individual grant-in-aid programs, each with its own set of special requirements, separate authorizations and appropriations, cost-sharing ratios, allocation

formulas, administrative arrangements, and financial procedures. This proliferation increases red tape and causes delay. It places extra burdens on state and local officials. It hinders their comprehensive planning. It diffuses the channels through which federal assistance to state and local government can flow."

Those are the words of Lyndon Baines Johnson to the United States Congress on March 17 as he told of the failure of the present grant-in-aid system.

And then he concluded by proposing three new grant-in-aid programs.

State and local government are buried now under a mass of 400 federal aid appropriations, 170 separate federal aid programs, administered by 21 federal departments and agencies, 150 Washington bureaus and 400 regional offices.

It is no wonder the Department of Housing and Urban Development is spending \$30,000 on "A Study of the Means by which Local Governments Obtain Information on Federal Aid".

We have to spend money to find out how to give it away.

Of course some governments have not waited for federal aid in the area of finding out how to get federal aid. California, for example, has whole offices of people in Washington trying to get some of that federal money. There are offices there representing the state finance office, the legislature, the university, the state colleges and at least three cities and one water district.

And despite all this, you know, Californians still send more money to Washington than they get back.

We began in 1960 with a New Frontier and we progressed to a Great Society and during the process the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has grown two-and-one-half times as fast as the increase in population. The payroll increased  $7\frac{1}{2}$  times and total government spending has increased  $8\frac{1}{2}$  times.

Somewhere a voice says, "But that is due to the Vietnam war." And it is true that defense spending since 1960 is up 68 percent--but non-defense spending is up 97 percent.

The deficits for these several years total \$50 billion and the credibility gap is almost as big.

A year ago the President assured us he would stay within the budget and even cut it back by some \$3 billion. After the election we learned that spending would be \$14 billion over the budget. Then came



the first prediction of the coming year's budget deficit: \$8½ billion. Now they admit to \$11 billion but, just in case, they've asked for authority to accommodate a deficit of \$29 billion.

I am part of government now (a funny thing happened to me on the way to Death Valley) but I am just as fearful as I ever was about government's capacity for growth and government's appetite for power.

I have observed first-hand government's resistance to change and the savage anger of some when any effort is made to reduce the size of its structure.

But I have learned also it can be reduced.

Fortunately, all of us in our administration in California were totally inexperienced; we had not learned all the things that cannot be done. For one thing, we set out to keep our campaign promises-- and once the people got over their shock, they sort of took to the idea.

We put a freeze on out-of-state travel for state employees and reduced it 78 percent. That means we reduced it by \$1 million a year.

Some times it was fun doing it. I remember four men came in one day and asked special permission to go to a seminar study group back East--we sent one and told him to come back and tell the other people.

For the first time in California the automobiles in our state motorpools exceeded the demand on the part of state employees, and this is reflected by a 10 percent reduction in the gasoline the state has to buy.

We put a freeze on hiring replacements for state employees who retired or resigned. Without a single firing or layoff, we have reduced the number of employees by 7,659. And that is \$50 million a year.

Shortly after the Watts riots a private citizen in our state--an industrialist--gathered his fellow industrialists and said we must recognize that it is our responsibility to do what we can and the thing we can do is provide jobs.

And they set to work and in a 16 month period they put 17,800 of the hard core unemployed in the curfew area in Los Angeles into productive jobs in private enterprise.

Immediately after the election I went to that citizen and I asked him if he would do the same thing for the entire state and I am happy to say that today he has put private industry to work in colla-

boration with our state employment service, to train and put to work the unemployed in our poverty pockets--Los Angeles, San Francisco, Oakland and other cities. More than 4,000 industries are actively engaged in this work right now at no cost to the taxpayers.

Then we invited 200 hand-picked business and professional men in the state of California into one room and we told them that up to now everything had been asked of them but blood--now we were asking for that. We wanted their blood. And we wanted them.

To a man they volunteered. And as I stand here tonight, there are more than 200 of the most successful men in California who have given up their homes and their own occupations for the next 4 to 6 months to operate in task force teams throughout California based on their particular specialty. They are just now finishing the job of going into every agency and department of state government to find out how it can be made more efficient and more economical and how it can practice modern business tactics.

One of those task forces is working on standardizing the floor space allotted to employees in government doing similar work. It is inconceivable that a structure as big as the California Government with 166,000 employees had never before done this fundamental thing that is done by any business concern when it lays out its needed space--who allocate and decide what is the standard--what is the required floor space for the desk employee. Well, they have done that.

Recently, they made the first recommendation to us and that recommendation caused us on the same day to cancel out the construction that was to start in the next month or two of a \$4 million, ten-story public building in Sacramento. It won't be needed. It won't be built.

Not all our savings are in the million dollar class.

My predecessor had his picture printed on the state maps. This governor's picture will not be on those maps. As a matter of fact, there will not be any maps. And that will save \$192,000.

Experienced hotel men/<sup>comprise</sup> one of our task forces, checking our prisons as to food buying, menus and housekeeping practices.

Another citizens' task force is doing an in-depth study of our tax structure.

No government could possibly hire or afford the manpower now working voluntarily in our state. And all we had to do was tell them they were needed.

I do not believe this is peculiar to California. I believe that all over America, there are citizens who believe government is their business. All they want is to be asked and to be told how they can be of help. Every problem that besets us, from drop-outs to disease, from job training to student loans, is being solved someplace in this country right now by someone who did not wait for government.

Perhaps what we need is a system of inter-communication to learn and teach each other the solutions that have been found here and there to head off problems before they become a government project.

Now this does not mean there is no part for government to play. Government has a legitimate role, a most important role in taking the lead in mobilizing the full and voluntary resources of the people.

In California, we call this partnership between the people and government the Creative Society.

Some who are inclined to resent any dilutions of government's influence continue to charge that people like ourselves are turning back the clock.

Well, the Creative Society is not a retreat into the past. It is taking the dream that gave birth to this nation, and updating it, and making it practical for the 20th century. It is a good dream. It is a dream that is worthy of your generation.

Where are those others? Call their philosophy the New Deal, the New Order, or the Great Society. It is they who would take us back to the 19th century to the rule of the many by the few even if the few are a so-called intellectual elite in the nation's capitol.

# # #

(Please note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)





OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 9.27.67

RELEASE: Saturday, September 30th  
6:30 P.M. (c.d.t.)

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Republican State Central Committee, Milwaukee

9-30-67

Early in this decade, half-way around the world, a disciple of Ghandi's passive resistance--Pandit Nehru--lived in a world of collaboration--playing off east against west and believing he had the situation well in hand. In 1962 came a rude awakening when the Red Chinese poured across his border. Nehru promptly went into seclusion. Reuters of London--which has known every contact in Asia for decades--was two days in finding him. It asked for an evaluation of the situation. He gave Reuters just eight words: "We have been out of touch with reality."

Have we been out of touch with reality?

Is this the message of last Nov. 8th? Did a restless people--a vibrant people--express their discontent with the tired old cliches of the 30's? Did they tell us they were too self-reliant to sell their dreams of the future for the dull security of the ant heap?

My fellow Republicans--I urge you to read the message of last Nov. 8th very carefully. Ours was no narrow partisan victory last year. And ours will be no narrow partisan victory next year.

A wind of change is blowing across our land. Democrats and independents alike are joining hands with us to protest at the polls what has been going on in their governments.

Last year:

They voted against going deeper and deeper into debt when we are supposed to be more prosperous than man has ever been.

They voted against a war on poverty which poverty is losing.

They voted against the idea that we can, as a state or nation, afford anything and everything simply because we think of it.

And because most people believe in reward for productive labor, they voted against giving that reward to those who are able to but unwilling to work.

They voted again the idea that government ( 'st grow ever larger, more costly, more powerful.

They voted against continuing an easy atmosphere of peace and prosperity while some young Americans are dying in defense of freedom.

We have reached a turning point in time.

It is our destiny--the destiny of our party--to raise a banner for the people of all parties to follow but choose the colors well, for the people are not in a mood to follow the sickly pastels of expediency--the cynical shades of those who buy the people's votes with the people's money.

Thousands upon thousands of Americans today are groping for answers to their doubts--seeking a cause in which they can invest their idealism and energy. And because there can be no vacuum in the area of human relations, some of them are finding the wrong cause.

Politics as usual would indicate that we should be taking positions not unattractive from any viewpoint. But statesmanship demands that we face reality with faith in the people's wisdom.

Half a million fighting men in Vietnam are dependent on a life-line of ships threading through the Russian-built mines and torpedoes in the harbor of Saigon. Somehow these bring on no talk of escalation.

Yet, Russian-built munitions to kill those fighting men enter the unmined harbor at Haiphong to the north and are told that if we do what the enemy does and mine that harbor the war will grow bigger and more terrible.

In the meantime our leaders offer a trade deal to help increase Russia's industrial capacity. The press reports that our government has in mind the purchase of giant generators from Russia for our own Grand Coulee Dam while we worry about the unemployed.

It would be the height of folly for us to attack the patriotism and the sincerity of those who believe that the enemy's hostility and announced intention to destroy our way of life will turn to friendship if, regardless of provocation, we add to his strength.

But, we can challenge their naivety<sup>e</sup> and their lack of touch with reality.

Within a one week period we have seen a war in the Mid-East begin, and end, and it did not bring on World War III.

A small nation, faced with the denial of its sovereignty--indeed, of its very existence--reminded us that the price of freedom is high but never so costly as the loss of freedom.

Once again, when the sound of battle came, men in high place in our government were caught by surprise. Having backed away from those decisions they should have made earlier, they are faced with drastic and extreme alternatives.

Those who have followed our banner--the Republican banner--want to know and should know our stand on those issues and problems that plague our nation.

Because freedom is indivisible, we must make it clear we oppose all those who deny freedom to anyone in our land because of race, religion or national origin.

We must guarantee every citizen his right to share in an abundant society proportionate to his ability. But we will not tolerate those who use either "civil rights" or the "right of dissent" as an excuse to take to the streets for riot and mob violence--under the euphemism of civil disobedience.

Let our banner also say we will accept responsibility for eliminating the poverty of the genuinely poor, but that we shall deny the arrogant misuse of poverty funds for political nest-building.

Tell them we will oppose the use of taxation and deficit-spending as a means of control in the market place.

Here, in the richest nation in the world where more crime is committed than in any other nation, we are told that the answer to this problem is to reduce our poverty. Well, this is a worthy goal in itself, but it isn't the answer.

During the dark days of the depression, when poverty was rampant, the crime rate was at an all time low.

Government's function is to protect the society from the criminals, and not the other way around.

The criminal is responsible for his misdeeds, not society. His punishment must be swift and certain. Trials are held to determine

guilt or innocence. ( They are not exercises in the use of legal technicalities.

In short, our banner must be a symbol of our belief that government exists for the convenience of the people--that our national purpose is to provide the ultimate in individual freedom, consistent with law and order.

And if this is the banner you would raise, then you have come to the moment of truth.

All that we believe with regard to individual freedom and the limitation of the power of government rests with us.

We have within our power the ability to broaden the base of our party.

A year ago how hopeless was the picture? One party ruled this nation. One man ruling that party. The two party system dead. And out of our despair we came together in unity. A unity we have never known before in our party and on November 8th--and I believe history will record that date--we restored the two party system.

If you believe in the causes we have discussed here tonight, then--when you go forth from this place--go determined that no member of the opposition party will ever be able to quote your words about a fellow Republican to bring about that Republican's defeat.

Resolve now, that no remembered bitterness as a result of organizational strife, nor remembered grudge, will keep you from supporting the cause that brings us together.

Do this: go out of here determined that there is nothing more important than the challenge confronting you, the challenge that in reality confronts our entire nation--and I tell you then in a very short time you will hear the voice of this party and this people.

The tone will be unmistakeable.

It will cry of victory.

Thank you.

" " " "

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)



10/  
12

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
CALIFORNIA FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN BANQUET  
SAN FRANCISCO - OCTOBER 12, 1967

There were some who reacted with shocked horror when we proceeded to do the things we promised we would in the campaign, even though they seemingly approved them at that time.

We learned the savage anger with which some in government can fight back and actually sabotage efforts to reduce the size and power of government.

And as they got their propaganda mill grinding, I'm sure you must have been confused, and found you lacked answers, particularly when our opponents challenged you for an answer.

Let me tell you, sometimes I'm confused when I read what I'm supposedly doing. For the most part the press has been very fair and objective. But a few publications let ideology get in the way of their objectivity. I can read what they say I'm doing and get so mad at myself I go out and sign a recall petition.

There's only one way to avoid controversy and that is to do nothing.

There was and is, for example, tuition. Now I have no quarrel with those who choose to disagree with me either on philosophical grounds or the practical virtues or lack of same. I do suggest there has been considerable distortion of what we advocated and a great deal of silence about the details of the program offered.

And frankly, I'm fed up with hearing a debate on the relative merits of free education versus the other kind. The debate properly is: since education is very costly, who should pay and what's a fair share for those getting the benefit.

And since no one in the academic community has seen fit to mention the plan we proposed and the reasons back of it I would like to do so briefly here and now.

Our great university system offers a premium education to those who rate in the top 12½ percent scholastically of their high school class. Since little effort is made to make this education available to those from lower income groups, those attending the university come from families of comparable means to those attending our private and independent schools such as Stanford and USC.

Problem No. 1 then is providing an education for children of the lower income families. Problem No. 2 is the high dropout rate in our university. Problem No. 3 is the dissatisfaction of students with so many professors engaged in research rather than teaching. Problem No. 4 is that in our rapid expansion to match our growth there are never enough state funds so that new courses have to be delayed.

We suggested a tuition only one-sixth of that charged at Southern California and actually less than one-tenth of the cost of educating a student. If accepted it would provide a combination of grants and loans to needy students. With the grant getting larger and the loan smaller each year to encourage the student to go on and get his diploma. The loans of course to be paid back after graduation.

In addition, this tuition would also provide for 250 new teaching chairs with \$25,000 salaries for professors who would teach. And it would leave several million dollars for capital building projects each year to help keep pace with our growth.

Now apparently all these suggestions prove I am against youth, education and intellectualism.

Let me add something I'm for and all Republicans should be. Legislation now hung up in congressional committees which would grant full tax credits to parents paying tuition to educate their sons and daughters.

I'm sure that many of you are disturbed by charges that this administration is practicing economy at the expense of the mentally ill. Several days ago in L.A. I read a melodramatic account of deteriorating care for the mental patients and even how one might have been saved from suicide if more care had been available.

The writer very carefully refrained from making it clear the suicide occurred the year before I took office. Now very simply what we've done is to continue the policy that put California out in front of the nation in mental health care. From 1960 to July, 1966 the number of patients in our mental hospitals declined by more than 10,000. The number of employees increased by more than 1,000.

While maintaining the ratio of patient and employee of July, 1966, in the hospital. We are seeking at the same time to upgrade the program of local care for patients which has already proven successful and which has reduced the patient population in the hospital.

A few days ago the National Association of State Mental Health groups revealed our increased support for these local programs is the largest in history and where a year ago there was \$13.38 per diem spending for each mental patient, this is now \$15 per patient.

# # #

NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes there may be additions to, or changes in the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.



10/14

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 10.13.67

FOR RELEASE SUNDAY AM's

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN ✓  
Louisville, Kentucky  
October 14, 1967

I can just hear the opposition getting ready to level the charge of carpetbagger., and if I were here to give you advice on who should represent you in government, perhaps their charge would be justified. But you've already made that decision.

Actually, I'm here to commend you on the wisdom of that decision and to suggest additional reasons why the people of this land and in every state of this land, regardless of party affiliation, should compare the philosophy of the Republican Party with that of the present national leadership. And why, after such a critical appraisal, they should elect to follow our party's lead.

Of course, you have visitors and they will tell you who you should vote for, just as they've been trying to tell each one of us how to run our lives for 10 these many years.

We had quite a tourist trade in California last year during our election. The Vice President, practically all of the Cabinet, some well known in-laws, and a couple of Senators.

One of them, a young Senator from Massachusetts, came to warn the people of California against voting for someone totally inexperienced in public life. Now, if memory serves me correctly, that young Senator had never held office before he became a Senator. As a matter of fact, he'd never held a job.

From the "New Frontier" of 1960 we have progressed to a "Great Society." And during the process the civilian bureaucracy of the federal government has grown two and a half times as fast as the increase in population.

The payroll has increased seven and a half times, and total government spending has gone up eight and a half times.

Population in this period increased by ten percent. But spending for health and welfare was multiplied twenty-one times as much as that increase in population--210 percent.

Thirty-two million Americans now receive regular checks from the federal government, either directly or from states under aid programs financed largely with federal funds.

With the nation's work force at something more than seventy million people, it's easy to see that less than two of us are responsible for each one of those checks. Government welfare programs number 239 in 1964, 399 in 1966, and now total more than 450. And there is no end in sight.

A government program is the nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this earth. Government spending will more than double in this decade and undoubtedly double again in the 1970's.

At the same time, there are unfunded commitments for retirement benefits, pensions, subsidies and other items, totalling more than a thousand billion dollars.

Each program is adopted on a thin edge of the web with the unspoken knowledge that it's cost will go up.

Since 1960 we added fifty billion dollars to our deficit and have drained away our gold to where we fear for the solvency of our currency. Indeed, the coins we jingle in our pocket no longer have the ring of silver.

I remember when I was a small boy; a streetcar ran past our house, and when we could get our hands on a penny we rushed out and put it on the streetcar track, waiting for the next car to come by and flatten it into a nice, round, shiny piece of copper. Now the federal government is doing it and selling them for a quarter.

Last March 17th, the Congress of the United States heard these words. "There are today a very large number of individual grant-in-aid programs, each with its own set of special requirements, separate authorizations and appropriations, cost sharing ratios, allocation formulas, administrative arrangements and financial procedures.

"This proliferation increases red tape and causes delay. It places extra burdens on state and local officials. It hinders their comprehensive planning. It diffuses the channels through which federal assistance to state and local governments can flow."

Thus spoke Lyndon Baines Johnson as he told of the failure of the present federal grant-in-aid system, and then he concluded by proposing three new grant-in-aid programs.

State and local government are buried now under a mass of more than four hundred federal aid appropriations. One hundred seventy separate federal aid programs administered by twenty-one federal departments and agencies, one hundred fifty Washington bureaus, and



on "a study of the means by which local governments obtain information on federal aid." We have to spend money to find out how to give it away.

When the "Welfare State" was first conceived, in the dark days of the depression, most of us accepted it, not only because we all felt and still feel our responsibility to lend a helping hand to those suffering misfortune; but we believed we were adopting temporary remedies and that we would return to our customary independent ways when the emergency had passed.

But now we see the temporary remedies have become a permanent way of life. Welfare recipients, sometimes the third generation of a single family, live on public subsistence. But even as the plans fail to achieve their objective, always the planners have new answers, and always the new answers have an old familiar ring. They are just more of the same thing that didn't work in the first place.

We have been told the problems are too complex for simple answers, until gradually we have accepted government by mystery. The idea that only a chosen elite in the nation's Capitol can make the decisions and find the answers.

Government is a mystery and it is certainly doing nothing to make it simpler. There seems to have evolved a special kind of government language, incomprehensible to simple citizens like ourselves.

For example, what does a city councilman or a county commissioner, or even a governor do when he receives a report from the Department of Housing and Urban Development, that reads, "Action oriented orchestration of innovation inputs, generated by escalation of meaningful indigenous decision making dialogue, focusing on multi-linked problem complexes, can maximize the vital thrust toward a nonalienated and viable, urban infrastructure."

I have been protesting the growth of government for a number of years, expressing concern lest government grow so complex as to become unmanageable and beyond the control of the people.

Daniel Webster said, Government always justifies its usurpation of power, on the plea of good intentions and that intention is to better serve the people's welfare." But of course, we all know there is a well-known road that is paved with good intentions, but no one wants to go where it leads. Then Daniel Webster warned that in every generation there are those who want to rule well, but they mean to rule. They promise to be good masters, but they mean to be masters.



Government tends to grow because there is always so much that can be done for the people. It is easy for the dedicated public servant to see how much could be accomplished, if only we had a little more authority and, of course, a little more money to back that authority.

I know no Republican gathering could be held in this place unless it contained a great many former Democrats and perhaps many who are still affiliated with that party. I know you are present because you, too, are deeply disturbed over the course our country has been following these recent years. I know, too, the feeling of guilt or betrayal that some of you feel particularly those who have changed party registration. I know because I, too, felt that wrench and was surprised to discover how deeply ingrained is the sense of party loyalty.

I was a Democrat most of my life and only recently found I could no longer follow the leadership of my party. If there has been betrayal, it has not been we who have betrayed our party. The guilt is not ours.

When the leadership of that party repudiated the constitutional concepts of individual freedom, local autonomy and states' rights; when it embraced the 19th century philosophy of rule of the many by the few; that one man in the White House was omnipotent, and that a little intellectual elite in the nation's Capitol can engage in social tinkering even to the extent of telling working men and women of this nation how and with whom they must share the fruit of their labor, then I say the leadership of that party betrayed us.

Today the leadership of the honorable party of Jefferson and Jackson has abandoned the dream of individual freedom, has lost its faith in the people's ability to determine their own destiny, believes only in centralized government and an all-powerful state. We find it is the Republican Party that is polarized around a belief in constitutional limits on the power of government, belief in the right of the individual to freedom of choice, a belief in a federal system of sovereign states and not just administrative districts of a central government.

Look at the platform of the Democratic Party of 1942 with its promise of a 25% cut in federal spending, an end to deficit spending, and reduction of the national debt. A return to the people and to local and state governments the constitutional rights, which even then it was claimed had been taken from the people and centralized

Read the message of last November 8th very carefully. Ours was not a narrow partisan victory, a political triumph by a party seeking power and prestige. A wind of change is blowing across our land. Millions of Americans--Democrats, Independents and Republicans--joining hands voting against what has been going on, voting against going deeper and deeper into debt as a nation, while inflation erodes their pensions and savings and outstrips their ability to earn. They voted against the idea that as a nation we can afford anything and everything simply because we think of it.

The working men and women of this nation voted against taxing themselves to provide medical care and a standard of living for others that was often more than they could afford for their own families. They voted against the idea that government must always grow larger, more costly and more powerful, and they voted against continuing an easy atmosphere of peace and prosperity while young Americans are dying in defense of freedom.

We have reached a turning point in time. It is our destiny, the destiny of our Party to raise a banner for the people of all parties to follow.

Choose the colors well, for the people are not in a mood to follow the sickly pastels of expediency, the cynical shades of those who would buy the peoples' votes with the peoples' money.

Thousands upon thousands of Americans, those forgotten men and women who work and support the communities and pay for all the social experimenting are groping for answers to their doubts, seeking a cause in which they can invest their idealism and their energy. They are too self reliant to sell their dreams of the future for the dull security of the antique.

They believe in this nation as a nation under God, and that our national purpose is to provide the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order. That their freedom is theirs by divine right and not by government whim. They love peace, but not at any price. They believe that a cause worth dying for is a cause worth winning.

\* \* \* \* \*

I know that politics as usual would indicate that our party should take positions not unattractive from any viewpoint, but statesmanship demands that we face reality with a faith in the people's wisdom. And there is a need for statesmanship today.

Democrats can only redirect their party's policy and philosophy by repudiating the present party leadership, and that gives us Republicans an awesome responsibility. All that we believe with regard to individual freedom and limitation of the power of government rests with us. We have within our power the ability to broaden the base of our party.

One year ago how hopeless was the picture. One party ruled this nation and one man ruled that party. The two-party system was alive only in memory or theory. Out of despair we came together in unity, a unity we've never known before in our party.

Let history record that on November 8th last we restored the two-party system. Many of the problems we have touched on can only be solved at the national level, but the realities of our political system reveal the road back lies through the state house.

No political party can fulfill its obligations on the national level unless it has control of the states and the state house. your Congressman, ask those Republicans who represent you in Washington what a help it would be if behind them were a Republican Administration in their state.

You have before you an inspiring example of unity in the presence here, in the participation in tonight's dinner of Judge Cook. You have your candidate in Louie Nunn. Take your example from them. Let us have unity now, not out of despair, but out of determination. If you believe in the causes we have discussed tonight, then when you go forth from this place, go determined that no member of the opposition party will ever be able to quote your words about a fellow Republican to bring about that Republican's defeat.

Resolve now that no remembered bitterness as a result of organizational strife, no remembered grudge will keep you from supporting a cause that brings us together. Millions of Americans in a voting bloc that crosses racial, religious and ethnic lines are watching, and millions of young Americans, our sons and daughters, are waiting to see if once again we let ourselves be divided by the shading of liberal conservative or moderate, applied complete with hyphen before the word Republican. They watch to see if we place more importance on those shadings than on the challenge that confronts us, for with youthful wisdom they know the price they will pay if we fail to meet our challenge.

The stake we play for is the future in which they must live.

10/  
26



EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Alf Landon Lecture, Kansas State University  
Manhattan, Kansas - October 26, 1967

I am speaking here today neither as an academician nor as a politician. I do not have the training to be the first nor the aspiration to be the second. That leaves me the role of concerned citizen, and among my concerns is higher education and its place in contemporary America.

Listing the problems is easy--solutions are a little harder to come by. For example, there is the problem of financing the increasing cost of higher education. I have some first-hand experience with that one, but I cannot lay claim to having the answer. Nor do I think that university president has the answer who stated bluntly that the academic community's only responsibility was to tell government its needs, and government's obligation was not to question but to simply come up with the money. This was higher education and contemporary America meeting eyeball to eyeball.

Strange as it may seem, there is a limit to what government can extract from the body of the citizenry - a limit fixed, not by pity or unwillingness to wield the scalpel, but by the hard fact that unless that body of citizenry is able to function on a 9 - to - 5 basis, the schoolhouse door will not open at all.

Government's share of the wealth has to stop short of interfering with the production of wealth. Higher education explains it as having to do with the law of diminishing returns.

Then, of course, having decided on and collected its share, government must allocate. So much for roads--so much for protection against the law breaker---for help to those who must depend on the rest of us for sustenance--for health--and, of course, for education, elementary through college and university.

Never, according to those engaged in these various facets of government, is there sufficient funding for all that needs to be done. But when government is taking all the economy will bear, choices must

be made, and, if education demands an increase in funds greater than the normal workload increase occasioned by growth and higher prices, then it must be taken from some other program.

Now this should not be interpreted as minimizing the importance of education. No one denies the value of a higher education for all those able to assimilate one. Indeed, a vast network of institutions of higher learning, both public and private, is essential if we are to maintain our nation as the world's leader in science and technology. Nor does anyone deny the growing needs in our nation for teachers, for doctors, lawyers, economists and sociologists, and yes in these days, not only for a literate public, but also for a well-educated and knowledgeable populace.

Alfred Whitehead said, "In the conditions of modern life, the rule is absolute: The race which does not value trained intelligence is doomed."

There is no question but that Americans all over this land have assigned a high priority to education. It is also true that the cost of education is increasing faster than the increase in public funds. A more sophisticated answer is needed than just "come up with more money."

I suggested a partial answer in California based on the theory that good tax policy involves assessing at least a part of the charge for a service against those receiving the service. In a word, I proposed tuition at our State University and Colleges. The result was cataclysmic. I could not have branded myself as any more "anti-intellectual" if I had said, "Me Tarzan, you Jane."

Actually, there was much more to my proposal than just a method for collecting revenue.

The students enjoying the benefits of public higher education in California come from the same income levels as those attending the private or independent schools such as Stanford and U.S.C. Very few from low income families can take advantage of the educational opportunities made available by the taxpayers of California.

With this in mind, half of the funds from the proposed tuition would go for a combination of loans and grants-in-aid to needy students.

And since another problem in our University ( an exceptionally high dropout rate, we tried to cope with that. Our plan called for 75% loan and 25% grant the first year, 50-50 the second year, 75% grant and only 25% loan the third year, and 100% grant the fourth year. The loans, of course, would be repaid after graduation.

Another problem at our University is the unhappiness of students over lack of contact with professors engaged more in research than in teaching. To help meet this problem, one-fourth of the tuition money would provide for 250 new teaching chairs at the University and the remaining fourth could be applied to capital construction of needed facilities.

Since all of this could be accomplished with a tuition that amounted to less than 10% of the cost of the education, we did not think the proposal was punitive.

May I add that, if we adhere to the idea that everything adds to the educational experience, I believe there is some merit in the student accepting responsibility for a portion of the cost of his education-- as long as no qualified student is denied an education because of lack of funds.

There are benefits and burdens that accrue both to the individual and to society, and the burdens, including the burden of cost, must be borne by both.

But if all the problems of finance could be solved tomorrow, there would still be cause for concern about the place of higher education in contemporary America.

What is our definition of academic freedom?

Those who teach, understandably enough, define it as the right to teach as they see fit without interference from administrators and certainly not from those who hold the public purse strings or who fill the public purse.

But those who pay for the education, students and taxpayers, also have a definition of academic freedom: their freedom to have some say in what they get for their money.

Those holding public office try to interpret the will of the people and pass it on to the university administration, conscious always that they must not appear to be exerting political control over education. Equally uncomfortable are the administrators who must interpret the educators' viewpoint to the crass politicians and vice versa--they can be likened to a prisoner in front of a cellophane wall being shouted at by both sides.

And the truth is--all the claims are legitimate and must be reconciled within a framework of mutual understanding and compromise.

The dictionary defines education as "the impartation or acquisition of knowledge, skill, or the development of character as by study or discipline."

The taxpayer is wrong who ignores the great increase in things we know--knowledge acquired since he was in school--and who demands "no new-fangled courses. What was good enough then is good enough now."

But so is the student wrong who would eliminate all required courses and grades--who would make education a kind of four-year smorgasbord in which he would be the sole judge of how far and fast he ran in pursuit of knowledge.

And that educator is wrong who denies there are any absolutes--who sees no black and white of right or wrong, but just shades of gray in a world where discipline of any kind is an intolerable interference with the right of the individual. He rebels at the oldfashioned idea of "loco parentis" and claims he is there to impart knowledge, not to substitute for absentee parents. But he can not escape a responsibility for the students' development of character and maturity.

Strangely and illogically, this is very often the same educator who interprets his academic freedom as the right to indoctrinate students with his view of things. Woe to the student who challenges his interpretation of history, or who questions the economic theory given as proven formula in what is, at best, a very inexact science.

One thing we should all be agreed on is the university's obligation to teach, not indoctrinate.

Institutions of higher education are repositories of all the accumulated knowledge of man, but they must not be vending machines. Along with the dispensing of facts and figures must come the production of wisdom.

In our colleges today are undoubtedly more than one President of the United States, a number of Supreme Court Justices, Cabinet members and many Legislators.

And this brings me to the part higher education plays in contemporary America.

These institutions were created, and are presently maintained, to insure perpetuation of a social structure--a nation, if you will.

Now don't put a narrow interpretation on this as some will, and translate "social structure" into "status quo" or "social order" or "preserve the aristocracy; keep the little bananas from becoming top banana."



Our country, unfortunately, has a lot of people who would turn the country back to the dark ages, or ahead to 1984. Some have a concept of government more akin to Frederick the Great than Thomas Jefferson.

Our nation is founded on a concern for the individual and his right to fulfillment, and this should be the preoccupation of our schools and colleges.

The graduate should go forth, literally starting on a lifetime of learning and growing and creativity that will in turn bring growth and innovation to our society.

And the truth is--never in history has there been such a need for men and women of wisdom and courage--wisdom to absorb the knowledge of the past and plan its application to the present and future, and courage to make the hard decisions.

At Stanford University in 1906 William James said, "The wealth of a nation consists more than in anything else in the number of superior men that it harbors."

At the risk of great oversimplification may I suggest that the great ideological split dividing us on the world scene and here within our own borders has to do with the place of the individual.

Acceptance is given more and more to the concept of lifting men by mass movements and collective action, in spite of the fact that history is strangely barren of any record of advances made in this manner. By contrast, the road from the swamp to the stars is studded with the names of individuals who achieved fulfillment and lifted mankind another rung.

It is time we realized what we mean by "equality" and being "born equal".

We are equal before God and the law, and our society guarantees that no acquisition of property during our lifetime, nor achievement, no matter how exemplary, should give us more protection than those of less prestige, nor should it exempt us from any of the restrictions and punishments imposed by law.

But let there be no misunderstanding about the right of man to achieve above the capacity of his fellows. The world is richer because of a Shakespeare and a Tennyson, a Beethoven and a Brahms. Certainly major league baseball would not be improved by letting every citizen who wanted to, have a turn at playing Willie Mays' position.

We live (even many so-called poor) at a level above the wildest dreams of the kings of one hundred years ago--because some individual

thought of a horseless carriage, an ice box and later a refrigerator, or machinery that lifted burdens from our backs. (I would have thrown in television if I were still appearing on Death Valley Days.)

Why did so much of this develop so far and fast in America? Other countries are blessed with natural resources and equable climate--yes, and energetic and talented people.

But here, to a degree unequalled any place in the world, we unleashed the individual genius of man, recognized his inherent dignity, and rewarded him commensurate with his ability and achievement.

Your generation is being wooed by many who charge this way we have known is inadequate to meet the challenges of our times. They point to the unsolved problems of poverty and prejudice as proof of the system's failure.

As students, you have a duty to research to find if the failure is one of system--or is it the inadequacy of human nature?

You should also inquire if those who would replace the system have anything to offer in exchange other than untried theory packaged as Utopia. It sometimes seems strange that what is so often described as the brave new world of the future must be upheld by the collectivist philosophy of nineteenth century theorists like Rousseau, Fourier and Marx.

You have lived your entire lives in a governmental framework tending ever more toward the welfare state and centralism. We still have government of the people, by the people and for the people, but there seems to be a lot more of "for" the people and less "of" and "by". This is justified on the claim that society has grown so complex we can no longer afford too much individual freedom.

To invoke "states' rights" is to be suspect of wanting to deny "human rights", and similar charges of selfishness greet any attack on the tendency of government to grow, but more particularly when attention is called to failures by government in the field of human welfare.

But you are students and therefore engaged in a search for truth.

Has the idea of a federation of sovereign states been proven unworkable because here and there selfish individuals used state government to impose on the freedom of some? Isn't there something to be said for a system wherein people can vote with their feet if government becomes too oppressive? Let a state pile on taxes beyond a bearable limit and business and industry start moving out and the people follow.

Let us think very carefully before switching to a system in which these states become administrative districts enforcing uniform laws and regulations.

If I may personalize here, let me tell you some of what we have learned in California these past nine months.

California--that is where they give governors on-the-job training. Being totally inexperienced, I had not learned all the things you cannot do, so I set out to keep my campaign promises. And once the people got over their shock they sort of took to the idea.

By every rule of reason, government "of" and "by" the people must be superior to any other kind.

No government could possibly muster a group capable of making the multitudinous decisions that must be made every day to keep a society like ours moving.

If a state is to be great it must call upon the greatness of the people. And the people must be prepared to give a portion of their time to public affairs because government is their business.

The only alternative to the people running government is government running the people.

We put together a blue ribbon citizens committee to recruit personnel for the administrative posts that had to be filled by appointment. They did not just screen applicants for public jobs; they persuaded top level people in business and the professions to take jobs which represented tremendous personal sacrifice in salary in almost every case.

Then we invited the most successful citizens of our state to lunch and locked the doors. We outlined a plan for bringing their knowledge to bear on government. They were asked to give up their own careers for a period of from four to six months, to work full-time as members of task forces going into every agency and department of government to see how government could be made more efficient and economical by the use of modern business practices.

And we asked them to put up the \$250,000 it would take for administrative overhead in this undertaking. They volunteered to a man and they have just completed more than six months full-time away from their own pursuits and even their families.

We are correlating their reports and putting their recommendations into operation. They range from methods of buying supplies to data-processing, from rotating department heads to consolidating files.

By applying the floor space standards of private industry to our own office employees, we will reduce this year our need for office space by two million square feet. We have already cancelled construction of a four million dollar building.

On their recommendations our phone bill will be reduced by twelve million dollars a year. Our budget for out-of-state travel by state employees has been cut 78% and we have reduced the number of employees by 2½% without a layoff or firing. We simply stopped hiring replacements for those who resigned or retired. Until this year the number of state employees had gone up each of the last eight years anywhere from 4 to 5½%.

We have embarked on something we call the "Creative Society". It is nothing more than a full-time effort to involve the independent sector in finding and solving problems before government comes rushing in with bureaus that always seem to multiply like wire coat hangers in a closet.

Already we have thousands of industries--2,600 in Los Angeles, 1,500 in San Francisco and so on throughout the state--organized and working in cooperation with our state employment service to match the hard-core unemployed in our poverty-pockets with jobs they can do or can be trained to do. The man in charge is working for no salary and the cost of the program is borne by the industries.

Contrast this with the proposed poverty program I vetoed several weeks ago. It, too, was aimed at the hard-core unemployed. It was going to put seventeen of them to work clearing park land, but half the funds went for seven administrators to oversee the seventeen unemployed.

We need you--but we need you not just with a head full of packaged information marching in the ranks.

We need you asking why, if we are so prosperous, should the numbers of those on welfare increase each year? Shouldn't welfare, if it is successful, be reducing the need for itself? Will we consider it a success when all of us are on public subsistence or should we judge its success on how many people it rescues from the dole?

We need answers to crime and why it has reached a critical point. Just blaming it on poverty will not do, because in the poverty of the great depression crime was at its lowest level and now in prosperity it has reached its peak.

Higher education in contemporary America has a sacred obligation to instill attitudes toward growth and learning that will in turn



shape society. You are here to find yourselves as individuals, to at least have a chance to realize your potential.

The world is full of people who believe men need masters. Our society was founded on a different premise, but continuation of this way of ours is not inevitable. It will persist only if we care enough. We must care too much to settle for a non-competitive mediocrity. Only the best that is in each of us will do.

If it has seemed that we have left your generation with no cause to believe in, no banner to follow--you do have a cause here in this land.

For one tick of history's clock we gave the world a shining golden hope. Mankind looked to us. Now the door is closing on that hope and it could be your destiny to keep it open.

# # #

NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes there may be additions to, or changes in the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 10-25-67

MEMO TO THE PRESS

Correction to excerpts from speech by Governor Ronald Reagan, Alf  
Landon Lecture, Kansas State University, Manhattan, Kansas - October 26,  
1967.

Page 8, Paragraph 2 -- "On their recommendations our phone bill  
will be reduced by two million dollars a year."

# # #



REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
AT CHILE-CALIFORNIA CONFERENCE  
Sacramento, October 31, 1967

I am pleased and impressed with the tremendous response to the invitations to this meeting. In this room are many of the leaders of California's educational, professional and industrial community. Thank you for coming to this Chile-California Conference.

Today marks the end of one program and the beginning of another. As of today we are ending a relationship with the U. S. Agency for International Development (AID), which began in 1964 and under which California has been a contractor for a technical aid program, fully funded by the U. S. government.

We will not dwell on the reasons why this is being terminated.

It is enough to say that we were disappointed that AID in Washington saw fit to delay and question and postpone decisions affecting our participation in this program to the point that we felt we had no choice but to terminate our relationship with them.

So we are here today to discuss what might appear to some of you to be a ridiculous program. A Chile-California Program without funds. An aid program without government money? You could ask with considerable justification, why try to keep it going? What is so special about Chile?

Well, Chile is something special to California, and to Californians for a lot of reasons. We have had a long relationship with this friend of ours to the South.

During our earliest days, Chilean farmers grew many of the foods which fed our 49'ers. In his book, "Recuerdos del Pasado", the Chilean historian and adventurer, Vicente Perez Rosales, tells of his visits to Sacramento in 1849.

Chileans provided the first assistance to the people of San Francisco after the great earthquake and fire of 1906.

Californians have reciprocated upon many occasions, especially during recent years when devastating earthquakes have caused tragic losses to our Chilean friends.

A broad exchange of students, businessmen, teachers, doctors and tourists has continued to draw California and Chile closer together.



Our similarity of climates, our common Spanish heritage, which leaves us with cities of the same names, our sharing of the favored Pacific currents, give us much in common.

This is the reason a Chile-California Program was started. This is why we, today, can easily answer the question, "Why Chile?". Our friendship cannot be disregarded. We want to do everything we can to expand it, to bring more and more people of all walks of life in each country into a new, broader, more meaningful "people-to-people" relationship.

I mentioned that there will be no funds. In addition, we must make it clear that the State of California cannot legally engage in a formal foreign aid program. But at the same time we must reassure our Chilean friends that U. S. assistance programs will continue without substantial change because of the change in the Chile-California Program. First of all, it is important to note that the State of California never expended as much as 1% of the total U. S. AID funds to Chile in any of the three years we operated as a foreign aid agency. Secondly, we must remind our Chilean friends that great non-government U. S. programs also are continuing, including a five million dollars a year grant to support a valuable program involving the University of California and the University of Chile.

And, of course, U. S. businessmen and tourists continue to pour vast sums of money into the Chilean economy.

But even though we've got a lot going with Chile, I would like to see more.

The purpose of this conference is to focus attention on our Chile-California relationship in the hopes that a major expansion in our total exchange will result. An exchange which will benefit both the State of California and Chile.

I think there is a great opportunity here for us, as Californians, to build a non-government program, a "people-to-people" effort which will not only augment the program of our government but also add a totally new dimension to it.

Where do we start? I think we all agree that agriculture is the place to begin. Chile, like California, is blessed with a mild climate, good soils, and ample water for irrigation. We are interested in seeing if the things we've found work in California also will work in

Chile, if our ways and methods can be used to advantage by Chilean farmers, if they and we can jointly find better ways of growing and harvesting and distributing crops and livestock products.

We are proud of the students we have sent to Chile and pleased with the fine Chilean students who have come to study here. As the years go by the total results of exchanges such as these cannot but improve our understanding and friendship for one another. We would like to expand upon student exchanges with Chile.

I am particularly proud of the Sister-City relationships which our California cities, such as Sausalito, Millbrae and Long Beach have entered into with cities in Chile. I hope other California cities will take advantage of the Sister-City idea and take a look at cities in Chile.

If we are going to accomplish these things it is going to be done outside of government, as I have said. That is not to say that those of us in California government cannot participate. We all can, but voluntarily, in addition to our regular duties. I am gratified at the large number of California government employees who have volunteered to do this.

But if we are going to really have a worthwhile effort it will take all of you here today and many more. To help get this started I am going to resort to an idea which has been working quite well during recent months, the "task force".

One of the things I have found since I took this job was that if you ask the leaders of the community to help, they respond.

So now I am going to ask that some of you become another "task force" to take time to study how Californians can be of help to Chile, to ask Chileans to help Californians--in short, to work out a plan whereby the peoples of California and Chile from all walks of life can participate in a new, volunteer program which will, I hope, make a substantial contribution to an improved social, economic and political knowledge of one another.

This task force will, we hope, give us a blueprint. In the meantime, we would appreciate your thoughts and your ideas to help in formulating that blueprint.

We have the opportunity to prove that there are other and better ways to lend a helping hand than just spending money. I hope we can take advantage of it.

NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes there may be additions to, or changes in the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.

# # #





EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
California Institute of Technology Banquet,  
Ambassador Hotel, Los Angeles  
November 8, 1967

Some time ago, I was privileged to have a preview of Caltech's plans for the future. I found these plans exciting---exciting to me as a citizen and a father, and as the governor of the most technological state in the union, who properly should from time to time take stock of this state's great resources--and the California Institute of Technology is a unique resource, one of California's most valuable. It is easy to see that what Caltech is setting out to accomplish in the period ahead is important not just to our southern California community and not alone even to the whole state of California. It will benefit the nation and the world. Caltech long ago ceased to be merely a local asset. The results of its research and education have accelerated the flow of new science and technology and their utilization throughout the globe.

I was therefore especially delighted when I was invited to come here this evening and have the opportunity of sharing with you some of my thoughts--my philosophy--on some topics that have been much on my mind and that are recalled immediately when I think of Caltech. Perhaps you have noticed that during the time I have held office there have been a "few occasions" when I have found it necessary to put forth a view or two concerning higher education in the state of California. Perhaps you have also noticed, as I certainly have, that the occasions have tended to revolve around crises, some budgetary, some administrative some perhaps--if you will forgive the word tonight--"political" in nature.

Tonight, without the pressure of a deadline to meet or emergency issues to be resolved, I should like to discuss with you some thoughts about the importance of higher education and of science and technology, about the matching to technical change of appropriate, corollary social development and maturity, about the using of advancing science and technology to the fullest, achieving the promises that are ahead and minimizing--if not eliminating--the negatives resulting from the high rate of scientific and technological change. I should like to raise the question of how our handling of expanding science and technology affects the individual, his independence, his creativity, his freedom. And I should like to comment on the role, as I see it, of the private university and college, and its relation to the growing influence of government on all aspects of our lives, including science and technology.



Let me say, first that I can think of no better platform for these comments than this evening, a Caltech evening, in which you are launching your new Science for Mankind development program. Of course, no informed person who knows the development of California as the state with the most advanced technological industry, with the largest number of technical-degree graduates, and no one who is familiar with the growth of science and technology in the world is unfamiliar with Caltech's past accomplishments and present stature.

No institution is perfect, but there are a few which perform so well and with such style, and which contribute so greatly to their communities, as to win universal respect and gratitude. Caltech is conspicuously one of these. With information and insight far beyond the reach of most of us, Caltech has pioneered the most valued speculations about the origins and composition of the universe, about the character of the elementary particles of matter, about the essence of life.

It is true that much of Caltech's teaching and research is well known to have to do with absolutely fundamental questions which, to many, may seem to be of longer range than can be of interest to those on the firing line of today's immediate problems--a governor's office might be considered such a firing line. But it takes little imagination to see the implications of Caltech's basic research in terms of ultimate human progress and values. Can anyone doubt that the findings of Caltech's astronomers on the nature of the universe will make an impact on every man's personal philosophy, that the findings of its physicists will increase our control of energy and matter, that the findings of its earth scientists will help in the human management and utilization of this planet, that the findings of its chemists and biologists will affect our medicine, our health?

But if you are more interested in immediate, demonstrable results, think of some of the things it is easy to find on the record that Caltech's engineers have done for the here and now.

Their research in aeronautics has influenced the design and performance of all commercial and military aircraft--a direct contribution to southern California's preeminence in the aviation industry.

Their hydraulics engineers established the technological basis for pumping and channeling Colorado River water to our metropolitan water district.

Their electrical engineers provided the technological foundation for the system and equipment that enabled the Southern California Edison Company to bring hydroelectric power from the Colorado River, across the mountains, to this region.

Caltech's studies of underground temperatures and pressures pointed the way toward improvements in drilling efficiency which, in turn, vastly increased southern California's petroleum production.

Its earthquake engineering program is directly responsible for the specifications that have at last made it safe to construct tall buildings in the 'quake-prone areas.

And its great Jet Propulsion Laboratory, as we all know, made history, and will make more, in the exploration of space. It produced America's first satellite, Explorer I. It produced the first instrument to probe the space near Venus, the first close-up photographs of the planet Mars. And it produced the first soft landing of instruments and the first excavation on the moon.

Now, I could go on and detail a variety of other things that I have known for years that Caltech has done--such as turning out, year after year, a superbly trained legion of graduates; such as providing scores of its faculty members for service in government and as consultants in industry; such as adding more than a little to this nation's lustre by the winning of Nobel Prizes--this honor has come to four of its graduates and seven of its present and past faculty members.

These examples of Caltech's superb accomplishments of the past speak for themselves, of course, as evidence of Caltech's stature. But they tell us something else as well: science and technology represent together a powerful force engaged in changing our world. Now, this adds problems as well as benefits. So I should like to make a comment that has been very strongly on my mind about the interaction of advancing science and technology upon our society--more specifically, about real dangers to freedom of the individual in the coming technological society; dangers, that is, if we don't arrange for our society to preserve these freedoms, if we are not intent on advancing mankind as well as his technology. We need more science because it can solve problems and be used to elevate man, but we need to match science with skill in applying it for the good of society. A college is not just a vending machine dispensing packaged knowledge; it must impart wisdom. In this regard, I want now, particularly, to congratulate Caltech on a major dimension of its future goals. I understand that Caltech is planning a major program on the relation of science to society

Of course, being Caltech, you are, I am told, starting with a fundamental attack on the distinction between living and inanimate matter, and you expect to build up from that to eventually understanding people--that will probably take you a few years, but you will get it done, or at least some of it. I believe it is well known that Caltech has already cracked the genetic code and is deep into the understanding of the molecules that are indispensable to life processes. My staff, in doing homework, further tells me it was the recognition by Caltech's biologists of the underlying phenomena that has led to much of the progress in tissue and organ transplants. So it is reasonable for us laymen to take seriously what we now hear said by Caltech scientists--that we are approaching a new era in the control and cure of disease, in the increase of longevity, and even that we are soon to arrive at a capability to influence the human species.

I believe you, I accept its being only a question of time until these developments will come. The potential good for all mankind will be enormous. But I cannot help reflecting that such developments can be thwarted, neutralized, even turned to evil if we do not match them with appropriate social advance. How ludicrous, but nevertheless realistic, it is that here our civilization's scientists are learning how to increase man's life span and finding ways to affect the genes to improve man, and are doing both at a faster rate than the same civilization is learning how to avoid the population explosion that threatens the ruination of our civilization.

I note, also with great interest that Caltech is planning to continue the search for answers on what matter and energy really consist of, down to understanding even more fundamentally than is now possible the makeup of the tiniest particles of matter--from which I am again ready to believe we shall have under man's control in the coming decades even greater amounts of energy than now that we can unleash. We shall be able to move mountains, change the earth's terrain and the weather above it, desalt the oceans if we choose. But I cannot help commenting that this same society that makes such scientific advance has not yet learned how to live with itself so as to preclude the use of such energy for society's destruction.

I notice that in your plans there is the further scrutiny of mysterious radiation from outer space. Perhaps you will find the secret of those things--what is it you call them, "Quasars"?--which are not stars but sometimes look like stars, and that produce so much more energy than you have any way of explaining today. You may even find in some of that radiation from outer space the answer to the question as to whether or not there is intelligent life on some distant planet of some remote star. But I cannot help saying that I am equally interested upon occasion in the question: do we have intelligent life on earth? Our present space program did not result because a mature society properly, deliberately, imaginatively pitted the potential benefits against our available resources to attain the best match. Rather, it has resulted in major part from reactions rather than plans--reactions to the unexpected prestige accomplishments of another nation.

There is, in fact, room for questioning whether our space program today has the right balance amongst space developments for national security, which deserve the highest priority; scientific space exploration which undoubtedly will in time bring us profitable new discoveries; and space developments that speed economic growth in the short term, such as communications satellites.

I am told that your plans also include major advances in the use of electronics to extend man's intellect, to provide the technological fundamentals for vast memory and for information processing at tremendous rates and with pervasive capacity and availability. This will lead to our ability to automate and enhance greatly the material operations of our society. Here, I have to issue a warning that we had better match such technological advance with social understanding and action so as to have not a robot society run by computer, but one where we put all of this advanced science and technology to work as new tools for man so he can attain a higher life of greater personal freedom, versatility, skill, incentive, and creativity.

After all, if your scientists are going to teach us how we can control the genes to alter the species and to make it possible for young couples to choose that their child be 10 percent like Einstein, 10 percent like father, 10 percent like mother, and 70 percent like Cary Grant, if you will, then let us try to evolve a pattern of society that permits these decisions to be made by the parents--not by some central computer in the government that will figure out what kinds of kids are best for all of us to have and then order up the right multidigit formula for the genes so the mothers will give birth only to docile, standardized "automatons" in a thoroughly regimented society.



Now, I have taken this occasion to express these concerns about the possible imbalance--the mismatch--of scientific and social advance because of what I see as the most exciting thing of all about Caltech's future plans. You are planning, as I have noted, to apply the strength of the scientific approach to the acceleration of the human side, the social side of life. I am informed that Caltech is acutely aware of the lack of harmony between scientific progress and social progress, and is setting about to contribute to the creation of a better tie.

Characteristically--for Caltech, that is--you are starting with fundamentals. Human behavior is a function of the human brain. Very little is known about this miraculous instrument, but surely something useful can be learned if it is studied at the level of molecular biology, as you plan to do. And because the workings of the brain and the workings of a complex computer offer some potential similarities and interesting contrasts, I understand that Caltech has its biologists and its engineers closely allied in this endeavor. Their goal is no less than a practical understanding of the mechanics of thought, memory, consciousness, and emotion--and thus an understanding of the behavior of the human animal.

And alongside this effort, you are bringing in the social scientists, the men and women who will also try to create a better balance between scientific and social progress by studying the behavior of man as it has been--and is--for whatever reasons internal to the brains and nerves of the man. I cannot applaud too heartily Caltech's concentration on the importance of man as an individual as seen by these plans, by your symposia, by the interests of your faculty members.

I have indicated that I think Caltech is one of the state's--indeed, one of our society's--great resources. I have told you that I find Caltech's plans for the future very appealing to me as a citizen and as a representative of government, because I feel that its research and its higher education will bring us not only more scientific knowledge and technological tools that can be used to aid mankind, but also because Caltech is entering the field of understanding the behavior of man on a scientific basis. In so doing, you will now commence the making of a contribution on that extremely important front that needs breakthroughs--ensuring that, as human beings, individually and in groups, we will make the best use of science and technology.

Now, Caltech, in many ways, is unique. But it shares with other institutions of higher learning and research, whether state-sponsored or privately-supported, the need for large funds. And here there are problems, several different kinds of problems, facing all institutions of higher learning. To begin with, higher education has to be looked upon as an investment. Both basic research and higher education, properly conceived and directed, benefit the whole society. Some of the benefits take years for realization and even for evaluation. Many citizens, many individuals of independent means, lack the patience and the foresight to appreciate the investment aspect of higher education. In any case, the competition for funds for other necessary aspects of life makes it difficult to ensure the ready availability of sponsorship to the degree both desirable and, certainly in the long run, justifiable both for higher education and research.

There is also the problem of getting objective thinking for broadening the base for acquisition of funds--such as adding tuition in the state's university and colleges (accompanied, I always add, by an enhanced program of loans and scholarships for the lower income but deserving students)--or allowing an income tax deduction for certain college expenses. In fact, I think you may have observed that if one suggests tuition as a means of increasing available funds for higher education he may even be accused of being against higher education--the very process he is trying to finance.

Now, very specifically, how do we ensure that this kind of asset, Caltech, and the approach it uses of uninhibited, individualistic effort to understand the fundamentals of nature on behalf of mankind, will continue to receive sponsorship in this day and age? Such sponsorship, the backing of Caltech and of higher education in general, must come in the end from the community. But the community may be looked upon as consisting of two categories. One, about which we have heard a good deal in recent months--at least, I certainly have--is people organized as a government to serve the rest of the people.

Our government agencies on all levels--local, state, and federal--are to varying degrees involved in scientific research. At the local level, it is mostly a matter of operating schools that help children learn something about science. At the state level, it involves the establishing and financing of universities and colleges engaged in research. At the federal level, it is an enormous and very deep commitment.

The involvement of local agencies is not a problem that need engage us tonight. The involvement of state agencies is, to me, a matter of great concern--as you may already be aware--but again, not tonight! The involvement of federal government agencies is very much a part of my thinking--tonight.

I must make my position very clear. The federal government's participation in scientific and engineering research is to an extent inevitable and desirable. The pace, risk, and magnitude of some of today's problems--especially in the area of defense--demand that the federal government underwrite--and control--many parts of the total research effort. But let us plan to watch this federal government involvement.

I mentioned earlier that, while the interaction between scientific research and the community promises many good things, it also is surrounded by dangers. And one thing I had in mind was this: there are literally hundreds of so-called "private" colleges and universities in this country, including some of our finest, that are so heavily dependent--especially in the fields of science and engineering--upon the federal government as to be in danger of losing what matters most--their identity, their individuality, their integrity, their independence.

I sympathize with students when they resent becoming a set of digits on a punched card without individuality. However, I believe there is something even worse; that is, direction, decision-making, and control of research and teaching coming not from individually brilliant, independent minds, but out of a huge, centralized government bureaucracy. I do not mean that the colleges so controlled are likely to be victims of a plot. I assure you that I am not talking about Democrats or Republicans. But I am talking about politics in the sense that a political administration can generate bureaucracy--and any bureaucracy can be a threat to honest inquiry, and honest inquiry is the heart and soul of scientific research.

The federal government now spends about \$4 billion a year on college campuses, and half of this goes for government-desired research. I will not pretend that I can evaluate all aspects of this outlay. I have no doubt that much of it can be justified. But I think all of us should ponder the figure and its impact upon the many private colleges and universities whose backs are now, financially, to the wall. They will crave this kind of support. Very likely, they will seek it. But how many of them can accept it and still hold on to their integrity?

A precious few, such as Caltech, may be able to do it indefinitely. I understand that, although Caltech today gets a substantial fraction of its operating funds from the federal budget, the federal part is for extraordinary services rendered. It is not really money that Caltech today depends upon to pursue its very special, independent goals. But it is money and, considering the desperate need for money among even the most staunch and dedicated seats of learning, it is not going to be despised or lightly rejected.

Which brings me now to some observations on the second category of the community as a sponsor for higher education and scientific research--the private community--independent individuals, corporations, and foundations.

Between science and community, the interaction is very busy indeed. Caltech does its part. It has shown how a private center of scientific research meets its obligations to the community, how good this can be for all of us. The part of the community represented by the federal government aggressively does its part. The question I raise tonight is whether the private part of the community--individuals, corporations, and foundations--does its part. I have my doubts about it. I fear that too many who would like to and could do something about guaranteeing independence from government control over research, who are in a position to make generous private grants, don't get around to it. They may even use much time and energy decrying the steady, increasing encroachment of government control upon more and more facets of our lives, while at the same time allowing, defaultingly, the federal government to do exactly that.

The independent, private sector of the community can do more than make financial contributions to private universities to guarantee their existence--although I'm not knocking such contributions, especially tonight. This sector can also press for new ideas for the federal government's action to aid in providing superior incentives for private giving. For instance, tax credits for certain college expenses, better tax incentives for sponsorship of basic research in the colleges and universities.

Nor does the support of the private universities by the private sector imply any less support for the important state-supported universities and colleges. I am a devout believer in the benefits of



competition, even in ( gher education. In Calif( ia, where we have both high grade state institutions and private ones, strong support for both will work to the advantage of quality in both. The alternative of a single, state-controlled system without the side-by-side, independent ideas of the private schools would be far inferior. In the end, it would mean less total interest in, backing of, and performance by the state's institutions. The other extreme, to work for a predominantly private system, failing to plan for a continued strong state-supported operation in California, would be equally unthinkable.

We have some funding limitations--I hope and believe they can be short term--with regard to the state university and colleges. There is only so much that can be done just so fast to cure state budgetary ills. But meanwhile, the private sector has very considerable independent option and means to act on the front of the private colleges. There is just the fear that the need and importance may not be appreciated.

Maybe you have that fear, too. In any case, I hope you will think hard about what Caltech and the other private colleges and universities are undertaking these days for the good of the community at large. It is a tremendous order. Few institutions would dare take on Caltech's plan for the future. Fewer could offer any promise of succeeding. But Caltech is by every standard extraordinary in its record and its promise. It has just launched a campaign to raise many millions of dollars toward the fulfillment of that promise. As a private citizen and as the governor of your state, I wish the institute total success. It is really very hard for me to imagine how anyone today could make a better investment in the future of our state and our nation than by supporting this effort, and I earnestly hope that you and your friends will do so to the full limits of your good sense and generosity.

# # #

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 11.10.67

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Olympic Hotel, Seattle, Washington  
November 10, 1967

If it seems that I am picking unduly on the opposition, let me note I am picking on the leadership of the Democratic Party because I am sure there are millions of fine, patriotic, earnest, Democratic citizens who are deeply disturbed at what is taking place in the nation's capital. We have moved since 1960 from the New Frontier to the Great Society and they know that the Great Society is not the wave of the future, it is an end of an era--a dismal rehash of the methods, the language, the philosophy of the past--the cliches that we have heard over and over again since the dark depression days of the 30's. And those Democrats, as well as Republicans, have watched as civilian bureaus have multiplied in Washington like wire coat hangers in the closet.

Federal employees have increased  $2\frac{1}{2}$  times as much as the increase in the population in these last several years. Our federal government is spending \$425 million a year, just to tell us how well off we are. This is all being spent on public relations. Never have so few spent so much to tell us so little.

In Joliet, Illinois--I was back there and I heard about a citizen--and this is true--a citizen, a bachelor had come to this country and taken citizenship and he felt a great debt to the country, and so, when he died, he left his accumulated fortune of \$170,000 to the United States government with the expressed wish that it be used to help pay off the debt.

And in due time, a probate court in Joliet, Illinois, filed this will--just a few weeks ago--and routinely deducted \$27,000 and sent it to Springfield as the state's share by the way of inheritance tax.

The federal government is fighting the case--wait until you hear the reason--the federal government legitimately is fighting on the basis that it is a charitable institution, and they have got a good case. Forty-two million Americans are now receiving regular checks from the federal government either directly or under state-aid programs financed largely by the federal government.

Now there are something like 75 million of us in the nation's workforce. That means that fewer than two of us are responsible for



each one of those checks. Government welfare programs at the Federal level in 1964 numbered 239--by 1966, 399--and now there are more than 450 and there is no end in sight. A government program is the nearest thing to eternal life that we will ever see on this earth.

By the end of the decade, government spending will be more than doubled and every fiscal expert frankly admits that in the decade of the 70's, it will double again. Now our problem is we do not know whether we can stand all the government that \$300 billion will buy.

Each program is adopted on the thin edge of the wedge with the unspoken knowledge that its cost will go up. In just over a decade, 100 new programs have been added to government. During <sup>the</sup> first year of their existence, costs totaled \$3½ billion. Those 100 programs now cost \$16½ billion a year.

In February of 1964, the President said, "If we weaken the dollar we weaken the whole free world's monetary system. We will defend it." And since he started defending it, the dollars lost another 7¢ in value.

Economic doctrine is shaped to fit political objectives. Deliberate and planned inflation has eroded the value of our savings and outstrips our ability to earn. We are not more prosperous. We are just handling more money.

Now you and I know and have lived all our lives on the basis that we can depend on credit if, from time to time, spending must outstrip earnings: If it is in an emergency case and we have to use credit to re-establish our former healthy state; likewise, if it is to provide for an education, or to expand a business, or to start a business. But credit is used based on the sound hope that future income will be higher, and thus justify the use of that credit. You and I know that we may not use credit just to live it up and enjoy a better life than we could afford. And it is time we realize that the rule applies to a nation as it applies to us.

When a country violates this rule, inflation is the inevitable result. Because the money supply is out of kilter, the first symptom when this begins and inflation begins to show--and it looks pretty familiar to all of us by now--first there is a boom, production increases, unemployment falls, and there is a slight increase in prices. Then, casually, a few economists burst into print to tell us that the economy is over-heated. People begin to find they are discontented with their salaries. Some producers are unwilling or unable to raise prices so they reduce the quality or size of their



product. Then there begin to be more strikes. Yes, even racial problems--because inflation does not hit all of us equally. The poor are hit first and are hit hardest by this cruel system.

We continue on, and because inflation is like radioactivity--it is cumulative--there comes a loathing for the underpaid-regular job. You can read the help wanted ads now and see the jobs that are again/<sup>going</sup>begging. The cracks appear on the moral structure. Payola, the pay off, the gift in high places, become common place. The wounds of the nation will not heal. But the night clubs are full and the dance girls more heady. And who is served by all of this? Certainly not democracy. The winner is dictatorship.

Now you and I are told that in order to prevent runaway inflation, the government is going to ride to the rescue. We must have a ten percent surtax because, unless the government keeps us from spending this money of our own, it will fuel the fires of inflation.

And now the credibility gap becomes a morality gap, because the government is not taking that money to prevent spending--to restore the balance between the amount of money and amount of goods. The government intends to spend this money and the government's claim is that they can spend it more wisely than we can spend it.

Spend it more wisely--like that grant to a university of \$159,000 to teach mothers how to play with their babies, or \$3 million to build a zoo? \$65 million for Middle East coal mines that have produced no coal?

How much is your teenage son's spending allowance? And do you have any strings attached to it? I doubt if anyone provides an allowance without a few strings that have to do with some chores and keeping up grades, doing some things that are in line with rules that we believe are proper for rearing a teenager. Well, the press reports that one state now has a poverty program that is going to provide \$50 a month pocket money so that poor boys can live "like their peers" and there will be no strings attached.

But not <sup>everything</sup> the government does is wrong. The Department of Agriculture just announced that they have just reduced the stockpile of feathers. We now only have 3 million pounds.

You and I are told that the problems are too complex for simple answers. We now have a government by chosen elite and a chosen elite in the Capitol--not elected but appointed--and that means government by mystery. We are not supposed to understand it--just obey it--it is too complicated for the average citizen to understand--can't have the townhall meetings any more.

We have a free enterprise system but within the framework of government planning. The law of supply and demand has given way to the planned economy. I think that planned economy means that when, under their plans, they cannot deliver bacon, they will arrange to not deliver the eggs at the same time.

The government is a mystery, and they keep it that way with a language all their own that is uncomprehensible to simple citizens like ourselves. For example, what do you think a city councilman or a county commissioner or even a governor does when he receives a report from the Department of Housing and Urban Development that reads "action-oriented orchestration of innovation inputs generated by escalation of meaningful and indigenous decision-making dialogue focusing on multi-length problem complexes can maximize the vital thrust towards a non-alienated and viable urban infrastructure." I think what that means is that, if you want successful urban renewal, we need a change of management in Washington.

I have been protesting the growth of government for a number of years, expressing a concern lest it grow beyond the consent of the governed. Now I am a part of government--/ a funny thing happened to me on the way to Death Valley. But, I am just as concerned as I have always been. And now--inside the last several months I felt it first hand--the savage anger of some who resist any effort to dilute the power of government and reduce its leviathan structure. But I learned that it can be reduced.

Last January, I took over government machinery that had been run for eight years by those who would be little brother to big brother in Washington. For eight years, when Washington sneezed, the gesundheit was heard in Sacramento. Being totally inexperienced, I had not learned all the things you cannot do. For example, I discovered that I had the right to veto some of the poverty programs that came over my desk--but I had not learned that you were not expected to exercise that veto. So I exercised.

Now one of those programs, you would think, was right down my alley as to philosophy. It was a program--a grant to a county to put the hardcore unemployed to work clearing up our park lands. This does fit my philosophy; I believe in this type of of thing. But looking a little closer, we discovered that 17 hardcore unemployed were going to be put to work, but more than half of the appropriation was for seven administrators to make sure that the 17 got to work on time. So we vetoed it.

There was another program we voiced quite expensive. It was going to set up a training course. It was a training course that seemed to us to be in picketing and demonstrating. Now if there is one thing we do not have a need for in California, it is more demonstrators. As a matter of fact, we can even put them on the road outside the state--as you perhaps observed today. I don't ask anymore whether I will be picketed; I just ask: "which ones?" (There were some pickets the other day that had signs "Make Love not War;" and they did not look like they were capable of doing either.)

I felt an obligation to keep my campaign promises. Once the people of California got over the shock, they kind of took to the idea.

The state government that I inherited was spending more than \$1 million a day over and above state revenue. Now I expressed a belief during the campaign that our system of government was meant to be run by the people, with the common-sense thinking of the people brought to bear on the problems of government.

(During the campaign when I was saying those things, we had quite a tourist trade from Washington--not the state--the nation's capital--all of them were talking about my inexperience of course, and that was particularly true of one young senator from Massachusetts. He was very concerned because I had never held public office. Now if memory serves me correctly, he never held public office before he became a United States senator. Come to think of it, he never held a job))

But normal, everyday business practices were unknown. For example, we discovered no one in the State of California government knew how many automobiles the state owned. There was no orderly plan for buying them. They had no plan. Any businessman would understand--dealing with fleet buying--trading them in on a mileage or a time basis. We found that department heads were just going out and buying them retail. They had everything on order from Buick Rivieras to Pontiacs with bucket seats.

Well, we put a freeze on ordering new cars, and the anguished screams would have curdled your blood. And yet, strangely enough, in about three months we had a report back and, I think for the first time in the history of the automobile in California, there was a surplus of state-owned cars in every motorpool over and above the demand by the employees.

By May of this year, we had reduced the purchase of gasoline for state cars by 15 percent a month. Now part of this was because we

also put another freeze out. We discovered we had a traveling body of employees in the state. They were out of the state all the time. And we put a freeze on that. We did not tell them that they could not go; we just said that they had to come in and explain to us why they were going. And, we have now reduced the budget for out-of-state travel by 78 percent.

For eight years, the number of state employees had increased each year--from four to five percent. Last year five percent. We did not think that this was necessary, but we had to prove it, so we put a freeze on hiring replacements. We did not fire or layoff; we just refused to hire replacements for those who left the service of the state. And now these nine or ten months later, I'll tell you, not only have we stopped that four or five percent annual increase; there are today 2½ percent fewer employees than there were in January when we took office.

A year ago last June, Lyndon Baines Johnson put a freeze on the hiring of federal replacements and there are today 227,000 more employees before he put on the freeze.

By putting in effect common-sense business practices with regard to standardizing specifications and competitive bidding and consolidated buying, we have reduced by millions of dollars the cost of supplies. For example, we simply changed the method of buying the tires for the Highway Patrol and this year we just finished buying the high speed tires and the bill is \$141,000 less than it was last year.

We found out that licenses were expiring all on the same date--a number of things licensed by the state. This meant that large office spaces stood virtually vacant during the year and then there would be the rush for temporary employees for that last-minute renewal of the licenses. We are now staggering the expiration dates so that we have an even workload throughout the year. We do not have that feast or famine situation.

We applied private business standard to the floor space occupied by our employees. And as a result, this summer we were able to cancel the proposed construction of a \$4,300,000 building in Sacramento by simply putting the employees closer together. We do not need that building now or in the foreseeable future. Another one that was already up--work was underway on the interior--a 14-story office building--will / <sup>house,</sup> when it is completed, 1,051 more employees than it was intended for--simply by applying to that building the standards that are used in any business concern in allocating floor space to employees. By the end of the coming year we expect to reduce the <sup>nine</sup> million square



reer now occupied by state employees to seven million.

When I took office, there was a big stack of stationery...they were pretty optimistic--they had another fellow's name on it, and they came in one day to haul that out to burn it. I just couldn't stand the thought of that. Oh, I have got some stationery with my name on it, but I thought there must be times where we are writing between ourselves within the state and we could make use of that. So now, the girls just "x" out that other name and type mine in and you, you know, I get a certain amount of pleasure out of that.

The state had a phone bill of \$16 million a year. Now every private business concern and every private citizen knows that the phone company has a department--you can send for them and they will come in free of charge--you tell them what your phone problems are and how much you want to use the phone, and they will tell you the best and the most efficient phone system you should have. So we did this. We called in the phone company; they were happy to come in. We found employees at adjoining desks with inter-communicating systems. They had phones that cost \$2 a month extra per phone to have lights on them so that a fellow could look at the light and tell if the fellow next to him was using the phone or not. We have told them that they can turn their heads and get the same effect. Within the last few weeks the phone company notified us in writing that our phone bill for the coming year will be reduced by \$2 million.

We turned to the people for committees to recruit appointees for government. Oh, incidentally, before I get into this about appointees--but it does have to do with one of the appointees we have who has to deal with our highway program...

Now we have tremendous highway expansion down there to match the increase in population. In that lengthy state of ours, to just keep up with the growth in population, we should build 300 miles a year. We have only been building 250; it would take two cents a gallon increase in the gas tax to build that other 50 miles.

Each year for eight years, we have been used to reading a notice that certain highway projects that were scheduled will now be delayed until the following year because of the increase of the cost of right-of-way or bids were not as low as we thought they would be and so forth. Well this one administrator in charge of that program so far this year has made so many economies in his department that we were able to announce that not only are we building all of the things scheduled on time, we are building \$99 million worth of highway projects one year in advance. That is equivalent to a 1½ cent increase

on the gas tax. . . .

But, as I said, obviously government cannot compete with private business in the talent market. But, government can--if it puts it on the basis of asking people at least to give up a portion of their time--take a few years, a couple of years, or a year out of their lives to serve their state and their community. And we have, as a result, people who are doing this.

A blue ribbon citizens' committee went out recruiting for us, and with a little arm twisting, we have many serving at great personal sacrifice; salaries in some instances are a third of what they were making in private life.

But the most exciting thing was the leading citizens who at our invitation, formed themselves into task-forces--experts in their field--the most successful people in the business of data processing all the way to hotel management. And incidentally, we gathered these leading and successful citizens--business and industrial and professional people--in one room and they volunteered to a man. More than 240 of these people gave up six months full time, five days a week away from their homes and their businesses, going into every agency and department of our state government. They are correlating their reports right now.

Now, no government could possibly afford this manpower, but all we had to do was to tell them they were needed. And I don't think that this is peculiar to California. I think all over the nation there are people who are waiting to be asked--people who want to help and who believe that government is their business.

Our nation is beset by problems. For three decades we have seen government claim jurisdiction over the problems of human misery from poverty to disease and always we have been told that there is some great emergency that has forced the government to take action. Just think back--how many of you can remember a single time when there wasn't some immediate crisis that the federal government had to deal with--and the only solution was some kind of drastic and radical solution and usually a costly one. They offered us an instant tomorrow.

Well now, it is tomorrow and as every one of their plans failed, they have been ready with new ones. But each one of the new plans--when you take a closer look--has the same tired old familiar appearance--just more of the same thing that failed the first time out.

we felt a compassion and we felt a responsibility to lend a helping hand to those who, through no fault of their own, could not find work. We still feel that compassion, and we still accept that responsibility. But our approach then was proper. We knew it was an emergency and we knew that what we were trying to do was to tide someone over a temporary spot in his life when he needed a helping hand and that still is all that most people want--help in learning to help themselves. But somewhere, something went wrong. What should have been temporary remedies for a temporary sickness have become a permanent way of life for an <sup>ever</sup> increasing number of people. We found in California an increasing number who are the third generation of their families to be living on public subsistence. The government cannot explain, in this time of prosperity, why welfare is ten times as big as it was during the Depression. And the government offers only more perpetuation of the degradation of our people--the institutionalizing of poverty for millions of our citizens.

I think that it is time that Americans of every political persuasion face up to the fact that welfare as we know it in this country is a colossal and almost complete failure. It has become a hopeless end-of-the-road instead of a hand up to a life of self-respect and independence.

And now I can just hear the voices saying: now there go those Republicans once again putting dollars ahead of human beings and ahead of human rights.

Well for once, let us answer them--if they think that it is just a matter of money...spending--let's tell that we will spend whatever is necessary to save human beings, but we are going to stop destroying them.

Man is the creature of the spirit. Filling his belly does not make up for emptying his soul of self-reliance and moral fiber.

For 200 years we fought the greatest war on poverty the world has ever seen and this certainly is no time to abandon the free system with this great potential. The time has come for us to unshackle the genius and the ability of our people and turn to them for the answers to these problems. Now if they seem insoluble--too much for the people--that is because you and I have been told, over and over again through all these years, that they are too big for us to handle--that if we are going to have big business, big labor and a big country, we are going to have to have big government taking

care of everything.

Well, let me just ask you something-- if someone came to you in your church or temple and gave your church or your temple the names of two heads of families--hard core unemployed--and asked you if your church or your temple could take on the job of trying to give them a hand and get them started in some occupation--get them back on their own feet-- /<sup>looking</sup> around at the number of people in your congregation--that would not look like such a tremendous task, would it? Well, there are less than two hardcore unemployed heads of families in the United States for every church. Now I am not suggesting that religion take over this chore. I just want to put the problem in a proper perspective.

Not too long ago in an eastern city, a driver of one of their garbage trucks--had a family and earning \$150 a week--was evicted because the landlord wanted to make another use of the building. He was having difficulty finding a place to live. Now this is not a welfare man, this is a city employee. And just recently they found out that for the past several months welfare took over this case and put the family up in a motel at \$1,300 a month--with the taxpayers paying the bill. Can anyone believe that if someone had simply broadcast in that city of 200,000 that this was the plight of one city employee--that they couldn't have found him a place to live? You know what the result would have been--he would have had scores of places from which to choose a dwelling place for himself and his family.

I think that we should stop being our brother's keeper. It is time to start being our brother's brother and perhaps our brother will find a way he can keep himself.

We who are Republicans let us read the message of last November 8 very well. There is a wind of change blowing across this land. Millions of Americans--Democrats, Independents and Republicans--voted against what has been going on. Working men and women of this nation voted against taxing themselves to provide medical care and a standard of living for others that was often more than they could afford for their own families. They voted against going deeper and deeper into debt as a nation with the idea that we could afford anything and everything simply because we think of it. They repudiated the idea that government must always grow larger, more costly and more powerful. And they voted against continuing an easy atmosphere of peace and prosperity while some young Americans are dying in



defense of freedom.

We have reached a turning point in time and, as far as our Party is concerned, we have reached a turning point because it is the destiny of our Party to raise a banner to which the people of all parties can repair. But choose the colors well, for the people are not in the mood to follow the sickly pastels of expediency or the cynical shades of those who would buy the people's votes with the people's money. Thousands upon thousands of Americans--those forgotten men and women who work and support their communities and at the same time are paying for all the social experimenting and tinkering--are groping for answers to their doubts. They are seeking a cause in which they can honestly invest their idealism and their energy.

These people are too self-reliant to sell their dreams of the future for the dull security of the ant heap. They believe in this nation as a nation under God, and that our national purpose is to provide the ultimate individual freedom consistent with law and order. They believe that the function of government is to protect society from the law breaker, and not the other way around. They believe that freedom is theirs by divine origin and not by a government whim. They love peace, but not at any price. They believe that if their sons are to be asked to die for a cause, that cause should be worth winning and that son should be allowed to win it.

I know that "politics as usual" would indicate that our Party should take positions not unattractive from any viewpoint. But statesmanship demands that we face reality, and there is a need for statesmanship in this nation today. It demands that we face reality and have faith in the people's wisdom.

We who are Republicans bear an awesome responsibility--not alone because we must carry on the fight for individual freedom and the limitation of power of government but because now we have it within our power to broaden the base of our Party. There must be many Democrats and former Democrats among us who still look to us for leadership, because they can no longer follow the tortuous trail that has been taken by the leadership of their own Party. I was a Democrat myself, and I know that wrench I felt--and was surprised by it--when I re-registered...to discover how ingrained...that this loyalty departed. But I also know that it is not I who left that party and betrayed it, the leadership of that Party has betrayed the members of the Party. Winston Churchill said that "some men change principle for Party and some men change Party for principle". Now, we who are Republicans can offer that leadership to our fellow citizens

One year ago we could not have said...the picture was so hopeless. One Party ruled this nation and one man ruled that Party. Our forces were in disarray out of despair. A year ago we came together in unity, a unity that we really had not known before in this Party. And on November 8--I think history some day will describe it as a day when we restored the two-party system.

Now let us have unity and let us have it, not out of despair, but out of determination to meet our challenge. If you believe in the causes that we have discussed here today, then go forth determined that there will be no bitterness...no result of some organizational strife...no remembered grudge that is going to keep you from supporting this cause. Millions of Americans in a voting bloc that crosses racial, religious, ethnic and political lines are watching. But what is more important and what I have seen throughout the country and in traveling into a number of other states as I speak to Republican groups--millions of young Americans are watching...our sons and daughters. And they are waiting to see if, once again, we will let ourselves be divided by the shadings, "liberal," "moderate," "conservative," applied complete with hyphen, before we use the word Republican with regard to ourselves. They are watching to see if we place more importance on those shadings than on the challenge that confronts us. For with their youthful wisdom they know that the price they will pay, if we fail to meet our challenge, is the future in which they must live. It was once said that "for one shining glorious moment in history, we had the key and the open door and the way was there before us. Men threw off the yoke of centuries and thrust forward along that way with such brilliance that for a little while we were the light and inspiration of the world." Now the key has been thrown carelessly aside, the door is closing, and we are losing the way. But we can find the way. We can find it if we are willing to assert our right to run our own affairs, to remind government that its only power is derived from "we the people," that those are the three most profound words in the entire Constitution..."We the people" Government is our creature, created for our convenience, and we can have no greater responsibility--no more valuable legacy to leave to our children--than the restoration of that American dream.

Thank you.

# # # # #

11/11

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 11.10.67

MEMO TO THE PRESS

C-O-R-R-E-C-T-I-O-N

Veterans Day Address by Governor Reagan - Saturday -  
November 11 in Albany, Oregon:

Page 5, Paragraph 2 should read:

.....Justices Douglas and Stewart (instead  
of Potter).

# # #



EXCERPTS FROM VETERANS DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
North Albany Junior High School  
Albany, Oregon  
November 11, 1967

Some of us here remember this day as one named in observance of the silencing of guns in a war that was fought to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy.

I know that many of you gathered here must be harking back in memory to some who cannot be with you---some you knew only as boys, but who were men in the price they paid for a cause.

Now this day has been renamed because other Americans have died, and died for noble causes. Twenty-odd years after that war to end wars, the sons of the Doughboy were G.I.'s in World War II, and they fought for our freedoms. They created an organization to end wars, and we have known very little peace since. They and their younger brothers and even their sons fought again in Korea, and today another generation of young Americans is dying in Vietnam.

We at home are torn with dissension and we accuse each other, trying to find blame and place blame for why this should be. There are those among us who charge that the fault is ours--that we are the aggressors--that peace could come to the world if we would but change our ways. To each solution that is offered, to every alternative, they plaintively cry "there are no simple answers to these complex problems." Is it possible that the answer is, in truth, simple, but one that demands too much--one that is simply too hard for too many of us to accept? Is it possible, perhaps, that peace has become so dear and life so sweet that some would buy it at the price of chains and slavery?

Let us start with the assumption that everyone in the world wants peace. We pick up our daily press and almost every issue carries stories of those who want peace. We know that our clergy, with the greatest of sincerity, urges that we pray for peace. (Of course we must be careful not to do this in a public schoolroom.) Businessmen form organizations to strive for peace.

With all this universal demand and all this concentration on peace, why, then, should it be so impossible to achieve? In all of history, one can find few, if any, instances where the people have started a war. War is the province of government, and therefore, the more autocratic government is, the more centralized, the more totalitarian, the more government can direct and control the will of the people, the greater the chance for war.

We hear the cry for peace everywhere, but another word seems absent---no voices seem to be crying "freedom". How long since we have heard about that? Each year we observe a Captive Nations Day. At one time, pronouncements on that day here in our own land anticipated the future freedom of those now held captive and enslaved. But more and more, we have diluted that theme, until now we use the day to speak of peace with no mention of freedom. Is it possible that while we are sorry for the captives, we do not want to offend the captors? If we have the courage to face reality, peace is not so difficult to come by. We can have peace by morning if we do not mind the price. What is blocking the quest for peace? We all know the answer even if some in high places are reluctant to voice it.

A totalitarian force in the world has made plain its goal is world domination. This has been reiterated by Nikita Khrushchev and by the present rulers of Russia. Each one has stated they will not retreat one inch from the Marxian concept of a one-world socialist state. So, all we have to do, if peace is so dear, is surrender. Indeed, not even that---just announce that we are giving up war and the tools of war, we are going to mind our own business, we will not fight with anyone for any reason, and we will have peace.

Why are we so reluctant to do this? Because there is a price we will not pay for peace, and it has to do with freedom. We want peace, but only if we can be free at the same time. Too many of us remember a few years back when the tanks rumbled through Hungary and over the bodies of the freedom fighters. And then above the echoes of the last few shots came that final radioed plea to humanity. "People of the world, help us. People of Europe, whom we once defended against the attacks of Asiatic barbarians, listen now to the alarm bells ring. People of the civilized world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help. The light vanishes, the shadows grow darker hour by hour. Listen to our cry." And sometimes when the wind is right, it seems we can still hear that cry and we find ourselves wondering if the conscience of man will be hearing that cry a thousand years from now.

There are those in our midst who do believe we can bring peace by the unilateral action I have described---by simply refusing to fight. Please believe me it would be the height of folly for us to challenge their sincere belief that we can end the cold war simply by convincing the enemy of our good intentions, and that it isn't necessary that we ask him to give up his plan for imposing his will upon the world. But we can challenge their lack of touch with reality.

As I said earlier, we all share in their desire for peace. Not one of us will take second place to any other in willingness to do everything possible to achieve peace. It is precisely because we do want peace that we plead for a review of history. Page after page has been bloodied by the reckless adventures of power hungry monarchs and dictators who mistook man's love of peace for weakness.

How many nations have backed down the road of good intentions to end up against a wall of no retreat with the only choice to fight or surrender? We do not repudiate man's dream of peace. We must not. It is a good dream and one we share with all men for the dream is as old as man himself.

But we do repudiate an attempt to achieve that dream by methods disproven by all of our past experience, methods played against the background music of Neville Chamberlain's umbrella tapping its sorry way to the slaughter of a generation of young men.

Nor can we safely rest the case of freedom with the United Nations as it is presently constituted. Not until reconstruction of this organization puts realistic power in the hands of those nations which must, through size and strength, be ultimately responsible for world order, can we submit questions affecting our national interest to the UN and be confident of a fair hearing.

I realize there are those who will charge we offer an alternative of narrow nationalism and chip-on-the-shoulder sabre rattling, that we endanger the world and bring closer the dread day of the bomb.

A few months ago, there was talk of World War III as the Middle East bubbled and boiled over into a war that began and ended within a week. A small nation, faced with a denial of its sovereignty, indeed, of its very existence, reminded us that the price of freedom is high, but never so costly as the loss of it. They brought what almost seems to be a new concept of war to the world---victory---and it didn't bring on World War III.

Go back a few years and recall another time of crisis. This time the Red Chinese were threatening to invade the off-shore islands and Formosa. The world tensed and we heard the familiar terror talk that any action of any kind would bring on World War III. And then another voice was heard speaking in a tone we have not heard for too long a time in this land of ours. Dwight David Eisenhower said: "They'll have to crawl over the 7th fleet to do it."

The invasion of Formosa did not take place; no young men died; and World War III did not follow.

By contrast, we listened to those who said Laos would be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. So we backed down to buy peace and we bought Vietnam.

Armistice Day is not being honored in Vietnam. The set of enemies who confront Americans in Southeast Asia are half a world removed in space--and perhaps even a whole century removed in time--from the collection of enemies whom we faced in that war to end wars in Europe half a century ago. And if we believe the more pessimistic political scientists, the war which we fight now in Asia, is one in which our enemy will never accept an armistice. He will fight on and on, we are told, until the United States gives up and withdraws in weariness and failure.

What about the solemn lessons that Americans were supposed to have learned from all the wars, great and small, which they have fought through the past half a century?

From those tremendous campaigns across Europe and Africa; and on the seas and under the seas and in the skies; and in Asia and among the Pacific Islands?

From the billions and billions of dollars beyond counting that have been spent on weapons and munitions, and on moving armies and fleets and air forces across the face of the earth--sums vast enough to support whole civilizations?

And what has happened to the warrior skills that came to Americans from experience in wars--experience unwanted and unsought, but unmatched nevertheless?

We Americans have had one general and continuing experience outside our waters these past 50 years. It is the experience of fighting wars, and trying to prevent wars. And yet, at this dismal juncture, somehow we are unable or at least unwilling to bring to terms, or force to an armistice, a ramshackle water buffalo economy with a gross national budget hardly equal to that of Pascagoula.

What has gone wrong? What has happened to our knowledge of



Where did the American strategic responses in Southeast Asia begin to go awry?

I, for one, find it strange that two of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court should now assert in public that the legality of the American military operations in that part of the world should be reviewed by that Court.

If there are indeed true grounds for suspicion of illegal acts or actions, as Justices Douglas and ~~Potter~~ <sup>Stewart</sup> seem to imply, what a monstrous crime that would be! Here are more than 500,000 fresh troops being sent forth across the Pacific in their youthful innocence every year. If they are encouraged in illegal acts then scores of Generals and Admirals must be accessories before and after the fact. And if a crime has been committed, whose crime would it be? The President's? McNamara's? Or the Congress who passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which the President insists provided him with legal sanctions? And how would Justices ~~Potter~~ <sup>Stewart</sup> and Douglas measure the offense, if an offense there be? Would the war-making be a felony? Or a misdemeanor? And what punishment would they prescribe to fit such a crime?

It is impossible to imagine anything sillier.

Maybe it could be argued as a legalism that the Administration of the hour has in fact misled the people and taken them wrongly into war. That would be a matter between the Executive Branch and the people. That is one thing, and I am not necessarily disposed to hold with either Justice on the point. The other thing is, of course, whether American forces should be in Viet Nam at all. Let me make my own position clear. I believe that the U.S. has work to do and a place to fill in the Pacific, and that we must not stop fighting until the security of our allies has been assured in freedom and independence. This war, in other words, had to be fought, even if it is not yet called a war, which it is. But I also hold that we got into it in an altogether strange and even mysterious way, and that is the cause of much of the confusion and acrimony and anguish among us.

*Southeast Asia*

The fundamental error was made just about six years ago and that first year, 1961, was a bad year for the United State's power position in the world. It was the year of the incredible botch at the Bay of Pigs; of Khrushchev's cold and calculated affront of our President at their meeting in Vienna; of the ominous start of another Soviet crunch at Berlin; of the earth-shaking Soviet breach of the nuclear test moratorium; of the first large, vicious armed attacks by the Viet Cong on the South Vietnamese villages; and of the breaking by the North Vietnamese of the promised neutrality of Laos.

The year 1961 was, on the fact of the record, the year when Soviet Russia in alliance with Ho Chi Minh in Asia, clearly decided to test, at places of their choosing, the nerve and stamina of a new Administration in Washington..

We decided not to stand in Laos. We accepted the occupation of Eastern Laos by the Pathet Lao Communists. Who, like the Viet Cong, were and remain a nationalist front for *Hanoi*. We did what in the international jargon of diplomacy is called a political and strategic retreat. But this retreat was not described to the rest of us as a retreat. On the contrary, the compact which thus split Laos into three parts was celebrated as a great feat of statesmanship.

What it did, of course, in the Eastern one third of Laos was to open uncontested access to the corridors in South Viet Nam from the North. It is known to our fighting men as the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

The sequence of American actions thereafter is clear, even if the strategical reasoning is not.

The prime recommendation of the Taylor-Rostow team was to raise the strength of the United States military mission in South Viet Nam from a few hundred men--(about 700 men, actually)--to some 15,000 men. The American forces already in the country were not combat troops. On the contrary, they were concerned almost exclusively with the chore of training and equipping a small South Vietnamese army, itself without experience and tradition in war. The additional troops who were sent in also were charged with continuing the training and

From that point on, nothing went right.

The very people we were trying to help kept warning that an aggression was in the making, and that the appeasement in Laos would have the fatal effect of making South Viet Nam vulnerable. But Washington simply was not listening.

Well, it has been a dreary matter of addition ever since. There were a mere 700 or so training troops at the start. Then 15,000 more and then the combat formations--first by regiments--then by brigades, and finally by divisions. And now, only six years later, more than 500,000 American troops are there.

From the start, it was a case of being too late with too little, while tipping our hand to the enemy so that he always knew in advance what we proposed.

The strategy has been justified with a quotation from another General named Polybius. That strategy holds:

"It is not the purpose of war to annihilate those who provoke it, but to cause them to mend their ways."

Polybius was a Roman who wrote on war 2,000 years before our twentieth century invention of "wars of National liberation."

In any case, neither Polybius, or even General Maxwell Taylor, seem to have provided a satisfactory answer. Wars, or politics conducted in the form of war, simply cannot be won or settled this way.

And the cost of trying to get Ho to improve his manners keeps going up and up--to more than \$30 billion a year. Worse still, the options now open to us from the existing platform of strategy grow more difficult.

Some say the war cannot be won by force and that the bombing should be stopped. Stop the bombing, and we will only encourage the enemy to do his worst. A Marine General reported that in one bombing pause, his men counted 150 truck convoys and more than 300 sampans bringing up supplies. Some others hold for a closing of Haiphong and even an Inchon-type landing. The feasibility of such actions is a matter for the generals and admirals to decide---a professional judgment. But the military can only advise. It is for the government and the people, and only they, to decide what is to be done with such advice, if anything is to be done at all.

The one thing that is sure in this situation is that we Americans must finally make up our minds as a people whether we want to carry the war through to a conclusion, or give up.

We Americans who live on the West Coast do not look on the Pacific as an alien sea, or upon Asia as a feared or alien shore. For generations, we have traded across this ocean, and now the jets go back and forth. In a very real sense, we are a Pacific people, as we are also an Atlantic people. Senator Fulbright and Mr. Walter Lippman to the contrary, we are not--nor can we ever be--indifferent to what happens there. And least of all can we turn away from an aggression which seeks to crush free and independent nations and, toward that end, would eject the protective American influence from the Western Pacific.

Isn't it time that we admitted we are in Vietnam because our national interest demands that we take a stand there now so we won't have to take a stand later on our own beaches?

Isn't it time that we either win this war or tell the American people why we can't? Isn't it time to recognize the great immorality of sending our neighbors' sons to die with the hope we can do so without angering the enemy too much? Isn't this a throwback to those jungle tribes sacrificing a few of their select young on a heathen altar to keep the Volcano from exploding?

The war in Vietnam must be fought through to victory, meaning first, an end to North Vietnam aggression, and second, an honorable and safe peace for our South Vietnam neighbors. We have been patient long enough and our patience wears thin. This is the way to peace and it is a way in keeping with our basic principles.

Probably no society has ever been founded completely on the principle of individualism, but certainly our government and our system has come closer than man has ever come in all the history of man's relation to man. Ours is the concept that an individual's rights are inviolate, and thus we are deeply disturbed at the idea that young men can be asked to die for a cause unless that cause is worth winning and worth involving the total effort of all of us collectively.

# # #

-8-

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above notes.)



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 11.11.67

RELEASE: Saturday, November 11  
10 P.M.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
100 ADELPHI

EXCERPTS FROM VETERANS DAY ADDRESS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
North Albany Junior High School  
Albany, Oregon  
November 11, 1967

LIBRARY  
GOVT. PUBS. SERV.

Some of us here remember this day as one named in observance of the silencing of guns in a war that was fought to end all wars and to make the world safe for democracy.

I know that many of you gathered here must be harking back in memory to some who cannot be with you---some you knew only as boys, but who were men in the price they paid for a cause.

Now this day has been renamed because other Americans have died, and died for noble causes. Twenty-odd years after that war to end wars, the sons of the Doughboy were G.I.'s in World War II, and they fought for our freedoms. They created an organization to end wars, and we have known very little peace since. They and their younger brothers and even their sons fought again in Korea, and today another generation of young Americans is dying in Vietnam.

We at home are torn with dissension and we accuse each other, trying to find blame and place blame for why this should be. There are those among us who charge that the fault is ours--that we are the aggressors--that peace could come to the world if we would but change our ways. To each solution that is offered, to every alternative, they plaintively cry "there are no simple answers to these complex problems." Is it possible that the answer is, in truth, simple, but one that demands too much--one that is simply too hard for too many of us to accept? Is it possible, perhaps, that peace has become so dear and life so sweet that some would buy it at the price of chains and slavery?

Let us start with the assumption that everyone in the world wants peace. We pick up our daily press and almost every issue carries stories of those who want peace. We know that our clergy, with the greatest of sincerity, urges that we pray for peace. (Of course we must be careful not to do this in a public schoolroom.) Businessmen form organizations to strive for peace.

With all this universal demand and all this concentration on peace, why, then, should it be so impossible to achieve? In all of history, one can find few, if any, instances where the people have started a war. War is the province of government, and therefore, the more autocratic government is, the more centralized, the more totalitarian, the more government can direct and control the will of the people, the greater the chance for war.

We hear the cry for peace everywhere, but another word seems absent---no voices seem to be crying "freedom". How long since we have heard about that? Each year we observe a Captive Nations Day. At one time, pronouncements on that day here in our own land anticipated the future freedom of those now held captive and enslaved. But more and more, we have diluted that theme, until now we use the day to speak of peace with no mention of freedom. Is it possible that while we are sorry for the captives, we do not want to offend the captors? If we have the courage to face reality, peace is not so difficult to come by. We can have peace by morning if we do not mind the price. What is blocking the quest for peace? We all know the answer even if some in high places are reluctant to voice it.

A totalitarian force in the world has made plain its goal is world domination. This has been reiterated by Nikita Khrushchev and by the present rulers of Russia. Each one has stated they will not retreat one inch from the Marxian concept of a one-world socialist state. So, all we have to do, if peace is so dear, is surrender. Indeed, not even that---just announce that we are giving up war and the tools of war, we are going to mind our own business, we will not fight with anyone for any reason, and we will have peace.

Why are we so reluctant to do this? Because there is a price we will not pay for peace, and it has to do with freedom. We want peace, but only if we can be free at the same time. Too many of us remember a few years back when the tanks rumbled through Hungary and over the bodies of the freedom fighters. And then above the echoes of the last few shots came that final radioed plea to humanity. "People of the world, help us. People of Europe, whom we once defended against the attacks of Asiatic barbarians, listen now to the alarm bells ring. People of the civilized world, in the name of liberty and solidarity, we are asking you to help. The light vanishes, the shadows grow darker hour by hour. Listen to our cry." And sometimes when the wind is right, it seems we can still hear that cry and we find ourselves wondering if the conscience of man will be hearing that cry a thousand years from now.

There are those in our midst who do believe we can bring peace by the unilateral action I have described---by simply refusing to fight. Please believe me it would be the height of folly for us to challenge their sincere belief that we can end the cold war simply by convincing the enemy of our good intentions, and that it isn't necessary that we ask him to give up his plan for imposing his will upon the world. But we can challenge their lack of touch with reality.

As I said earlier, we all share in their desire for peace. Not one of us will take second place to any other in willingness to do everything possible to achieve peace. It is precisely because we do want peace that we plead for a review of history. Page after page has been bloodied by the reckless adventures of power hungry monarchs and dictators who mistook man's love of peace for weakness.

How many nations have backed down the road of good intentions to end up against a wall of no retreat with the only choice to fight or surrender? We do not repudiate man's dream of peace. We must not. It is a good dream and one we share with all men for the dream is as old as man himself.

But we do repudiate an attempt to achieve that dream by methods disproven by all of our past experience, methods played against the background music of Neville Chamberlain's umbrella tapping its sorry way to the slaughter of a generation of young men.

Nor can we safely rest the case of freedom with the United Nations as it is presently constituted. Not until reconstruction of this organization puts realistic power in the hands of those nations which must, through size and strength, be ultimately responsible for world order, can we submit questions affecting our national interest to the UN and be confident of a fair hearing.

I realize there are those who will charge we offer an alternative of narrow nationalism and chip-on-the-shoulder sabre rattling, that we endanger the world and bring closer the dread day of the bomb.

A few months ago, there was talk of World War III as the Middle East bubbled and boiled over into a war that began and ended within a week. A small nation, faced with a denial of its sovereignty, indeed, of its very existence, reminded us that the price of freedom is high, but never so costly as the loss of it. They brought what almost seems to be a new concept of war to the world---victory---and it didn't bring on World War III.

Go back a few years and recall another time of crisis. This time the Red Chinese were threatening to invade the off-shore islands and Formosa. The world tensed and we heard the familiar terror talk that any action of any kind would bring on World War III. And then another voice was heard speaking in a tone we have not heard for too long a time in this land of ours. Dwight David Eisenhower said: "They'll have to crawl over the 7th fleet to do it."

The invasion of Formosa did not take place; no young men died; and World War III did not follow.

By contrast, we listened to those who said Laos would be the wrong war in the wrong place at the wrong time. So we backed down to buy peace and we bought Vietnam.

Armistice Day is not being honored in Vietnam. The set of enemies who confront Americans in Southeast Asia are half a world removed in space--and perhaps even a whole century removed in time--from the collection of enemies whom we faced in that war to end wars in Europe half a century ago. And if we believe the more pessimistic political scientists, the war which we fight now in Asia, is one in which our enemy will never accept an armistice. He will fight on and on, we are told, until the United States gives up and withdraws in weariness and failure.

What about the solemn lessons that Americans were supposed to have learned from all the wars, great and small, which they have fought through the past half a century?

From those tremendous campaigns across Europe and Africa; and on the seas and under the seas and in the skies; and in Asia and among the Pacific Islands?

From the billions and billions of dollars beyond counting that have been spent on weapons and munitions, and on moving armies and fleets and air forces across the face of the earth--sums vast enough to support whole civilizations?

And what has happened to the warrior skills that came to Americans from experience in wars--experience unwanted and unsought, but unmatched nevertheless?

We Americans have had one general and continuing experience outside our waters these past 50 years. It is the experience of fighting wars, and trying to prevent wars. And yet, at this dismal juncture, somehow we are unable or at least unwilling to bring to terms, or force to an armistice, a ramshackle water buffalo economy with a gross national budget hardly equal to that of Paracagaula.

What has gone wrong? What has happened to our knowledge of politics and power?



Where did the American strategic responses in Southeast Asia begin to go awry?

I, for one, find it strange that two of the nine Justices of the Supreme Court should now assert in public that the legality of the American military operations in that part of the world should be reviewed by that Court.

If there are indeed true grounds for suspicion of illegal acts or actions, as Justices Douglas and Potter seem to imply, what a monstrous crime that would be! Here are more than 500,000 fresh troops being sent forth across the Pacific in their youthful innocence every year. If they are encouraged in illegal acts then scores of Generals and Admirals must be accessories before and after the fact. And if a crime has been committed, whose crime would it be? The President's? McNamara's? Or the Congress who passed the Tonkin Gulf Resolution which the President insists provided him with legal sanctions? And how would Justices Potter and Douglas measure the offense, if an offense there be? Would the war-making be a felony? Or a misdemeanor? And what punishment would they prescribe to fit such a crime?

It is impossible to imagine anything sillier.

Maybe it could be argued as a legalism that the Administration of the hour has in fact misled the people and taken them wrongly into war. That would be a matter between the Executive Branch and the people. That is one thing, and I am not necessarily disposed to hold with either Justice on the point. The other thing is, of course, whether American forces should be in Viet Nam at all. Let me make my own position clear. I believe that the U.S. has work to do and a place to fill in the Pacific, and that we must not stop fighting until the security of our allies has been assured in freedom and independence. This war, in other words, had to be fought, even if it is not yet called a war, which it is. But I also hold that we got into it in an altogether strange and even mysterious way, and that is the cause of much of the confusion and acrimony and anguish among us.

The fundamental error was made just about six years ago and that first year, 1961, was a bad year for the United State's power position in the world. It was the year of the incredible botch at the Bay of Pigs; of Khrushchev's cold and calculated affront of our President at their meeting in Vienna; of the ominous start of another Soviet crunch at Berlin; of the earth-shaking Soviet breach of the nuclear test moratorium; of the first large, vicious armed attacks by the Viet Cong on the South Vietnamese villages; and of the breaking by the North Vietnamese of the promised neutrality of Laos.

The year 1961 was, on the fact of the record, the year when Soviet Russia in alliance with Ho Chi Minh in Asia, clearly decided to test, at places of their choosing, the nerve and stamina of a new Administration in Washington..

We decided not to stand in Laos. We accepted the occupation of Eastern Laos by the Pathet Lao Communists. Who, like the Viet Cong, were and remain a nationalist front for Hanoi. We did what in the international jargon of diplomacy is called a political and strategic retreat. But this retreat was not described to the rest of us as a retreat. On the contrary, the compact which thus split Laos into three parts was celebrated as a great feat of statesmanship.

What it did, of course, in the Eastern one third of Laos was to open uncontested access to the corridors in South Viet Nam from the North. It is known to our fighting men as the Ho Chi Minh Trail.

The sequence of American actions thereafter is clear, even if the strategical reasoning is not.

The prime recommendation of the Taylor-Rostow team was to raise the strength of the United States military mission in South Viet Nam from a few hundred men--(about 700 men, actually)--to some 15,000 men. The American forces already in the country were not combat troops. On the contrary, they were concerned almost exclusively with the chore of training and equipping a small South Vietnamese army, itself without experience and tradition in war. The additional troops who were sent in also were charged with continuing the training and equipping, but they were to do more of it faster.

From that point on, nothing went right.

The very people we were trying to help kept warning that an aggression was in the making, and that the appeasement in Laos would have the fatal effect of making South Viet Nam vulnerable. But Washington simply was not listening.

Well, it has been a dreary matter of addition ever since. There were a mere 700 or so training troops at the start. Then 15,000 more and then the combat formations--first by regiments--then by brigades, and finally by divisions. And now, only six years later, more than 500,000 American troops are there.

From the start, it was a case of being too late with too little, while tipping our hand to the enemy so that he always knew in advance what we proposed.

The strategy has been justified with a quotation from another General named Polybius. That strategy holds:

"It is not the purpose of war to annihilate those who provoke it, but to cause them to mend their ways."

Polybius was a Roman who wrote on war 2,000 years before our twentieth century invention of "wars of National liberation."

In any case, neither Polybius, or even General Maxwell Taylor, seem to have provided a satisfactory answer. Wars, or politics conducted in the form of war, simply cannot be won or settled this way.

And the cost of trying to get Ho to improve his manners keeps going up and up--to more than \$30 billion a year. Worse still, the options now open to us from the existing platform of strategy grow more difficult.

should be stopped. Stop the bombing, and we will only encourage the enemy to do his worst. A Marine General reported that in one bombing pause, his men counted 150 truck convoys and more than 300 sampans bringing up supplies. Some others hold for a closing of Haiphong and even an Inchon-type landing. The feasibility of such actions is a matter for the generals and admirals to decide---a professional judgment. But the military can only advise. It is for the government and the people, and only they, to decide what is to be done with such advice, if anything is to be done at all.

The one thing that is sure in this situation is that we Americans must finally make up our minds as a people whether we want to carry the war through to a conclusion, or give up.

We Americans who live on the West Coast do not look on the Pacific as an alien sea, or upon Asia as a feared or alien shore. For generations, we have traded across this ocean, and now the jets go back and forth. In a very real sense, we are a Pacific people, as we are also an Atlantic people. Senator Fulbright and Mr. Walter Lippmann to the contrary, we are not--nor can we ever be--indifferent to what happens there. And least of all can we turn away from an aggression which seeks to crush free and independent nations and, toward that end, would eject the protective American influence from the Western Pacific.

Isn't it time that we admitted we are in Vietnam because our national interest demands that we take a stand there now so we won't have to take a stand later on our own beaches?

Isn't it time that we either win this war or tell the American people why we can't? Isn't it time to recognize the great immorality of sending our neighbors' sons to die with the hope we can do so without angering the enemy too much? Isn't this a throwback to those jungle tribes sacrificing a few of their select young on a heathen altar to keep the Volcano from exploding?

The war in Vietnam must be fought through to victory, meaning first, an end to North Vietnam aggression, and second, an honorable and safe peace for our South Vietnam neighbors. We have been patient long enough and our patience wears thin. This is the way to peace and it is a way in keeping with our basic principles.

Probably no society has ever been founded completely on the principal of individualism, but certainly our government and our system has come closer than man has ever come in all the history of man's relation to man. Ours is the concept that an individual's rights are inviolate, and thus we are deeply disturbed at the idea that young men can be asked to die for a cause unless that cause is worth winning and worth involving the total effort of all of us collectively.

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)



11/16

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Youth Opportunities Foundation Scholarship Fund Banquet  
Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles  
November 16, 1967

I consider it a great privilege to be able to speak here tonight, for a number of reasons.

Any opportunity to talk with and meet with a representative segment of the 10 percent of California's population that is Spanish-speaking is most welcome. Too often office holders have taken you for granted in the years between elections and then come around in election years and asked for your support. I am not here tonight to make a political speech or to ask for your support. I am here to tell you that we will continue in this administration to try to merit your support. And I am here to tell you what down deep we all know--that the two-party system functions better when it crosses ethnic and language barriers and when one party does not base its appeals on racist or racial grounds.

I want you to know, also, that this administration recognizes our problems, those that are peculiar to you with a dual language and a dual culture. And those that are common to all our people.

It is a privilege to be here because the Youth Opportunities Foundation is one of the finest examples of the Creative Society I know of anywhere.

Here we have more than 25 major businesses and industries and scores of individuals from the independent sector banding together to help provide college and professional educations for 50 young people of Mexican ancestry.

But the importance of the Youth Opportunities Foundation goes far beyond those 50 students. It is indicative of what the independent sector can do in the field of education and it is an example that can be followed and multiplied many times over, not only for American youths of Mexican descent, but also for qualified children of all nationalities who need help in getting an education.

But I am not here tonight to talk about the Youth Opportunities Foundation. You here are more qualified than I to enumerate its accomplishments. You know the needs of your area and your people better than anyone you might ask to speak at a banquet such as this.

I would like to talk a bit, however, about our recognition of the problems and what we at the state level are attempting to do in the area of education.

But first, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to those Americans of Mexican descent who are serving in this administration. I do not favor separating Americans into blocks or groups on the basis of their origin, their race or religion or even their occupation. The goal of all of us should be to eliminate dividing lines and think of each other only as fellow American citizens. This should hold true in selecting or electing those who serve in government positions. However, when you have a large segment of your citizenry who are a part of our rich history and yet are not participants in our present activities to the extent their numbers and their abilities warrant, then we have an obligation to make a special effort to involve them. That is why, altogether, more than 30 Americans of Mexican descent have been named to non-civil service positions so far where we can count on their advice and counsel as well as their special familiarity with the problems of their own people.

Especially I want to acknowledge one of your Youth Opportunities Foundation officers, Dr. Francisco Bravo, who not only serves as a member of the State Board of Agriculture, but who also has been a trusted friend and adviser since way back in the campaign days.

I would also like to pay tribute to two hard workers on my own personal staff, Bill Orozco, who is in charge of our Los Angeles office, and Armand Delgado, who is my aide in Sacramento for Spanish-speaking Affairs.

We have other appointments coming up in the weeks ahead, appointees who not only will meet special needs, such as serving as members of draft boards, but also appointees whose broad skills and talents will benefit all of the people of California.

Sometimes the things we are trying to do get lost in the shuffle of more exciting or newsworthy events.

One of those is our plan for helping low-income students who are otherwise qualified to receive educations in our state-supported universities and colleges.

There are some who have suggested that perhaps this is a plan better not talked of here because it involves tuition.

But I say this is the place to talk of it because it can result in your qualified boys and girls going to college.

And let me say this, those of you who would continue to depend on the so-called "free" education now offered are just kidding yourselves. At the last count, less than 100 persons with Spanish surnames were among the 27,000 students at UCLA.

And yet, every American of Mexican descent, no matter how poor, is paying with his taxes a part of the cost of supporting our University and college systems.

Let me tell you briefly about our Equal Education Plan which, yes, would be financed by tuition or, if you prefer a euphemism, a student charge.

But that tuition would be paid by those who can afford to pay-- and that is the lion's share of those now attending. For the fact is, the average income of the parents of students attending our public universities is almost identical with the average income of the parents of students attending private universities.

This is fine. But I can't help but remember that originally our public system of higher education was developed to help those who could not afford to go to private schools.

We think that at the very least an education in our state colleges and universities should be available to those whose only reason for not attending is money.

Our plan will accomplish that end. Here is how it will work.

First of all, it is based on total annual necessary expenditures of about \$2,000 a year including tuition, fees, room and board, books and incidental expenses.

Secondly, all loans are to be repayable only after the student has left college and has begun earning.

During his first year of college, the student will borrow 75 percent of his basic \$2,000 and receive 25 percent in scholarships.

In his second year, the student will borrow 50 percent and receive 50 percent in scholarships.

During his third year, the loan will be 25 percent and the scholarship 75 percent.

During his senior year, the student will receive a full scholarship.



An alternative proposal which also has merit is to reverse the procedure and make the first year free in order not to discourage potential students from low income groups. This is a detail we can work out.

That is the basic plan.

We do not yet know what the need level will be, although we have studies underway in this area. It is obvious that a family making \$7,500 a year and having one child is in a better position to educate him than a family making \$15,000 a year and having four children. Some sort of sliding scale appears to be the proper way of handling this.

Other questions arise about repaying the loans. What about women who receive loans and then marry before they are in a position to repay? What about men in the service? What about those who enter professional areas where great need exists?

In these and other cases we think there should be forgiveness features. Exactly how these would work are for the Regents and the Legislature to decide, since it is the Regents who will eventually approve the plan for the University and the Legislature for the colleges.

At this moment these details are not nearly so important as the fact that we must provide a way for all those who can use a college education to receive one.

I have outlined a financing method, but that meets only a part of the need.

We must also encourage those students who are qualified to go on to college.

This will take the active cooperation, not only of the colleges and universities, but also the school districts and the high schools.

It will take the cooperation, the interest and enthusiasm of all those in public education to make such a plan known, to explain it, and in many cases, to sell it---especially to students who come from homes where there is a language barrier, where there is illiteracy or where, because of environmental factors, there is lack of ambition and even hopelessness.

Therefore, this plan--any plan--will need an aggressive guidance and information program at the high school level, expanded counseling and even a recruiting system.

This should not be the responsibility of the high schools alone. The college and university systems should work hand in hand with the school districts to assure that every student capable of acquiring and absorbing a college education has access to one.

We hear much in meetings of the University Regents about the benefits to the University of having substantial numbers of out-of-state students. And rightfully so. These do broaden the range of students and make for a more meaningful student dialogue.

However, here in California we have a broad strata of students who, if they just could get into the University, would also add to the quality and variety of the student body.

Although qualified intellectually, they have been barred in many cases because language and financial barriers have not let them live up to their true potentials in high school. In other words, scholastically, they are not among the top 12½ percent of their graduating class.

We are already at work on that problem.

This year, the Legislature passed and I signed legislation making it possible to give early instruction in two languages---English and Spanish.

Many a youngster from a Spanish-speaking home comes into our schools bright and willing, but shy and handicapped by a lack of knowledge of English.

Because of shyness, he will not ask questions raised by his unfamiliarity with English. As a result, he drops farther and farther behind, and in too many cases, loses all interest.

That legislation should go a long way toward rectifying this problem.

I know there are many other problems that face any citizen who has a language barrier. These are problems that cannot be solved overnight or by laws or by money. Welfare is one.

To put a man on welfare does not solve a problem. Welfare at best should be a temporary expediency.

In recent years welfare too often has been seen as the salvation of the jobless, regardless of why he is unemployed, rather than as a stopgap.

But welfare is no salvation. In the long run, welfare destroys men's souls, robs them of their dignity, takes away their incentive, demeans their wives and children.

# # #

(Note: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the governor will stand by the above quotes.)



To the Senate and the Assembly of the Legislature of California.

CALIFORNIA MEDICAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

The recent decision of the California State Supreme Court has made it necessary for me to add to the call of the 1967 second extraordinary session of the legislature a request that the legislature clarify its intent in the wording of the California Medical Assistance Program. We are also asking the legislature to go ahead with proposals that it conduct its own audit of the program, using an independent accounting firm, to insure that projected figures in this complex program have equal validity to both the legislature and the administration. Such an audit in no way, however, changes the need for a clarification of the intent of the law.

The Supreme Court decision in Morris vs. Williams invalidated regulations adopted by the Health and Welfare Administrator under authority we believed the legislature had given him.

The regulations were designed to provide health care services to the limit of appropriated funds for all persons covered by the program.

These regulations were the result of a careful study made by the eleven-member Health Review and Program Council established by the legislature to advise the administrator in the conduct of the Medical Assistance Program.

The Court's decision, though recognizing that the administrator must operate the program within appropriated funds, requires him to eliminate all medically indigent persons from the program before reducing any services granted to welfare recipients.

The medically indigent are 160,000 needy persons not on welfare but with insufficient resources to meet their basic medical needs.

In effect, the Court ruling has tied the hands of the administration in its effort to provide life-saving medical services for all needy California citizens.



The Court's interpretation of what it construes to be legislative intent has also severely limited the flexibility needed to administer this program.

To have a sound program with the administrative flexibility needed to meet changing conditions, I recommend the following legislation:

--A concise and workable definition of the term "feasible". This and related terms are used in numerous places in the California Medical Assistance Act. The absence of clear definition causes unreconcilable conflicts which not only eliminate administrative flexibility but also can result in endless litigation over every decision made in operating the program.

--A clear restatement of legislative intent that the Health and Welfare Agency Administrator has been given discretion to either reduce services to all beneficiaries or reduce the number of beneficiaries, or use a combination of both in order to operate the program within annual appropriations. The Court's required elimination of up to 160,000 medically indigent from the program will cause a massive shift of responsibility for their health care to the county taxpayers.

This will not only result in an estimated annual loss of \$70 million in Federal matching funds but will also place the financial burden of their care on the counties. For example: It is estimated that the annual fiscal impact on Los Angeles County could be as high as \$60.5 million; Alameda \$7 million; San Diego \$6 million; San Francisco \$5 million; Fresno \$2.5 million.

--A reduction in the interval between the time that services are provided and bills must be submitted for payment. The current six-month interval creates severe difficulties in determining current program expenditures during any fiscal year and in projecting program costs for subsequent fiscal years.

Enactment of these measures is essential if we are to carry out our responsibilities as mandated by the legislature.

Positive and continuing efforts must be made to assure medical treatment for those who truly need it. New state taxes are not the solution to this problem. It is our responsibility to the people of this state to find a way to administer this program within existing funds and still furnish necessary medical treatment.



OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 11.30.67

RELEASE: Thursday, November 30  
11 a.m.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
National Conference of State Legislative Leaders  
St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco  
November 30, 1967

I would like to take this opportunity to welcome all of you here to California.

To those of you who are Republicans, I would be glad to have you stay around -- I could use some help.

To those of you who are Democrats, I hope you all get to be governors some day -- with Republican legislatures.

Seriously, it is a fine thing to see so many of you here. It is indicative of the growing effort in recent years to upgrade both the quality of our legislatures and the quality of the legislation they seek to pass.

Your presence here indicates also the increasing interest in the various legislatures by the citizenry of our nation.

Everywhere we see the voters approving measures to improve the pay and the working conditions of their legislators.

I am proud to say that much of the leadership in upgrading the legislatures has come from California where men in both parties have worked diligently to improve the quality of those who serve and incentives for those capable of serving. The Speaker of our Assembly, Jesse Unruh, has worked tirelessly to bring about adequate staffing for California legislators to make them more able to serve their constituents, and across the aisle, proving the bi-partisan motive of this effort, he has been joined by a veteran Republican, Frank Lanterman.

Just a year ago California voters approved setting legislators' salaries at \$16,000 a year plus a \$25 a day per diem when the legislature is in session. In California, it hardly pays to run for Congress any more -- especially if you have a governor who will call you into special session now and then. So far, though, there has been no indication that a California governor can count on extra votes as a display of gratitude for issuing such calls.

Of course, no governor has a right to expect any legislator to vote his way as a favor or because of political expediency. But it goes without saying he does have a right to expect every legislator to vote the way he thinks is best for his state, irrespective of political considerations. By the same token, the legislature has a right to expect its efforts to be received and signed on that basis and no other.

In these complex times, more than ever before, the legislature is no place for the prima donna or for the legislator who worries more about protocol and prerogatives than he does about his duties to his state and his constituency.

In the early days of my administration we had our problems, not only with the members of the other party, but also with the members of our own.

In retrospect, I think this is understandable.

We were the new boys in town. There was much to be done and much to be learned.

So we learned by doing. But the process was not always easy and the way was not always smooth.

I suppose we made all the usual mistakes and tromped, inadvertently, on a lot of toes. Sometimes in making policy decisions in a hurry, we forgot to notify our own leadership, sometimes they were not there to notify.

In proposing programs, sometimes we did not consult with all those in both parties who thought they should be consulted with.

Often they were right. Once in a while we were.

How they reacted to our mistakes was the measure of the men in both parties.

But most, though they occasionally blew up, occasionally complained, and sometimes wondered if we would ever learn, buckled down and worked for what they conceived to be the best interests of the state.

Some people described the early days of my administration as a honeymoon. My reply was that if it was a honeymoon, I was sleeping alone. And then, looking around at some of those who allegedly were on the honeymoon with me, I decided that sleeping alone was not such a bad idea.



Well, that is the case for two legislative houses. There is, of course, the third house and here, too, the old stereotyped image is fading. The picture of shadowy figures offering favors in an atmosphere of bacchanalian revelry is being replaced by recognized and registered lobbyists representing everything from higher education to business associations and industries. Certainly no one denies the right of the individual or group to such representation. But here, too, you and I have a responsibility to consult now and then directly with the principals to make sure they have been correctly informed regarding proposed legislation and executive actions so that <sup>a</sup>that/lobbyist is truly representing their viewpoint and not just promoting his own political bias.

Of course, now and then we have a lobbyist who is both principal and representative. There is one who journeys up from a coastal city and pickets my office. He claims he has been wronged by the state and frankly I think he has (under a previous administration). Unfortunately my legal affairs secretary, after consultation with him, has decided there is nothing the executive branch can do to help him. He disagrees with the secretary and therefore continues to picket. But we have made some progress; he picketed my predecessor in anger and righteous indignation, but his signs now are written in a tone of sorrow and regret.

But getting back to the professional lobbyists, my feeling is that the day of the oldtime wheeler-dealer is going, at least in California. Since I have been in the Capitol, I have heard it said that the day when they could control votes with campaign contributions, parties, girls and booze is about over.

Speaker Unruh has been quoted as saying that "if a man can be bought with a lunch, he doesn't belong in Sacramento".

He is right. But let me add that if a man can be bought for any price, he does not belong in Sacramento or in any state capitol, and that, too, is our responsibility.

Again, I hasten to add that this is no indictment of the average lobbyist, who has a tough job and does it well. We look on many as friends and some as advisors.

But we also from time to time meet in my office with their bosses. We do not mean to eliminate the middleman. We want them to know firsthand what we are doing and why we are doing it and we do not want anything lost in the translation.

At the risk of sounding just a bit partisan, let me point out that my administration makes no bones about being business-oriented. A healthy business climate means a healthy economy and a healthy economy benefits all our people in jobs, in added tax revenues for added government services, in many other ways.

In addition, we believed and we are finding out it is true, that a government operated on business-like principles is a more efficient, more economical government.

Now we recognize that government, unlike business, is not here to operate at a profit. But our Constitution also forbids us to operate on a deficit.

Business methods, we are finding, can give the taxpayer more for his tax dollar.

Let me tell you just a few of the instances where we have found ways to do things better and cheaper.

You know, last winter we asked nearly 200 of our leading businessmen to form task forces and look at every nook and cranny of our state government to see how it could be made more efficient.

Their recommendations are still being correlated, but already we have accepted many of their suggestions and put them, or are putting them, into effect.

I recognize I have strayed a long way from my discussion of a honeymoon. But suffice it so say that if there were a honeymoon, it has long since ended.

And I am not complaining. Our entire system is based on a network of checks and balances. And among the most important of those is the two-party system where one party checks the other as soon as it gets out of balance.

There are those who complain that our system is slow, and unwieldy, and more designed for an 18th century rural society than for the technological society of the 20th century.

I do not believe that.

The faster science and technology progress, the more necessary it is for our political scientists and those in government to stand back and take a good hard look at where we are going, and how fast.

Science and technology are servants. They can become our masters, if in our hurry to keep up with them, we lose sight of what government is all about.

We can be like that political leader in an emerging nation who, looking up, saw the mob go by. He excused himself to his companion with the words, "There go my people. I must hurry and lead them."

Indeed, we must lead if our nation is to survive in the form we know it, but we must truly lead and not just get out in front and be pushed where the mob or our exploding technology take us.

And let me declare here without equivocation, in this tripartite system of ours, the leadership must come from the executive and the legislative.

It is the duty of the courts to interpret law, not to establish policy or preach a special brand of sociology. Nor is it the privilege of the court to set itself above reproach or criticism.

Often when the courts are criticized, there are those to rush to their defense with the assertion that those who criticize a judicial decision or a judge are criticizing our system.

This is nonsense. And even if it were not, who is to say that our system, great as it is, is above criticism.

Those who criticize the courts are often branded as extremists or facists or worse. This also is nonsense, just as nonsensical as calling the court's defenders Communists.

The courts are an equal branch of government, not a superior branch. Those who sit in judgment are human and as capable of error as you or I.

And the courts, like the legislature and the executive branch are responsible to the people.

Sometimes there are those on the bench who forget this.

As I said a moment ago, it is the duty of the courts to interpret law, not to make it.

Here in California, in my opinion, the judiciary has strayed in several cases into the areas ordinarily reserved for the executive or the legislative.

Our legislature right now is meeting in special session to attempt to straighten out our Medi-Cal program, because a State Supreme Court decision, if taken literally, would force us to cut 160,000 medically indigent persons from our Medi-Cal program before we can reduce any of the program's services to those on welfare.

To put it bluntly, under the court's ruling, we must pay for the cost of treating a cold for a person on welfare before we can treat a cancer afflicting one of our medically indigent.

In other court rulings, stays have been granted en masse to all our condemned men on death row, have delayed the use of supplemental labor from Mexico even after the United States labor department has approved, and have now forbidden the use of volunteer convict labor in harvest emergencies although the precedent for this goes back many years. Granted, it is not the best answer, but it is a better answer than letting crops ripen and rot for lack of harvesters in a world beset by hunger.

Is it any wonder that some congressmen and some legislators are seeking ways of preventing the courts from substituting their personal views for those of the legislative.

As I pointed out a minute ago, this is not a problem just for the executive branch; it is a problem also for the legislative. These two branches must not only be equal to each other, they must also be equal to the judicial branch.

For without equality, we again lose a part of our system of checks and balances.

And just as we must work to maintain our equality with the judiciary, so must we work to retain an equal relationship between our respective branches.

But maintaining an equal relationship does not mean we cannot have an equitable relationship.

The legislative and the executive, regardless of party, must work together in some degree of harmony if the states are to progress and if they are to maintain their sovereignty and not become mere administrative districts of an all-powerful federal government. And this is probably the most pressing problem we face and it puts us in the forward combat position in the defense of freedom. Those who sneeringly reject the term "states' rights" ignore the great part the state plays in providing a built-in guaranty against tyranny. So long as our citizens can vote with their feet and simply cross a state line in search of better and less costly government and freedom from onerous laws and regulations, states are automatically restricted as to how far they can impose on the individually inherent rights.



In our lifetimes, we have watched as the federal government has usurped more and more authority at the expense of the states.

We have watched it pre-empt our tax sources.

We have watched it bypass the states and deal directly with the cities and counties.

We have watched as it has nibbled away a little at a time in many areas of state sovereignty.

And in all honesty, some of you who have watched have approved.

And here I must disagree with those of you who do. Here is where we come to our one moment of truth as we face two loyalties. All of us are torn by a tendency to endorse the national policy if our party is responsible for that policy, but our first responsibility must be to our jobs and the oath we take. And that oath is to no party. We represent sovereign states in a federation.

If we give this up in the name of equality, in the name of efficiency, in the name of progress, we have taken a mighty step backwards.

Because as federal benefits can affect us all, so can federal tyranny.

And let us not delude ourselves into thinking it cannot happen here.

It can, if we let it.

It won't only if we prevent it. And we can prevent it by insisting on limitations of the strength of the federal government and the distance which it can intrude into our lives and into our states.

But to retain our rights at the state and local levels, we must also accept our responsibilities at those levels.

The task is basically yours, the legislators, and mine, the executive's.

If we fail in that task, if we do not meet the responsibilities we are called on to meet, the people will turn, however reluctantly, to the federal government for solutions to all their problems.

And the federal government will willingly and eagerly accept that responsibility.

This then, is the challenge of our times, to the states and to those who legislate in them, and to those who administer the laws--to meet the responsibilities our times demand of us.

And to do it in such a way our states can not only survive, but also maintain their sovereignty, their integrity and the hope they offer to future generations.

Our government was meant to be run by the people and the people can do this only if government and the control of the people's affairs is kept close at hand. In the most unique social order ever conceived by man, our own, we in state government occupy what could be the most unique position. We must have the wisdom and the will not to take unto ourselves powers and rights that are better left to the individual and local communities, and at the same time we must prevent a higher echelon of government from weakening our ability and determination to fulfill this function.

\* \* \* \* \*

(NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, Governor Reagan will stand by the above quotes.)

12/  
14

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
Sacramento, California  
Contact: Paul Beck  
445-4571 12.13.67

RELEASE: Thursday, December 14  
9:30 a.m.

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN  
Governor's Traffic Safety Conference  
Biltmore Hotel, Los Angeles  
December 14, 1967

Good Morning.

It is nice to see that so many people have beaten the freeway odds this morning.

Before this conference is over, I hope you will be able to tell the rest of us how to do it.

You know, I am so old I remember when the slogan "bring 'em back alive" referred to African big game hunts instead of today's traffic driving.

As a matter of fact, I even remember when you didn't have to pay extra for a stick shift and when separate seats in the front were standard equipment. I also remember when there was enough room in the back seat to stretch out your legs.

Those were the good old days when the speed limit was 45 miles an hour and it was hard to bend the steel in the fenders in a collision at that speed and the street was crowded if there were three cars in the same block. And you could always find a parking place on Main Street. And the nickel in your pocket was for coffee, not a parking meter.

Of course, those days are gone forever and that is one reason why we are here--to cope with new conditions and changing times, to make certain the car is a tool of convenience and not an instrument of destruction.

I want to thank all of you for responding to our invitation to attend and participate in this conference on traffic safety, to thank both you experts in the field and you who, though not experts, are concerned citizens.

It will take both of your groups to help us develop and put into effect a meaningful program of traffic safety.

The figures make it evident that we must develop such a program if we are to put an end to our terrible annual toll of traffic deaths and injuries.

You have seen the figures--nearly five thousand Californians killed last year and probably that many again this year. More than 200,000 were injured.



One Californian every two hours dies on the highways.

And the numbers of drivers and vehicles on those highways are increasing rapidly. In fact, unless we do something about it, 200,000 Californians will die in traffic between now and 1990.

How can we prevent this?

Ladies and gentlemen, I do not have the answer. No one man does. But in our society, the people collectively can find the answers and can put them into practice.

And that, again, is why you are here.

I am asking you to join with us to help prevent this kind of slaughter, to help us engage in an all-out program of preventive engineering, education and enforcement.

In California, state government has certain responsibilities in the area of highway safety, primarily:

- to build and maintain the state highway system, and
- to license the vehicles and the drivers who travel on those roads.

At the same time, and properly so, the state has also been given the responsibility and authority to make sure that only safe vehicles and safe drivers operate on our roads.

With your help, we mean to do just that.

Even in these times when travel by motor vehicle is so essential to our economic, cultural and social structure, operating a vehicle on public roads is a privilege conferred by the people upon those citizens who agree to maintain certain standards in the way they drive and in the vehicle they operate.

If the state fails to exercise this licensing procedure correctly and completely, it fails to protect its citizens.

One problem the state faces in this area is the drinking driver. Here we have learned that the problem drinker is the problem driver. A study last year in Oakland compared 150 drivers arrested for drunken driving with 150 ordinary drivers. The ordinary drivers among them had a total of only 65 prior arrests; the drunken drivers had 971, all resulting from the use of alcohol.

Alcohol is involved in approximately 35 percent of all fatal auto accidents. Last year between 1,500 and 2,000 Californians died in automobile accidents -- because of drunken drivers.

We must find a way to stop issuing drivers' licenses to chronic

alcoholics. We must find a way either to rehabilitate problem drinkers or remove them from our highways.

This year, my administration authored and the legislature passed AB 2538 -- the alcoholic demonstration counties law. This landmark legislation is designed to develop an effective and systematic reduction of drunk drivers on our streets and highways. By working with the courts, the law enforcement agencies, and with leaders in the behavioral and medical sciences, we intend to establish a pace-setting program which can prevent accidents and save lives.

This three-year program is now underway.

We intend, next year, to ask for a presumptive limits law for the driver who has been drinking.

This legislation would establish that blood-alcohol contents which exceed a certain level mean that the driver in question is presumed to be "under the influence of alcohol".

All presumptions would be rebuttable in court because due process must be protected. We are not engaged in any witch hunt-- but we are determined to protect our people from the drunk driver.

Finally, in the area of alcohol and traffic safety, we should amend the California coroner law to require postmortem blood-alcohol tests on all drivers and adult pedestrians killed in traffic accidents. Information from these tests is essential to better research. The tests are current practice in most California counties; they should be required in all counties.

More and more our citizens, especially young people, are turning to motorcycles as an inexpensive and swift means of transportation. We have no desire to interfere with this mode of travel, but we must protect the motoring public from obvious dangers.

This year, my administration endorsed and supported motorcycle safety legislation, that would have required special licensing procedures and special protective equipment for motorcyclists. Unfortunately, the legislation was killed in committee.

We will again endorse and support similar legislation next year.

Negligent drivers who have consistent, provable and obvious records of bad driving comprise only two percent of our driving population.

Eighty percent of the drivers having an accident this year will be individuals free of driving accidents in the last two years.

Thus, ~~while~~ while we continue to work with the negligent driver, we must focus more of our efforts on the "average driver" through improved and effective education programs, expanded public information programs, and better licensing standards and techniques.

California is on the way to having an outstanding driver education and driver training program in its secondary schools, but we will not achieve the accepted level of quality in this program until every school district conducts a meaningful, well-directed and effective driver education program.

The Teenage Safety Drive which preceded this conference illustrates that quality driver education pays off.

We will oppose any attempts to weaken the driver education program (which is funded almost in its entirety by the driver penalty assessment fund) and we will continue to work to improve the quality and extend the scope of this program.

As Director Verne Orr of the Department of Motor Vehicles has suggested, perhaps we can stress quality in the secondary school driver education program, expedite a service to the public, and reduce our operating costs, by permitting the schools to certify students as meeting the requirements for the drivers' license. These would relieve the D.M.V. of some 250,000 to 300,000 driver tests each year--the number of young people who annually apply for their first license.

Perhaps a change in our driver licensing procedures should be instituted so that the good driver -- the driver without any recorded citations or accidents -- is rewarded. Under this plan, the "good" driver might have his operator's license automatically renewed and mailed to him, while the "poor" driver would be required to appear in person at the D.M.V. field office to take the written and driving exams.

At any rate, licensing standards should be made more meaningful, and the tests should be given a higher level of validity.

One of the most important factors in our declining death rate (we have dropped from 6.4 deaths per million vehicle miles in 1956 to approximately 4.8 in 1966) in the advancement of medical

science--doctors are getting better at keeping people alive.

Even so, it is estimated that probably 10 percent of the lives lost because of highway accidents could be saved by improving emergency medical service and providing swifter transportation to hospitals or emergency stations.

An important law to increase first aid training for sheriffs, deputies, policemen and firemen was passed this year.

We are now engaged in a survey of the emergency medical facilities and services available to our motoring public -- county by county. This survey will tell us what we can do to provide proper emergency medical services for our motoring citizens.

At the same time that we move to tighten the licensing standards for drivers, we must move to tighten the registration standards for vehicles. We cannot knowingly allow unsafe vehicles on our highways.

The California Highway Patrol is engaged in a random mandatory vehicle inspection program, utilizing 62 passenger vehicle inspection teams throughout the state. We believe this "random mandatory" roadside inspection system has several definite advantages. But even as we continue this system of random vehicle inspection, we should move forward to develop the very best onsite vehicle inspection system. This is essential in these days of highly complex motor vehicles.

California has the finest system of state highways in the nation.

But, they can be made even safer.

State Highway Engineer John Legarra and his staff are constantly working to improve the design, the engineering and the construction of our highways.

However, it is difficult for the state to continue this meaningful planning and designing if the federal government insists on playing politics with the highway funds you have paid to Washington through the federal gas tax. Traffic safety is no place for politics.

At the state level, we have advanced highway safety through economy, as well as through engineering and design. In the first ten months of this year, the departments which operate on motor vehicle and gas tax funds have cut some \$99 million from their



over-head and administrative expenses. This \$99 million will be used to update 44 highway building projects. We are, in other words, spending this money for concrete and steel instead of red tape. Thus, economy in this sense means lives, since many of the projects which will be updated are calculated not only to provide convenience and faster travel, but also safer driving conditions. (The savings of \$99 million is about equal to the revenue which would have been produced had we increased the gas tax one cent per gallon.)

Though highway accidents have reached epidemic proportions, research in traffic safety is woefully inadequate.

I would like to see established a California Center for Traffic Safety Research. This could be a joint effort by government, private and independent sectors -- a public, non-profit institution dedicated to seeking not only the causes but the cures for highway accidents; studying the vehicle, the roadway, the driver.

Such a Research center could probably be funded with the monies already being spent but not coordinated, plus contracts and grants from private organizations and companies.

In recent years, the federal government has become active in the field of highway safety.

We welcome this participation so long as federal participation is directed to increased safety for our citizens, and so long as that participation is directed toward partnership and not preemption.

As we work with the federal government in the highway safety area, we will work even more closely with the city and county government, for the greatest number of accidents and the greatest number of deaths and injuries occur at the local level.

We are especially appreciative of the cooperation we have already received from the League of California Cities and the County Supervisors Association. We are also grateful for the help and the interest of such groups as the Governor's Committee on Traffic Safety, the California Traffic Safety Foundation, the Citizens' Advisory Panel on Traffic Safety and many other groups such as local and regional safety councils. In addition, many women's groups have put in countless hours in this cause.

It would be the greatest tragedy if, because of accelerated government programs, these and other citizens and citizen action groups slackened their efforts.

Increased efforts by such citizen groups, and by each individual citizen, are even more essential now.

After all, government can do just so much in this or any area:

The Governor can set the tone and give the charge to his various administrative agencies; the legislature can enact the laws; the enforcement agencies can enforce them and the courts can interpret and uphold them--but all of this effort falls short of the job unless the citizen and his action groups do their job.

The government can represent your wishes, but it cannot be a substitute for citizen action, follow-through, and determination.

And so, as I said at the beginning, that is why you are here, that is why we invited you to come--to provide the necessary brains, determination and impetus to make our highways safe for all of us and our children in the years ahead.

# # # # #

NOTE: Since Governor Reagan speaks from notes, there may be additions to, or changes in, the above. However, the Governor will stand by the above quotes.)