

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, 1968
[03/15/1968-05/20/1968]

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

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

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

3/18

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 3.18.68

RELEASE: Immediate

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Before Citizens' Conference on the California
Merit Plan for Judicial Selection
Hotel El Dorado, Sacramento
March 18, 1968

First of all, I want to thank all of you for having come here today--for having taken time from your busy schedules--to join with Chief Justice Traynor and me in this Citizens' Conference on the California Merit Plan for Judicial Selection.

In accepting our invitation, you have expressed your support for the plan which will further up-grade the quality of our judiciary in the years to come. I believe that your support reflects a concern on the part of all Californians that the high standards of our judiciary be both maintained and improved upon in the future.

While our state has achieved an enviable reputation for the quality of its judicial system, there remains a chance, under our present system, that ^{at} some time in the future the selection of judges might be made without regard to merit, proven honor, ability and integrity. The California Merit Plan for Judicial Selection was developed with exhaustive care. It has the unqualified support of the State Bar, the Judicial Council and my administration. I believe that a judicial selection system, based solely on competence and not on possible political considerations, will insure that the administration of justice continues to be in the very best interest of the people of this state.

As you know, one of my campaign pledges was aimed squarely at taking the appointment of judges out of partisan politics. Appointment of the best possible judges to the courts of California is a matter of extreme and personal importance to every citizen of this state.

Ours is a government of laws, not of men. Yet, we must always remember that laws are written by men, interpreted by men and changed by men. Because of this, all citizens have an obligation to insure that those who write the laws, those who interpret them and those who judge over them are fair-minded men and women, of proven honor, ability and integrity. Because of this, the method of judicial selection in California is a subject of great concern. It is

essential that attorneys have qualified judges before whom to try their cases. It is imperative that all citizens have confidence that they can obtain from the judiciary equal justice under the law. And it is vital that judges themselves can serve with pride among colleagues of demonstrated quality and merit.

Under our doctrine of separation of governmental powers, a governor can recommend laws but he cannot make the laws or appoint those who do. By the same token, the governor, except in clemency matters, cannot judge under the law, but he can--in fact, under our system, he often must--appoint those who do judge.

This authority places an awesome responsibility and power in the hands of the governor. He, in fact, controls the administration of justice through the men he chooses. Justice can be good, bad or indifferent, depending on the judge--and thus, indirectly, on the man who appoints the judge. While judges must, in theory, be approved by a vote of the people, the fact is that most attorneys who become judges seldom face a real test at the polls. Few judges are initially elected to office. Rather, most of them are appointed to the bench to fill an existing vacancy. And once appointed by the governor, a judge seldom faces opposition. As the incumbent, has a decided advantage over any opponent. Thus, with rare exceptions, the person who the governor selects for judgeship usually has a lifetime position.

It is with this appreciation of the governor's role in the selection of judges, and my responsibility for the executive administration of justice, that I so enthusiastically support this plan for judicial selection. For it would clearly take the selection of judges out of partisan politics. It would maintain the highest standards of judicial selection and insure that any governor could select only the most qualified candidate for appointment to the bench.

I am confident--and have been for a long time--that this plan is what the people of California want. I am pleased to know that you share my enthusiasm.

In last year's legislative session, plans were submitted by my administration and the State Bar to take the selection of judges out of politics. But, unfortunately, they did not gain the approval of the legislature.

The plan that will be explained to you today has been intro-

duced in the legislature by Senator Donald Grisky and co-authored by Assemblyman Bill Bagley.

The Chief Justice and I have asked for quick and favorable action by the legislature. We are sincerely hopeful that it will be approved by our lawmakers. The plan will then go to a vote of the people in November by means of a Constitutional Amendment.

Ladies and gentlemen, this is where you come in. You will form the nucleus of a statewide grass-root effort to enlist support for the plan by the people of this state. You and the local citizens' committees you will form in your communities will be able to carry this message to the people.

I believe that the massive public information program that you are about to embark upon will result in an overwhelming affirmative vote to change the law at the polls in November. Your charge is to explain the many merits of the plan before service clubs, community groups, business organizations and citizen bodies--and to answer those questions they may have with regard to it.

The workshops you will sit in on today will enable you to know much more about the plan yourselves and provide the groundwork for effective action in your communities.

Again, I want to express my sincere appreciation for your having come here today.

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.)

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

LAKE TAHOE BASIN PRESERVATION

I would like to urge quick passage of legislation to take the very important first step toward protecting Lake Tahoe.

While the legislation enacted by the Nevada Legislature to protect Lake Tahoe is not perfect, it is in many respects stronger than the legislation enacted by the California Legislature last year. Failure to enact this legislation would be a great tragedy for the people of California, Nevada and the nation who are concerned about maintenance of the unique environment of Lake Tahoe.

It is doubtful if a more effective piece of legislation can be achieved in subsequent years, and as a matter of fact, it would probably be weakened as time wore on. It would be a tragedy to permit this to be delayed. The bill is nonpartisan in content and nationwide in implication.

It is my opinion that the major portion of the Nevada amendments strengthens the bi-state compact, provides for an orderly approach to its business, and also clarifies the specific areas of jurisdiction of the agency and the counties and the city in the basin.

I feel that we should strongly support the necessary amendments to the California law to bring it into full conformance with the Nevada bill for expeditious action at this session of the Legislature as an urgency measure so that it can be transmitted to Congress for ratification at the earliest possible date.

The bi-state body compact is absolutely necessary to insure that the legislative authorities of the agency controlling the basin are basinwide and clear.

In summary, this legislation represents the efforts of hundreds of people in both California and Nevada who are interested in preserving the Tahoe Basin. The bill is probably as strong as any measure which could attain the support of the majority of local residents, conservation groups, and officials of local and state government in both California and Nevada.

We should adopt the Nevada bill, seek ratification by Congress of the compact, and then work together for the preservation of Lake Tahoe.

If we let this opportunity pass, we may never have another.

#

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

LAKE TAHOE BASIN PRESERVATION

I would like to urge quick passage of legislation to take the very important first step toward protecting Lake Tahoe.

While the legislation enacted by the Nevada Legislature to protect Lake Tahoe is not perfect, it is in many respects stronger than the legislation enacted by the California Legislature last year. Failure to enact this legislation would be a great tragedy for the people of California, Nevada and the nation who are concerned about maintenance of the unique environment of Lake Tahoe.

It is doubtful if a more effective piece of legislation can be achieved in subsequent years, and as a matter of fact, it would probably be weakened as time wore on. It would be a tragedy to permit this to be delayed. The bill is nonpartisan in content and nationwide in implication.

It is my opinion that the major portion of the Nevada amendments strengthens the bi-state compact, provides for an orderly approach to its business, and also clarifies the specific areas of jurisdiction of the agency and the counties and the city in the basin.

I feel that we should strongly support the necessary amendments to the California law to bring it into full conformance with the Nevada bill for expeditious action at this session of the Legislature as an urgency measure so that it can be transmitted to Congress for ratification at the earliest possible date.

The bi-state body compact is absolutely necessary to insure that the legislative authorities of the agency controlling the basin are basinwide and clear.

In summary, this legislation represents the efforts of hundreds of people in both California and Nevada who are interested in preserving the Tahoe Basin. The bill is probably as strong as any measure which could attain the support of the majority of local residents, conservation groups, and officials of local and state government in both California and Nevada.

We should adopt the Nevada bill, seek ratification by Congress of the compact, and then work together for the preservation of Lake Tahoe.

If we let this opportunity pass, we may never have another.

#

3/20

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 3.20.68

RELEASE: P.M.'s

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
California Farm Bureau Federation Convention
Ventura County Fairgrounds, Ventura
March 20, 1968

As one man who wants someday to go back to the farm, it is a pleasure to be here among so many of you that bad weather and worse government policies haven't driven off the farm.

I wonder sometimes at your determination and ability to stick it out in the face of so many adverse factors and so many imponderables.

You know that you are not going to get a break from the federal government but you keep hoping that you might get a break from the weather.

Well, there is nothing we in Sacramento can do about the weather except sympathize, and just how much we can do about government is a matter for discussion because we are hamstrung in so many areas by the power of the federal government, both that which Congress has granted and that which the executive has usurped. So for whatever it is worth, we offer friendly recognition of your problems and a determination to see what can be done. Even if that means only leaving you alone and not piling further rules and regulations on you.

Friendship and determination are not just words; they are the policy of the Department of Agriculture where Earl Coke is a real friend in need, and on to the State Agriculture Board where Allan Grant is one of your own, and on to my own staff where Executive Secretary Bill Clark comes from a pioneer California ranching family and still works at it, when he can find time.

We are pleased that that friendship appears to be a mutual thing between us and certainly the greater part of California's farmers and ranchers. That has been shown in your support of our reorganization bill increasing the responsibilities of the Agriculture Agency Secretary so that some business functions of government report to him as well as agriculture.

To those who have complained this reorganization diminishes the importance of the Agriculture Department and lessens its contacts with the governor, let me simply say:

"If this were the case, we would not have considered it."

Many of you recall a time when agriculture had practically no voice in government affairs or policies. The department was just one of dozens with no recognition of the fact that California agribusiness comprises one third of the state's economy.

Today Earl Coke is a full-fledged member of the cabinet, one of four top-level secretaries involved in determining the policy of the various state departments and making those departments function under guidelines arrived at in cabinet meetings.

For a time Earl occupied a unique position within the cabinet as the only member who represented a single department.

Reorganization will make him a little less unique, but will not in any way lessen the importance of agriculture or our concern with it.

Agriculture will still report directly to me and will retain its voice in the making of state government policy. And I can assure you that in this administration an agriculture-oriented man will always occupy that position.

Reorganization is not intended to downgrade agriculture, but to keep it a growing and vital part of California's economy.

Now, I recognize that that is more easily said than done.

Because what we want and what the farmer needs are not necessarily what the U. S. Department of Agriculture is willing to let him have. In fact, it sometimes seems that the U.S.D.A. and the Department of Labor are more interested in seeing how many roadblocks they can throw in front of the farmer than they are in making it possible for him to compete in a free economy.

They might have destroyed a large part of California agriculture, and they did destroy perhaps the best foreign aid program ever devised, when they denied the importation of supplemental labor even though their best efforts could not produce a domestic work force ready and willing to fill the need. American ingenuity has been able to make up at least part of the difference through development of such machines as cottonpickers, tomato harvesters and pneumatic pruning machines.

However, the labor problem remains severe--as most of you well know--catching you in a cost price squeeze and driving the cost of food to the housewife ever higher. Food prices have never been higher, but your share of the market basket dollar has never been lower.

Jobs once accepted eagerly are now beneath too many people. The answer is either much more mechanization or freedom to import supplemental labor when reasonable efforts fail to produce a domestic work force at harvest time.

The entire current approach to job training and job education is to fit the untrained and the uneducated into an urban sociological framework while all too often crops rot in the field for lack of harvesters.

It is true there are some who come to California and work on our farms and pick our crops and go home the better off for having done so. The so-called green card workers.

But, as usual, in a system inaugurated by the federal government, there is a major flaw. Green card workers only work at the pleasure of the government. If the labor department certifies any California farm, ranch or vineyard as an area of labor dispute, that farm or vineyard cannot hire green card workers. And the farmer has no redress in court. And, because it only takes one party to force a labor dispute, the farmer is vulnerable to coercion. For example, secondary boycotts are illegal--except in the case of farmers and agricultural products. Farms do not come under the National Labor Relations Act. Therefore, it is legal to institute secondary boycotts against farm products.

We know that is being done today in the case of California grapes, that it was done yesterday with California wines and that it may be done tomorrow with other California products.

And there is no redress in the Great Society for California agriculture which has remained 98 percent free of federal controls and subsidies. Could this be what is so disturbing to the planners in the Nation's Capitol--that California farmers are number ^{one} / in the nation, producing almost ^{half} of all the table vegetables, a variety of 250 crops and doing it by the simple free economy rule of supply and demand? Is this upsetting to the planners in Washington with their dreams of a planned farm economy, for further controls over what the farmer can grow and how much?

Despite the fact that the planned approach to agriculture has been a miserable failure to date, the 25 percent of farming that has been subject to government planning has known a steady decline in the per capita consumption of its produce while 75 percent still free has continued to increase per capita consumption of all it produces.

Remember when they criticized Ezra Taft Benson when farm prices slid to 84 percent of parity. Under Orville Freeman and the Great Society they are down to 74 percent of parity. In fact, farm prices have dropped five percent in the last 18 months. The things farmers bought cost them three percent more than a year ago.

Is it any wonder that one fourth of the farms in the nation have disappeared under the New Frontier and the Great Society? Sometime this year the total number of U.S. farms will drop below the three million figure. But Department of Agriculture employees have increased to one for every 25 farms.

---See INSERT - Page 7---

Today, 35 years after the federal government came up with its "answer" to the problems of the American farmer, he is still tied to these old, obsolete controls. He is still compelled to adjust his production, not to the market as he sees it, but rather to what someone in a Washington office tells him production ought to be.

And that "someone" not only can guess wrong but often does. He did in 1967, and as a result, farmers suffered not only in California but throughout the country.

Now, when a program has been in effect for over three decades and has failed to cure the problem it was set up to handle, you might think it is time to have second thoughts about it. To the everlasting credit of the farm community, they have had these second thoughts and have not been bashful about expressing them. The Farm Bureau Federation has been a leader in calling for an end to federal coercion, an end to an artificially regulated farm economy. The consumers don't want it, the farmers don't want it. But they are out-voted by a federal bureaucracy that does want it.

In fact, the administration is asking Congress to make this discredited multibillion dollar crop control program permanent. It is scheduled to expire in 1969. But fortunately, Congress seems unwilling so far to go along with the administration on this. Maybe the voice of the farmer is being listened to more closely in this election year. Certainly, the voice of the American taxpayer is.

There is no denying that the problem of the farmer's lagging income is very real and must be dealt with. But the answer must be found in America's free enterprise system, not in the outmoded, costly and unpopular regimentation under which agriculture has been existing.

Economic gain for himself and his family is the greatest

incentive to success that a man can have, whether he be a farmer or any other businessman. A centrally controlled farm economy does not provide this incentive. On the contrary, it discourages initiative. When this happens you are not just tampering with the mainspring of the American economy--you have broken it.

The role of government, both federal and state, should be to encourage production rather than to suppress it. And that role should include working to increase and liberalize foreign trade so as to open the markets of the world to the unexcelled agricultural products we produce in California and in the United States.

If government plays that role, then I think we can safely leave it up to the agricultural community to produce abundantly those products for which there is a demand, domestically and throughout the world. American agriculture has the know-how to produce what the market demands and will pay for. And that is the formula that makes for profitable farming. That is the formula that makes sense.

But coming back to our domestic agriculture, there is one nagging problem, peculiar to the West, that only the federal government can solve, but one that it won't act on unless we make the will of the people known. That is the 160-acre limitation.

Last April I asked a special task force of prominent attorneys, headed by Earl Coke and our Director of Water Resources William Gianelli, to look at this problem and make recommendations. They reported back in January. And their report reaffirmed what most of us have been thinking all along: The 160-acre limitation is not only unrealistic, uneconomic and obsolete, but also it is unfair to the farmer who must comply with it. It forces him to operate inefficiently, at an unnecessarily high cost per acre. He cannot compete with producers who have lower costs of production because their operations are on a large scale and can take advantage of the great technological advances that have revolutionized agriculture.

The task force recommended the limitation be raised to 640 acres and that this figure be reappraised by the Secretary of the Interior at least every ten years to keep in step with future changes in agricultural technology and economics.

This report is now under study by many people throughout the nation and hopefully a solution will be soon forthcoming.

Another problem is up to us to solve at the state level. California farmers, like the rest of us Californians, are the victims of high and continually rising property tax rates. In many cases excessive property taxes are the direct cause of farm failures.

This administration is dedicated to bringing property tax relief to all our citizens. We have already taken a number of steps in that direction such as increasing state aid to schools, thus allowing school districts to reduce their property tax rates. And if the legislature will cooperate, we will provide \$155 million more in property tax relief next year by turning sales tax funds back to the counties for the specific purpose of using those funds to cut property tax rates further.

In addition, this administration is dedicated to the proposition that farm lands should be taxed as farm lands and not as potential subdivisions. We will seek legislation to accomplish that end.

The challenge of the remaining years of the 20th century to those of you who depend on agriculture--that you defend that stake and you build on it so that your children and my children will have a better and free-er tomorrow.

Those of you in the Farm Bureau are dedicated to meeting that challenge. I know, for I have seen and read the "Farm Bureau Policies for 1968." And you and I are dedicated to the same things--to freedom, to less government interference in and control over our lives, to self-government and to the principle that maintenance of individual rights means acceptance of individual responsibilities. But, if you will permit a paraphrase, dedication without work is meaningless.

Those who would destroy those principles on which our nation was founded are a small minority. Their weapons are fear, distrust, misrepresentation and an ability to play on those who live in ignorance, poverty and squalor. And behind them, supporting them, are those who should know better, but who have forgotten that you cannot give a man freedom and dignity; that he must earn it, that what those who live in squalor and poverty and distrust need is a hand up, not a handout.

It is up to the rest of us to provide that hand-up that allows a man to earn or regain his self-respect.

Government alone cannot do it and should not do it. If we are to succeed, it will take the interest and effort of the independent sector--those of you outside of government.

I choose to call this involvement of people in the affairs of government and the problems of society the Creative Society.

A creative government is a necessary thing. But it cannot accomplish much unless the citizens who make up our society are also creative--unless they are willing to take a fresh look at old problems and work out better solutions.

When both government and the independent sector think and act creatively as a team--neither one telling the other what it must do but rather what each can do to reach a goal important to both--then there is no problem that we cannot solve.

We have been offered the Great Society. But it has become obvious that the price Washington wants us to pay for the Great Society is too high--too high in loss of freedom, too high in crime and chaos, too high in inflation and economic disaster.

A creative society can work in agriculture as well as in the city.

It is the creative energy and the productive genius of the California farmer that have made agriculture the number one industry in the state and California the number one agricultural state in the nation.

Part of this, of course, is due to our climate and our weather. But last year the weather was terrible for farming--at least in the spring, when we had that long spell of cold, wet weather. And the freeze we had toward the end of the year didn't help much either.

And yet, even though our total production fell below the previous year's all-time high, we retained our position as number one.

No--although our great California climate plays a major role, it is the independence and resourcefulness of the California farmer that is the key to his success. It is those qualities that we must look to if we are to have a truly creative society that affects every area of our state and nation.

It is those qualities that we must have, must instill and must exploit if California is to grow and if America is to survive in an ever more complex and ever more explosive world.

#

(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.)

INSERT - Take just a moment to contrast this with our own Department of Agriculture under Earl Coke. He has reduced costs in the Department by 10 percent, the number of employees 185, and at the same time is rendering improved services to the farmers

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

WELFARE

It does not take an expert in public welfare to recognize that there is great dissatisfaction with the present method of providing financial assistance and services to the aged, disabled and dependent.

Criticism and concern are voiced by those in all walks of life, including both the welfare worker and the welfare recipient.

Those receiving welfare are annoyed by delays and red tape and dismayed by a system that offers them no way out of poverty, a system which, in fact, tends to keep them forever shackled to a public dole.

The welfare professional is frustrated by the chains of regulations, the endless paper work and the daily intimate view of the consequences of a system that has not met its goals.

And the taxpayer becomes increasingly resentful of the ever-mounting cost of programs which too often appear to him to provide other families with things at his expense that he cannot afford for himself.

In the past decade, the average number of welfare recipients in California has risen 126 percent while the state's population has increased by only 38 percent. California's welfare bill exceeds a billion dollars a year. We now have 1.3 million people on welfare.

The Aid to Families with Dependent Children category has led the way up, its cost skyrocketing by 350 percent.

During the past year, Spencer Williams, secretary for Human Relations, and John Montgomery, Social Welfare director, have been concentrating on four objectives:

- (1) Simplification of procedures so that social workers spend less time on paper and more on case work, so that the truly deserving recipients have the security that comes with understanding to what they are entitled, and so overhead expenses may be reduced.
- (2) Finding where costs may be cut without interference with long established and continuing public concerns for the well-being of all our aged, disabled and dependent.
- (3) Opening new opportunities for parents to get off the welfare rolls and on to payrolls.

(4) Snapping the chain of dependency so that the more than 600,000 children now on the welfare rolls grow up with a chance to understand the importance of being self-supporting and fully-participating members of the community.

Achieving these objectives will be no easy task, nor one quickly accomplished. The legacy of despair and pessimism left through the decades by the current system will be slow to reverse, but we can start.

I am recommending legislation leading to the creation of a uniform standard of assistance covering all categories of aid, ultimately eliminating the 25 different need items which unnecessarily complicate present welfare administration for worker and recipient alike.

At present there are a variety of special need allowances all neatly itemized and many quite unrealistic.

I have a feeling that our main objective of helping people has been lost sight of in a welter of regulations that have government prescribing allowances based on everything from how many calories and vitamins the recipient ought to have for dinner to what he should pay to have his yard kept up.

The average person doesn't live that way. He looks at the amount of money he has and plans his life accordingly. This is the way we all do.

Most of the aged and disabled are capable of running their own affairs. They don't want government to tell them how to do it, especially when the result is more confusing than helpful.

With procedures and requirements simplified, the recipient will be able to know what benefits he is entitled to, as well as what his responsibilities are.

For the first time, perhaps, the taxpayer also will be able to understand what it is that he is paying for.

The system also has tried to categorize the recipient. There are separate categories of Aid to Families with Dependent Children and Aid to Families with Unemployed Parents of Dependent Children. There is Aid to the Blind, Aid to the Potentially Self-supporting Blind and Aid to the Needy Disabled. There is another separate program for the aged.

Not only does this create the need for repetitious paperwork and increase administrative red tape, but it also has led over the years to creation of inequitable differences in aid payments to the various categories, apparently without any recognition of the fact that people live in family groups.

There can be a blind recipient whose wife is an old age assistance recipient, or a disabled recipient whose husband is an old age assistance recipient, or there can be a combination of all three of these categories. We should treat them as husband and wife who plan together for their common needs and interests.

Differences exist in residence requirements, in the amount of property that can be held, the extent to which income may be retained and in the minimum and maximum amount of aid that can be paid.

Monthly benefits for the disabled have lagged behind those paid under the Aid to the Blind and Old Age Security programs. On the average, disabled recipients have monthly incomes that are \$15 less than a recipient of Old Age Security and \$30 less than a recipient of Aid to the Blind.

Worse, existing law (Section 13700 Welfare and Institutions) places a ceiling on the maximum average grant to the disabled which will have the effect of forcing a reduction in the average benefit this fiscal year.

Therefore, in addition to the legislation already mentioned to eliminate the chaotic situation created by a variety of categories and aid standards, I am asking the legislature to approve urgency legislation to increase the maximum average grant for the disabled for both this fiscal year and next.

I propose this increase as an interim measure pending enactment of legislation to provide better home care services for the disabled under a more favorable federal sharing formula. The new formula could produce an ultimate \$4 million sharing in state costs and eliminate \$1.6 million now contributed by the county taxpayer.

This approach also would keep persons in their homes in preference to costlier, but less satisfactory, hospital and institutional care.

In addition, it would provide employment opportunities to other aid recipients as homemakers.

Sharing of Proceeds of Estates Equally Among all Taxpayers

We Californians are proud of the fact that we lead the nation in almost everything. Regrettably, our leadership in welfare expenditures is unchallenged. We were one of the first states to provide for our elderly when the 1929 legislature established such a program. From that time until today, we have continuously liberalized our programs and increased our benefits without great concern about our ability to pay.

Meanwhile, we have seen great changes in the mode of living, in the type of housing, and in the separation of grandparents from the family home. Indeed, the notion about the family homestead has long since passed. No longer does the old home stand as a symbol of past family relationships and as a place for family to reunite annually.

Parents wish to be independent of their children and it has been in recognition of this that the legislature has virtually repealed responsibility of sons and daughters to contribute to the support of their parents. The fact is that a person earning, for example, \$16,000 a year has absolutely no responsibility under our law to contribute to his parents' support if he is married and has two children. In this anomalous situation, we still permit these relatives who have been absolved of filial responsibility to inherit the estates of the recipients.

It is my belief that where the taxpayers have assumed responsibility for the aged and disabled, then these taxpayers should share equally with relatives in settlement of the proceeds of the estates of recipients.

Accordingly, I am asking the legislature to enact a bill which permits the state to share in the proceeds of the settlement of estates of deceased recipients, with the provision that such settlement shall not be required as long as the spouse lives in and utilizes the home. This would be accomplished by making aid payments to adults a lien against any property owned by the recipient which would not be executed until the death of any surviving spouse.

A lien provision would not penalize the recipient in any way, nor would it deprive him of the full use of his property while he or his spouse require it. Such a provision would reduce expenditures in the adult categories of aid by about \$13 million a year.

Reasonable Living Cost Sharing by Parents of Disabled

The newest of our categorical programs is the Aid to the Disabled. This program, which started in 1957 under very strict definition of disability, was greatly liberalized by enactment of AB 59 by the 1963 legislature.

Since that time, this program has grown at an alarming rate. Upon review, I find that we have situations where aid is being paid on behalf of disabled persons who are residing in the homes of their parents, when, at the same time, the family income is substantial. This situation arises because, along with the tremendous liberalization in the definition of disability made by the 1963 legislature, also included in that package was a repeal of relatives' responsibility.

So we now find ourselves in the business of supplementing the income of families who have substantial income and classifying as a needy person a disabled person who resides in a home and lives under a standard of living that is anything but the minimum standard of assistance.

Accordingly, I am asking for legislation which will eliminate this subsidization of family income where it is not justified. Parents would be held to be responsible relatives under these circumstances. The annual reduction in cost would approximate \$3.5 million.

Payments to Married Couple on basis of Joint Living Plan

We have one other area where our public welfare policies are in conflict with the normal pattern of family living. This is the situation where we are treating a married couple as two single individuals and making individual grants to them as though they had no relationship to each other. Only in the case of housing have we computed need on a shared basis. I am asking for legislation to require that the computation of grants for couples take into account all shared items.

These include transportation, household operations, recreation and other items. It is estimated that this will save \$3.9 million a year.

But the most efficient and effective welfare system is no substitute for employment.

Through creation of the Job Training and Placement Council headed by Lt. Gov. Robert Finch and the cooperative efforts of the private sector led by H. C. (Chad) McClellan, we have intensified and consolidated efforts to place welfare recipients in realistic training programs and in jobs.

In my reorganization message I proposed creation of a Department of Human Resources Development and a Department of Commerce. These organizations would help create new jobs, and provide new employment opportunities while simultaneously training our hard core unemployed for productive work.

Community status and a personal feeling of worth are related to the extent to which an individual is a full and vigorous participant in the job market. By the end of last December, more than a half million children were dependent upon public assistance and, therefore, living in a dependency environment.

Congress, in enacting the Social Security Amendments of 1967, gave major consideration to the problem of moving these children from a dependency environment to self-sustaining family environment.

The combined efforts of Congress and the recommendations of the Job Training and Placement Council should begin to offer hope for the future instead of despair for the more than 600,000 dependent children.

In addition to legislation on work training, and to further emphasize the significance, necessity and urgency of employment, I am asking the legislature to enact measures which will remove from the Aid to Families with Dependent Children program the incentive to remain on aid by establishing a limit on family payments to coincide with the earning limit of a family breadwinner who is working at the minimum wage level.

This proposed legislation will complement the administrative progress that has been made in the past year. For example, by the end of June, social workers will have been relieved of the responsibility for the detailed task of annually establishing the eligibility of some 293,000 old age security recipients. This shift reduces the cost of the local property taxpayer while increasing service to the recipient.

I have instructed Spencer Williams and John Montgomery to continue to seek administrative improvement of the present system. But beyond that, we are seeking new, innovative approaches to the problem of public dependency that weld together all of the available resources, public and private.

One such effort is Project FOCUS that was just launched in cooperation with Fresno city and county. This pilot program will employ the most modern management techniques to effect close coordination of all of the many federal, state, local and private agencies in a concerted thrust to reduce not only unemployment and public dependency, but also potential public dependency.

I submit that to avoid and reduce the need for welfare is much more rewarding than to perpetuate an unworkable program that robs Californians of the initiative to make a place for themselves in society.

#

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
CALIFORNIA REPUBLICAN ASSEMBLY - CONVENTION
Claremont Hotel, Berkeley
March 30, 1968

The President's Commission report accuses us--you and I--all of us--of white racism.

It is a stigma we will live with from now on in our communities and with our fellow citizens unless we prove that they are wrong. You and I know that many of today's problems are the result of the prejudice that has divided mankind from the very beginning.

We know that there are those today who still spread the poison of bigotry and we cannot ignore them any more than we should overlook those others who are determined that no American will ever again have to tell his child he is denied some of the blessings of this land because he is in some way different.

And that is where you and I come in. We can take an interest. We can make the difference. We can insure equal rights and equal opportunity and equal treatment for all our citizens. We can do this by becoming involved in this great problem.

And make no mistake about it, if you and I as citizens do not become involved, government will--and at everybody's expense, because government always tends to work toward a common denominator, without much regard for individuals.

But we have an opportunity in this nation today to prove what freedom and equality are all about. We have a chance to prove that as Americans we can live up to our responsibilities toward our fellow men.

We have an opportunity to prove that we care.

You know that I have shunned labels as divisive in our party, but now let me refer to the one applied to us and our philosophy---conservative. We have assailed many of the programs launched in the name of liberalism and as a result have been charged with opposing the humanitarian goal.

We have seen these programs fail to achieve their purpose and in failing, lead to frustration and hopelessness on the part of those they were meant to help.

Who better than conservatives is there to cope with these problems? Is not our philosophy based on a belief in the individual, his freedom and his rights?

Now let us prove that ours is the way that can best meet this challenge, because we do believe in people--in their right to equal opportunity and human dignity. Here is our chance to prove that we are more than just negative critics.

Here is a chance to prove that the conservative way is the wave of the future because it works, because it can assure a man the dignity and the freedom he is entitled to in this land of ours.

In the last few weeks I have been meeting with members of California's minority communities all over the state.

I have been learning at first hand from them how our education system has failed them....how they are just passed from grade to grade and graduated without being able to read and write when they should keep them and hold them if they fail to make the grade, and teach them to learn what they are supposed to learn.

I have learned how our economic system has failed them....failed to extend the bounty that is the right of any of our citizens. And yet, these good responsible citizens in these communities sometimes bitterly, but more often with a patience that is hard for us to understand, sit in these meetings and you learn how they are standing between us and between those who have decided that they have reached the end of the road and that the only answer is the last, hopeless gesture of the club and the torch.

They have come and they have talked to me about the problems. Now, together you and I have to do something about this---better than what has gone on before. We can do something about it. It is our responsibility, but at the same time, it is good business. The alternative is to continue to support many of them on dole, to perpetuate their poverty.

But at the same time, there isn't a business in this country that is not begging for skilled workers while these people are begging for jobs and all we need to do is to provide the skills and we have the workers; they have the jobs. We do not have to pay the support any more---for they join us, in a productive economy helping support further programs and helping to pay the taxes to bear the load with the rest of us.

Think what it would do for American business if we could simply raise the minority population of this country to the national average. It is a potential market that is bigger than all the foreign markets of today that we are trying to hang on to.

This is good business. But also it is just plain good. We shouldn't be doing this as a crash program trying to find some palliative that will head off a long, hot summer. We should do this because it is morally right.

There was a French philosopher by the name of deTocqueville, who came to this country a hundred years ago searching for the secret of our greatness and he finally found it. He said, "America is great; it is good." And he said if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great. This is good---that we join with these people in the American dream. The American dream that we have nursed so long that is so almost beyond our reach any more is not a dream that every man will be level with every other man. It is a dream that every man will be free to become whatever God ordained he should be and this dream is our responsibility and the great heritage that we can pass on to our children.

#

(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.)

4/3

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Robert E. Kennedy Inauguration as President
California Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo - April 3, 1968

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 academician 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 lawbreaker--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 agriculturalists, and yes in these days, not only for a literate public, but also for a well-educated and knowledgeable populace.

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

Now there is no question but that Californians have assigned a high priority to higher education. Otherwise they would not be taxing themselves more than half a billion dollars in the coming year just to pay for the public four-year colleges and universities, to say nothing of the cost of the junior college system.

But in a state that by law must live under a balanced budget, must assign gasoline taxes only to highway purposes, and must also supply funds for the remainder of the education system, a great variety of welfare programs and just the day-to-day costs of running government, there is a limit on the amounts that can be allocated to higher education.

The cruel fact is that if we are to do more in this area, we must find new funds. And as I pointed out earlier there is a limit to the amount we can tax before we come up against the law of diminishing returns.

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, for instance, 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 college or 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 and must know--new knowledge found 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 old fashioned idea of "loco parentis" and claims he is there to impart knowledge, not to substitute for absentee parents. But he cannot 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 college'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 importation 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 icebox 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 mere administrative districts enforcing uniform laws and regulations, and where the font of all wisdom and all authority is in a distant capital, far removed from the people or their problems.

Higher education in contemporary America has a sacred obligation to instill not only learning but attitudes toward growth and learning that in turn will shape society.

You are here to find yourselves as individuals. But in a larger sense you are here so that eventually you can contribute to the progress of our nation and the betterment of the society in which we live.

Sometimes it seems that we have forgotten man's spiritual heritage; we have placed security above freedom and confused the citizen's responsibility to society with society's responsibility to the individual.

It is up not only to my generation but also to your generation to examine anew our individual goals and aims as well as what we want for this country of ours.

Is it enough to have material things? Aren't liberty and morality and integrity and high principle and a sense of responsibility more important?

The world's truly great thinkers have not pointed us toward materialism; they have dealt with the great truths and with the high questions of right and wrong, of morality and honor.

They have dealt with the purpose of man, not the acquisition of things. And when civilizations have disregarded their findings, when they have turned to the things of the flesh, they have disappeared.

You are concerned with my generation and what seems to be hypocrisy and lack of purpose on our part. And we in turn are concerned about your generation, seeing a rising spirit of unrest, aimlessness and drifting, a feeling of rebellion without a real cause that results sometimes in meaningless but violent actions. Now let me make it plain. I am aware that all of you are unfairly suspect because of a very small percentage of dissidents.

Nevertheless, you do seek a purpose and a meaning to life and apparently we have failed to give it to you. But, again, our failure was not one of bad intent.

We are the classic example of giving to you what we never had... from TV to wheels, from dental care to Little League. But I am afraid we have shortchanged many of you on responsibilities or the right to earn for yourselves.

All too often, because we had to earn, we wanted to give. Our motives have been laudable, but our judgment has been bad. "No," was either a dirty word or dropped from our vocabulary.

Some time ago in Newport, California, a row of luxurious oceanfront homes were threatened by an abnormally high tide and heavy surf. All through the day and night, volunteers worked, piling sandbags, in an effort to save these homes. Local TV stations, aware of the drama, covered the struggle. It was about 2 a.m. when one newscaster grabbed a young fellow in his teens, attired only in wet trunks. He had been working all day and night--one of several hundred of his age group. No, he did not live in one of the homes they were trying to save, and yes, he was cold and tired. The newscaster inevitably got around to why. The answer was so poignant, such an indictment of so many of us, it should be on a billboard across the nation. He said: "Well, I guess it's the first time we've ever felt like we were needed."

You are needed, we need your courage, your idealism, your new and untried viewpoint. You know more than we did at your age, you are brighter, better informed, even healthier. And because human kind is vertically structured, we can take a little credit for that. But, you want a purpose, a cause, a banner to follow and we owe you that.

A few years ago, a national magazine did a series of articles by prominent people including a president, a vice president and distinguished statesmen. Each wrote his idea of what was our national purpose. Somehow, nothing very exciting or profound resulted from these articles.

I have always felt it was because they tried to invent something we already have and have had for 200 years. Our national purpose is to unleash the full talent and genius of the individual, not to create mass movements with the citizenry subjecting themselves to the whims of the state. Here, as nowhere in the world, we are established to provide the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order.

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.

Does it seem sometimes that we have left your generation with no cause to believe in, no banner to follow? This is not true--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 this could be the challenge to your generation--your rendezvous with destiny--to keep that door 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.)

GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT TO AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT STUDY COMMISSION
APRIL 4, 1968; 11:00 A.M.; GOVERNOR'S COUNCIL ROOM

Last year Assembly Bill 764 was passed by the Legislature creating in state government the Automobile Accident Study Commission of which you are now members. The legislation states that studies of your Commission shall include studies of automobile accidents, including prevention, insurance, motor vehicle and procedural laws relating to automobile accidents, and the expeditious and adequate financial recourse of automobile accident victims. Specific mention is also made of the existing common law tort liability system and its relation to insurance of motor vehicles.

I have appointed Judge David Coleman of Los Angeles to be your Chairman. I know that all of you will work closely with him on this most important project. The authorization of this Commission by legislation is a first for this country. I know that the results will be another first. Your work is critical. We simply must make certain that the cost of automobile insurance is at a level where it is within the economic means of as many of our citizens as is possible.

The problems of automobile insurance are most critical to California since we have over 10% of the nation's automobiles. Californians like their autos and need them since to date there does not exist in California adequate transportation alternatives to the automobile.

I ask that you first determine the extent of the problem. Reports from Washington claim that costs have soared and that extensive changes are needed in the present system. We have also received information that there are some logical reasons for higher costs such as normal inflation and more and better coverage in the form of higher liability limits, theft and towing charge coverage, medical payments, uninsured motorist protection, etc. We also know that automobile costs and values have greatly increased and naturally have affected insurance costs.

Regardless of the reasons, the spiraling cost of automobile insurance is hitting Californians hard. From a study recently conducted in Los Angeles in connection with a transportation demonstration project, we have just learned that in the Watts area, only 46% of 534 men interviewed had access to an automobile. It was also learned that 38% of the available cars were uninsured. While we recognize that the sample used in that survey was not developed on a completely scientific basis, the data realized still leads us to the logical conclusion that many of our low-income citizens are unable to afford and/or obtain auto insurance.

GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT TO AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT STUDY COMMISSION
Page 2

The insurance companies themselves are in a difficult situation. They are in the business of underwriting insurance risks well and yet, the better they do this job, the more difficult it is for many of our citizens to obtain insurance. In other cases, if insurance can be obtained, the premiums go up to compensate for the higher risks.

I hope the Commission will take an objective look at the non-fault type of system which is now being studied by the American Bar Association as well as other State jurisdictions. I understand that there are many pros and cons on the system. I do believe that it is important, however, to consider carefully the feasibility of such a system if it could benefit our citizens. Under the concept, as I understand it, a person files a claim against the company insuring his own car rather than proceeding against the third party and his company. This concept would convert the present fault or tort liability system to that of a contractual basis. Since the fault system is a basic part of our American system of justice, careful study is needed before any drastic changes are proposed. One question that should be posed on the non-fault system is, to what extent would responsibility for accident involvement be removed? An objective look is needed. I hope in this aspect of your studies that you will seek the cooperation of the State Bar of California.

It would seem to me that one broad objective of the Commission would be to determine whether accident victims are reasonably compensated. I am told that there is a contention that insurance companies are forced by the system to overpay small "nuisance" claims since it costs more to fight these claims than it does to settle. At the same time, citizens with large legitimate claims are often unable to wait for a case to come to trial and must settle for whatever the insurance company offers. This type of situation may be the result of the system under which insurance companies must operate.

We also must give consideration to tighter driver license controls as well as to better law enforcement and more emphasis on traffic safety. In connection with drivers license controls, Stanford Research Institute has stated that if 20% of all licensed drivers lost their licenses, the accident rate would go down 80%. We would appreciate your views on this subject.

While this study, of necessity, is for the long range, I also feel it is important that you consider and recommend any interim solutions that would tend to minimize and relieve the current problem of high auto insurance costs.

GOVERNOR'S STATEMENT TO AUTOMOBILE ACCIDENT STUDY COMMISSION
Page 3

In discussing auto insurance, I would be remiss in not mentioning the fact that it is critical that we do a good job on the state level in order to avoid federal control of the insurance business. I hope the work of this Commission can aid in enabling California to be the nation's leader in solving this critical problem.

In summary, I believe that it is also important to emphasize the good aspects of the present long-established system. Are all of the complaints on auto insurance justified? We certainly would not want to have major surgery done on the system when minor surgery would do the job.

In order to aid you in this study, I ask that you coordinate with the Business and Transportation Agency, headed by Gordon C. Luce, as my representative. All affected departments of state government are at your disposal for data and backup information. Please feel free to utilize their capabilities whenever you so desire.

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 4.11.68

SPEECH DELIVERED BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
BEFORE THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL PRESS CLUB
Washington, D.C. April 5, 1968

Thank you very much.

I've crossed the path of many of you a number of times during the last year along the "mashed-potato circuit." And since you all read each other, it's hardly a secret that I've been going on at great length and even greater detail about the nuts and bolts side of the government of California. And some of you who've been assigned to cover what must have seemed like the pilot and all of the reruns must think by now after listening to me on a number of occasions that California kids grow up wanting to play "bookkeeper and budget."

Now, it's true that we've devoted a great deal of time and attention to restoring fiscal stability and effecting economies to insure the solvency of our state. We've instituted modern business practices. We've reduced the number of state employees. We've eliminated unnecessary office space, and we've streamlined operations generally.

We have in fact reduced government costs by tens of millions of dollars. Not, as some have charged, because we're not responsive to the needs of the people, but precisely because we are responsive to those needs. Public officials are elected to solve problems, and when they fail to keep a hand on the cost of the nuts and bolts, the problem-solving machinery of government grinds to a halt. We've made a start in reducing both the size and cost of government, but at the same time we've made a start on some of the most vexing programs and problems confronting not only Californians but also, I'm sure, all Americans in all of the fifty states.

How can it be that our affluent society, capable of producing goods and services in the amount of some eight hundred billion dollars a year, with an unfilled demand for skilled workers, at the same time can add tens of thousands of people each year to the welfare rolls, until the percentage who are living on public subsistence is greater than at any time in our history, even including the days of the Great Depression?

Well, we believe that it's possible, very possible, that the approach itself to welfare as we've known it in these recent decades could have something to do with this.

In the last ten years, while our state's population was increasing 39 percent, the cost of welfare in constant dollars in California went up 247 percent. As a state, we rank third in poverty and first, in the last few years, in the amount of federal poverty funds that are assigned there. Some of us out there think that welfare has at last revealed itself to be a colossal failure, just as charity is a failure unless it makes people independent of the need for it.

As presently constituted, welfare's great flaw and weakness is that it perpetuates poverty for the recipients of welfare, institutionalizes their poverty into a kind of permanent degradation. We think that it's time that we re-orient and re-direct welfare so as to stop destroying human beings and instead to start saving them.

We're trapped in a multiplicity of regulations and an administrative nightmare, imposed by federal regulations and red tape, that are an inseparable part of the federal grants and aid.

Fortunately, however, there are some loopholes. We discovered that we are permitted here and there to experiment, and so with the permission of the government in Washington, we've launched a pilot program in the area of welfare. We've taken all those multitudinous agencies that are dealing with this one particular problem and in one community, Fresno, we have put all of these programs into one. It is one coordinated effort under one director and we're going to feed the recipients of public subsistence into one end of this combined effort.

At a certain check-point, those who cannot provide for themselves, those who, whether it's through age or disability, must depend on the rest of us, will drop out of that program into this permanent subsidy on the public. We hope that in so doing and in streamlining this, we'll be able to prove that we can provide not only some of the necessities but some of the comforts that make life worth living for those unable to care for themselves.

It is ridiculous to find that there are eighteen separate categories of people on welfare. What does it matter why people are dependent if they are dependent? Our obligation is plain and simple: to provide for them, and we can do this by welfare in one considered effort.

But the rest of those people will continue on through the screening programs of job training, analysis of their problems, and eventually through job training, out the other end into private enterprise jobs. Jobs with a future. In other words, we are going to attempt to break the dependency cycle of welfare and make people independent of it. Perhaps in a year-and-a-half or two years, we will have the information to come to Washington and lay our findings before the government and ask for the flexibility to apply this on a wider basis.

We have at the same time in our state, doubled the number of physically and mentally handicapped who have been rehabilitated in the last year and placed out in useful employment.

We'll have a summer employment program for youth, aimed at the disadvantaged. It'll involve the independent sector and the local communities in a program to provide useful and gainful employment. The state government also will be involved. We've been able to make 3,000 jobs available, some are vacation replacements but many will have actual training jobs leading to permanent employment in public service.

But one problem overshadows all the others, and last night the cowardly hand of an assassin laid that problem on America's doorstep.

Whatever your opinion of Martin Luther King, whether you approved or disapproved, our nation died a little last night also.

It started dying and his murder began with our first acceptance of compromise with the law.

That compromise ranges from our indifference when some would apply the law unequally to some of our fellow citizens, to those who today, black or white, say it is up to us as individuals to decide which laws will be obeyed and which laws broken.

And it includes those in government, unless and until they have the courage to say the law will be enforced and will be enforced equally and applied to all men on an equal basis. *e quality*

The time has come for all of us to make a choice. Either we reaffirm our faith in man's ability to meet his fellow man in a spirit of good will with a determination to eliminate their differences peacefully, or we turn savage. We who are white must accept the responsibility for rendering the night-rider and his more gentlemanly ally, the friendly neighborhood bigot, impotent.

And those good, responsible people who make up the vast majority of the black community, must repudiate the bigots in their midst. Any other path leads only to the jungle, where those who are outnumbered die.

The President's Commission Report accuses us, you and me, all of us, of white racism. It's a stigma we'll live with from now on in our communities and with our fellow citizens unless we prove they're wrong.

You and I know that many of today's problems are the result of prejudice--prejudice that has divided mankind from his very beginning. We know too, that there are those today who continue to spread poison of bigotry and we can't ignore them any more than any of us should ignore those others, those millions of others who are determined, and who have been working ceaselessly over the recent years, to make sure that no American ever again will have to tell a child that that child is denied some of the blessings of this land because in some way he is different.

And that's where you and I come in. We can take an interest and we can make a difference. We can insure equal rights and equal opportunity and equal treatment for all our citizens. We can do this by becoming involved in this great problem.

During the past few weeks, I've been traveling up and down the state of California. I've been going into small meetings, without fanfare, with no press coverage, because that wasn't the purpose of the meetings. I've been quietly meeting with leaders of our minority groups in communities throughout California, and when I say leaders, I don't just necessarily mean the names that you are familiar with that appear in the public print as leaders. I mean those people who are dealing at first hand with the problem in their own neighborhood. Most of the time I've listened to their grievances, their suggestions, their hopes, and their hopelessness.

There's no standard pattern to these meetings. In some, I've met with great bitterness, and in some, I've heard suggestions and information about our own efforts to find solutions. I've learned how our educational system has failed them, how in too many instances we're passing, particularly the student from the minority area, passing the student from grade to grade simply because he's reached the end of the term and not because he's learned anything. And at the end

of the line he's handed a certificate or a diploma and it's meaningless, because there's no knowledge that goes with it.

He's unable to even read the directions at the beginning of a job training program.

I've learned how our economic system has failed to extend its bounties, as it should, to all who are willing to make an honest effort. I've heard their disillusionment with government programs, promising an instant tomorrow, but designed too often with political opportunism and expediency in mind.

M O R E

-5-

I've been charged, of course, with being opposed to the humanitarian goals because I've vetoed some of those poverty programs. You know, the law permits the governor to veto the programs and being totally inexperienced, I hadn't discovered that you weren't expected to, so I did. For example, in Ventura County of California, there was a program that on the face of it sounded very sound. It was to put 17 of the hard-core unemployed to work clearing the open-park lands that we have acquired. It sounds all right. But I vetoed the program when I learned that more than half of the budget was going to provide seven administrators to make sure that the seventeen got to work on time.

But that is nothing, compared to one of the programs in Chicago. Eight hundred and seventy-two thousand dollars granted to one of those political gerry-built organizations that was to teach basic reading and arithmetic to dropouts. An inquiring reporter went down after a time to see how the class was coming and he interrupted a crap game.

It was explained that it was recess and then he said, "How are we doing?" Well, take the faculty, who weren't paid an excessive amount, but who also weren't worked an excessive amount. One of them was in jail for murder, one was in jail for conspiracy to commit murder, three were out on bond awaiting trial for rape, one was out on probation for a burglary conviction. And the director said it was too soon to determine whether the program had been a success.

But these teachers were paid, in addition to their salaries, five dollars a head for each dropout they brought in, and since they were able to offer a dropout forty-five dollars a week plus a family allowance, they found that the best place to pick up an easy five dollars was at the nearest school where they were talking the kids into dropping out and coming over.

Now, this is our fault. Our willingness to accept politics as usual, our easy tolerance for wrong-doing in government, as if this is just standard practice, and we should not feel any urge to get angry. And yet, in these meetings, I found responsible, fine men and women of our minority communities, following disappointment after disappointment with a patience that is hard for us to comprehend, scrounging for contributions, trying to keep some of the more effective programs going, after some whim on the part of the government planners had cancelled or reduced them. These people, these people I met with, some of whom confessed they were threatened if they came to such a meeting, they are standing between us and these revolution

aries who believe the only answer left is the last hopeless gesture of the torch and the club.

Our meetings will continue with these people, but there will also be meetings with others, with leaders of the business community, with leaders of our labor unions, with educators, and with our own department heads in government.

Those of you who have heard me speak know that I have spoken with some pride of the personnel, the type of people who accepted appointments in our administration in California, people unlike the usual political appointees, people who have taken those jobs at a great personal sacrifice.

But you also know that I have never mentioned these people in any division, as to whether they belong to one particular group or another, or where they came from. For, in the first place, that is because I just can't help but believe that appointments should be made, neither because of, nor in spite of, race or religion or ethnic background. And, second, because I am sensitive to any appearance of grandstanding or trying to take bows for something that we should be doing just normally.

But now, after meeting with those good citizens, I think that it is time that they have a few symbols. Something to encourage them and to cling to, and I am going to tell you that my pride is even greater in the people who are working in our administration because we have the greatest number, the greatest percentage, of members of the minority communities in policy-making and executive positions in our administration than has even been true in any administration in the history of the State of California. And we have appointed more than seventy Negroes and Americans of Mexican descent to our draft boards throughout California.

Soon after I was elected, I chose an industrialist, Chad McClellan, who mobilized private industrialists in Los Angeles to go into the Watts area two years ago, right after the riots, to provide jobs for the hard-core unemployed in that area and I asked him to take this on on a voluntary, statewide basis and he has done this.

Today, more than 20,000 industrialists in sixteen of our communities, cooperating with the job-training programs, the state and the federal governments, are actually placing the hard-core unemployed in these private enterprise jobs.

The liaison in charge of this from government's end is my Lieutenant Governor Bob Finch.

Now, I don't mean to oversimplify, but I have a belief that jobs are the most important part of this problem. Regardless of all the social problems, regardless of all the things we love to talk about, of equality or opportunity or anything else, the ghettos' walls are economic. It does no good to pass legislation as window-dressing that opens doors if the people you're opening those doors for haven't the price of admission, can't buy the ticket to get in. Of the 17,800 unemployed in the Watts area who were put into jobs by the Chad McClellan program, almost immediately 30% of them moved out of that neighborhood, proving what the walls consist of in the ghettos.

We have learned something else from these meetings. In spite of the liberal stance of too many of our labor leaders, management today is way ahead of labor with regard to solving this problem.

I know something about employment and I know after 25 years as an officer and a leader of my own union, something of the responsibility of the union to its members when there are not enough jobs to go around.

But I know also, that when less than 3% of the union membership in California comes from our minority communities, there is something wrong and that isn't good enough.

The apprenticeship programs, for instance, are slow to take those who are darker-skinned or who have Spanish surnames. I know, too, California law requires that we as a state do business with equal opportunity employers and I know that that law is going to be enforced to the letter. We are checking our own civil service regulations. We do not believe that 99.7% of California's jobs require a high school diploma.

In education, we are exploring the possibility of premium pay for the good teachers so that they will be encouraged to take on the hardest jobs where there is the greatest need for their skills. When the physical facilities are needed for youth programs, athletic programs, adult meetings, when Archie Moore, the former champion out in San Diego, has almost two hundred youngsters and he is bringing them up and teaching them self-respect and he has to do it in a little storefront, why should the schoolhouse door be closed at four in the afternoon? Why shouldn't we use those physical facilities and the playground and the meeting room for programs of this kind for the

balance of the day and over the weekend and through the summer?

I'll tell you now that I heard no pleas in these meetings for forced bussing or for unnatural integration of children into schools far from their homes. Over and over again, from the people themselves, the plea was for good schooling and discipline in the schools their children are now attending, and, believe it or not, they told me they wanted more education aimed at jobs, at vocational training.

They said to me, "It just isn't true that everybody has to have a college degree to be happy."

There were points in which we were not in agreement.

I hold with government's right to enforce rules guaranteeing that those who do business with the public have an obligation to serve all of the public.

I endorse a law that bans restrictive covenants with regard to housing and I believe that that same law should apply to those who are in the business, the large-scale business of marketing tract homes.

But though I deplore and detest the evil sickness of prejudice and those who practice it, I cannot believe or bring myself to believe that we should open the door to government interference with regard to the individual's right to the disposition of his own personal property, because once that door is opened, government has been granted a right that endangers the very basis of individual freedom, the right to own and the right to possess.

There is a definite limit to what can be accomplished by law or legislation. Inevitably, and this was true in every meeting, we came to the point where the only obvious solution was the responsibility that lies with each one of us, our willingness to become personally involved, willingness to express our disapproval of those who are motivated by prejudice, even while we defend at times their legal rights to indulge in that sickness.

The industrialist must do more than write a memo encouraging the employment of Negroes. Sometimes, we have learned, a memorandum doesn't reach the shop steward or the foreman. We have discovered that if we are to continue with this program of providing jobs, the head of the company, the "top banana", must keep going down clear to the bottom every once in a while to remind them that this is his personal concern, and that it is his wish that they do something about it in each one of these plants and industries.

We have learned in government that many times the policy stops when it leaves our office and gets down to the firing line.

How do you think we feel when we have sent out the word down to our state employment offices and then we find in one of those offices that a man, an instructor, took a young Negro boy in to fill out an application and as they left, having filled it out, in one of our California offices, he asked the boy if he would put certain things down that he thought would be helpful and the boy said he forgot? "Well," he said, "Let's go back in and add them." And he went back ten minutes later and they couldn't find the application. On a hunch, he walked over to the nearest wastebasket, and they found the application.

School administrators must go out of their way to encourage, and prod, and arm-twist promising minority students, students who don't think that they have a chance of a scholarship and going to college and moving on.

It isn't enough simply to put a little notice up on the board saying that examinations for scholarships are available. They have got to take a personal interest and see that those individuals have their chance.

Yes, all of us have to spend a little less time trying to be our brother's keeper and start trying to be our brother's brother. We are embarked on such a course in California. Not because of any talk of a long, hot summer or a long, hot any-other-period of the year; this is not a crash program.

We are doing what we're doing because it is morally right to do it and it's a good thing to do.

The funny thing is, it is good from every angle. It is good business. Industry in America today needs men and women. It is crying for them to fill skilled jobs and here we have a community filled with men and women who need only the skills to fill those jobs. The alternative is to perpetuate poverty, keeping them on the dole at our expense. With jobs they become productive citizens, sharing the burden of government with the rest of us and making it easier to solve the rest of the social problems. If we can raise our minority communities to just the average level of purchasing power of the rest of the majority community, we have a potential market for our free enterprise system that is equal to or even greater than the foreign market, whose loss threatens our prosperity at this

very moment. That French philosopher so often quoted by all after-luncheon and after-dinner speakers, De Tocqueville, came to this country a hundred years ago, searching for the secret of America's greatness and finally found it. He said America is great because America is good, and he said if America ever ceases to be good, America will cease to be great.

Now, I am sure that some of what I have said has sounded very strange to some of you, coming from one who has in the kindest words been termed a conservative and by some has been charged with being willing to eat his young.

It shouldn't sound so strange, though. There is a Democratic state legislator out there in California, a black American, who represents the Watts area, Bill Green. He is a liberal, and he says, "One thing California and the nation have to realize is that the black community and the conservative community are coming much closer together. Liberals tend to intellectualize the question out of existence."

Well, now, I personally deplore the use of such labels as conservative, moderate, or liberal, or any other. I prefer to think that we are coming to a realization that those who look only to government for the answers have failed for some years to recognize the great potential force for good among those who instead have placed their faith in the doctrine of the individual.

We are dealing with individuals. Each one of them--they are not a mass problem. Each one of them is unique as we are unique and each one of them is uttering the same cry. It has been uttered by mankind since the very beginning. That cry from within that wants him to be recognized as having human dignity and independence. The American dream that we have nursed for so long in this country and neglected so much lately is not that every man must be level with every other man. The American dream is that every man must be free to become whatever God intends he should become. The restoration and the perpetuation of that dream is the greatest challenge confronting every one of us today. Thank you.

#

SPEECH BY

GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

T. & T. Dinner
Phoenix, Arizona
April 9, 1968

Here it is another election year and the Democrats have gotten out a handbook. It is a handbook for all of their candidates, containing all sorts of instructions. One I was really interested in. It said that the candidates should watch expenses and they shouldn't let out-go exceed income. They ought to have such a book for office-holders. We're the only people in the world whose money can go to Europe and we can't. And with the increase in postage, we can't afford to write. It takes the combined taxes of five families to pay the cost of the Federal Government for one second. Did you just blink? Before you opened your eyes, the government had spent \$4,550.00. But as Hubert Horatio Humphrey said, "A billion here and a billion there, it adds up". Hubert! There is a modest man with a lot to be modest about. He approaches every problem with an open mouth. For decades, they have tried to take every problem of ours and make it theirs, and that goes for everything else we own. Look how they solved the farmers' problems! Remember that old gag based on definitions? Socialism, if you have two cows the government takes one and gives it to you neighbor. Communism, the government takes both cows and gives you the milk. In Washington, they take both cows, shoot one, milk the other, throw the milk away and buy butter from Holland. Their idea of helping the farmer is to buy him a milking machine and then take his only cow to pay his taxes.

In 1940, it cost \$20.75 to make a long distance telephone call from New York to San Francisco, and for that same amount of money you could send 1,037 letters. Now it costs \$1.00 to make that call, and for that amount you can only send 16 letters. So the government is investigating the Bell System. They are spending \$425,000,000 on public relations each year just to tell us how well off we are. Never have so few spent so much to tell us so little. Civilian bureaus multiply like wire coat hangers in a closet. For three years of this administration, the president has asked Congress for the passage of 1,057 proposals. Congress has inacted 655, most of which increase spending. Health and welfare, the cost went up 71% over these three years. Aid to education 107%, housing and development 158.8%. But at the same time, the president piously tells us (quote) "The nation could face the return of strong inflationary pressures which could rob the poor and the elderly on fixed incomes". The implication was that they're not now having inflation. Well, tragically an entire generation has grown to adulthood not knowing anything else. In this year alone, our money will

buy \$14,000,000,000 less than it bought a year ago. That \$1,000 someone has saved and has in the bank earning \$45.00 in interest -- well subtract \$28.21, that's what it has lost this year due to inflation. The president signed a congressional resolution to reduce the number of federal employees by 2%, and with a cynicism all too prevalent in this government, he asked for an increase in the number of employees of 45,600 in his budget message. We're faced with a fiscal crisis that is greater in proportion than anything we've known since that dark Friday in October, 1929. But those in power lack the courage to take any of the steps they should take lest they prove politically unpopular. They go their blissful way, telling us they know better how to spend our money. For example, the \$249,000 on a research program called the demography of happiness. They did the research in Puerto Rico. Well, that's pretty good for a start. They don't have any income tax. • But do you know what we learned for \$249,000? We learned that those who earn more are happier than those who earn less. The young are happier than the old and if you are well and happy, you are happier than if you are sick.

In Joliet, Illinois, an adopted citizen of this country died, and out of gratitude to his adopted country he left his entire fortune of \$170,000 to the Federal Government. In due time a probate court filed on the will and deducted \$27,000 as the State of Illinois' share for inheritance tax. The Federal Government is fighting the case, and they are fighting it on the basis that the Federal Government is a charitable institution. And they've got a good case -- 42,000,000 Americans are receiving some kind of direct cash payment from the government. The welfare programs that numbered 239 in '64 are now 45, and more are proposed. Indeed, one wonders if the script of last week's surprising announcement hasn't been in the works for quite some time. There is a new government publication out. It's called "The Vice President's Handbook for Local Officials". Now it is printed at the taxpayer's expense but is quite an impressive campaign document. The president is dismissed in the book with just one photograph. But Hubert Horatio Humphrey is all through the book, usually surrounded by smiling, happy children. In fact, the book bears the seal of the vice president, and the message is happy and unsubtle. In the forward, authored by the vice president, the administration has 17 and one-half billion dollars to spread around this year among the state, city and local communities. Are you getting your share? Are you passing up your cut because of ignorance of procedures? And then he goes on to explain that if red tape gets in your way, if you are a local or state official, don't bother your congressman or senator -- just get in touch with old Hubert. He will cut through that red tape and see that you get yours.

In Washington, the slogan used to be "walk softly and carry a big stick". Now it's "walk softly and carry a big sack".

I inherited a government a little over a year ago that had been a little brother to big brother in Washington for eight years and during all that time whenever Washington sneezed, the gesundheit was heard in California. I won't go into detail about the fiscal chaos I inherited but there have been some moments when I have wondered whether I was

elected governor or appointed receiver. California ranks third in the nation in the number of poor but number one in the amount of federal poverty funds that have been allocated. But they didn't alleviate poverty, they created an administrative nightmare.

Following the Watts riots, millions of dollars in special programs were poured into that area and more than 50% of it went to administration. You know, when I became governor I discovered that I had the right to veto some of the poverty programs. I was totally inexperienced so I didn't know that I wasn't supposed to exercise that veto. So I went ahead and did it -- it was kind of fun. They had one that was a training course for demonstrators. Now if there is one thing we don't have a shortage of, it's demonstrators. Lately out there, I don't ask whether there are going to be pickets, I just ask which ones. There were some one day with signs "Make love, not war", and they didn't look like they were capable of doing either. For the other one, there was a program in Ventura County. This was to put the hard core unemployed to work clearing our open parks lands. Now that's right down our alley, but when we looked a little more closely we discovered 17 hard core unemployed were going to be put to work and that more than half of the budget was going for seven administrators to make sure the 17 got to work on time, in addition to which the 17 were supposed to travel 12,000 miles in the course of their work and there was no provision for travel expense or shelter. The general accounting office has found a job corps program with 1,869 enrollees and a staff of 1,078. Is it any wonder that the cost for each graduate pro-rates at \$50,000 each? For that amount they should charge tuition. This isn't peculiar to California.

In Chicago, an organization was awarded \$872,000 to teach basic reading and arithmetic to dropouts. Now this is a worthy purpose. A Tribune reporter curious as to how they were doing dropped into the school one day and interrupted a crap game. It was recess. He found the teachers weren't overly paid but they weren't overly worked either. Two of them were in jail, one charged with murder and one for conspiracy to commit murder, three were out on bond awaiting a trial for rape and another was awaiting trial for aggravated battery and still another was on probation for burglary conviction. And the director said that it was too early to say whether the program had been successful. But, the teachers could add to their income -- they were paid \$5.00 a head for every dropout they brought in, and since the dropouts were given \$45.00 a week and a family allowance the best place to find dropouts was the nearby school where they talked the kids into getting out of school so that they could earn \$45.00 over in this other place.

In New Haven, \$27,000,000 was spent on housing, education, job training and placement by the most famous of all the model poverty programs, but the deserving poor, most of whom were negroes, didn't get what they deserved probably because the director was getting \$30,000 and the dozen others of his staff were drawing down salaries between \$12,000 and \$20,000 each. The administrative overhead ran 50%. They had 250 phones for 274 employees; 23 offices were vacant over a year but they all were equipped with telephones. You can get around New Haven in 15 minutes from plowed ground to plowed ground, but the travel expenses for the staff totaled \$161,000. And now

on this day of tragedy, we understand that Congress is going to be told again and somehow the problem has failed of solution because not enough money has been applied to its solving. The credibility gap becomes a morality gap, and together those two gaps form a leadership gap on a scale we have never known and should no longer tolerate. We have given of our treasure with a generosity unmatched in all man's history. We are despised abroad and those at home we sought to help sink deeper in poverty because they and we have been victims of political opportunism and expediency.

Whatever you may think of Martin Luther King, whether you approve or disapproved, something of America was buried today. It began with the first acceptance of compromise of the law -- acceptance of those who would apply the law unequally because of race or religion, and acceptance of those who advocate breaking those laws with which we are in disagreement. And it includes those in government unless and until they have the courage to say that the law will be enforced equally to all at all times without exception.

In recent weeks, I have been going around our state from city to city quietly without any fanfare or press coverage meeting with the fine responsible citizens of our minority communities -- those men, fine Americans of Mexican descent, the fine Negroes in our cities. In city after city I have met with these good people and seen their unbelievable patience, overcoming frustrations as programs launched with great promise died because of mismanagement of the kind I have described or because of the whim of some bureaucrat in the distant capitol. I have learned how our educational system has failed them, how their sons and daughters are passed from grade to grade simply because the year has gone by and not because they've learned what they should learn until they are given a meaningless diploma at the end of the line and they don't have the education to even begin to read the directions in a job training program. I have learned how our economy hasn't extended its bounty to all our citizens. I have listened to their hopes and their hopelessness, and I have heard their plea. Curiously enough, it isn't for more welfare, more of these kind of programs, it's for jobs and their plea isn't to bus their children across town to another school. Their plea is to give them good discipline and schooling in the schools close to home where their children are now in attendance.

But now Republicans, why have we let our opponents preempt this whole humanitarian field when their record is one of colossal failure? Their whole big government approach has institutionalized poverty, perpetuating degradation until welfare becomes a way of life unto the second and third generations of the recipient families. It's our philosophy, not theirs, that's based upon belief in the individual, in his rights and his freedom. Well, we're dealing with individuals! These are the ones who have tried to answer problems as if these people constituted some faceless mass that could be lifted in some kind of movement.

Let's take ownership of a program that properly belongs to us. We're dealing with individuals, each one unique, each one crying out in his

for his rightful heritage of human dignity and the right to shape his own destiny. We have a chance to prove that we're more than just negative critics. We have a chance to prove that our way is the wave of the future. Let's do it not as some crash effort to avoid a long hot summer but because it's a good thing to do, it's the morally right thing to do. Then let's avoid the temptation of an election year. Let's leave the grandiloquent promises of an unreachable Utopia or an instant tomorrow to the opposition. Let's make one simple promise! We don't know how long it will take. We know the road is long and hard. We know it can't happen tomorrow or next week, but we're going to do whatever is necessary to start saving human beings and we're going to stop destroying them.

I was in Washington last week when the burning and the looting started. I was, as a matter of fact, in a Negro neighborhood center, in trying to find out what I could learn there, that would be useful in our own state. As a result, I was in that gigantic traffic jam as our government closed down. There was panic on the very air breathed. We drove to the airport later when the streets had been cleared of the traffic by the curfew. We made our way through the crowds of looters and the pall of smoke, met the columns of troops on their way in to the burning capitol of the most powerful nation on earth and no where was the abdication of leadership more evident than in our nation's capitol.

Now journalists in other lands, sharpening their pencils and their tongues, are all ready and hailing this as new evidence that ours is a sick society. Well, many of us are sick! We're sick of that kind of talk from those who have taken our treasure yet depend on us to stand between them and the barbarians who'd cross their borders within the hour if we removed our mantle of protection from their countries. We're sick of a so-called leadership at home that has left the ship of state adrift without rudder or compass. One who has abdicated the leadership will now treat with the enemy and those of his party who would replace him offer only that they would have quit earlier and given the enemy victory regardless of cost. And what of the young men who bleed their lives into the rice patties and the jungle trails of that far away land? If it wasn't to our national interest for them to be there in the first place, who put them there and why? And if it was in our national interest then why have they been denied victory, the victory they are so capable of winning? You and I should keep on asking a question -- is it now our intention to cancel their sacrifice and let the enemy win at a table that which he couldn't win on the field of battle? Let the enemy prove his desire for peace by agreeing to a cease fire so that the dying stops when the talking starts and, perhaps, then, and we hope and pray that this will be so, we can have some optimism -- some reason to believe that he really wants peace.

There has been a change in the palace guard. At the pentagon the regime of Robert MacNamara has ended as it began with a woe begone demonstration of military ineptitude. The play had a seven year run beginning with the Bay of Pigs and closing with the humiliating theft of one of our ships and the kidnaping of 83 young Americans and the subsequent murder of one. And in the last as in the first, there was a foundering of purpose and a loss of nerve. As has become fashionable of late, clever men who preside over our military forces and our

strategy congratulate themselves on sidestepping another decision and avoiding action.

The official explanation given for the inability of our air forces in the Far East to move out in support of the Pueblo is that all the fighters on alert in Korea are equipped only for nuclear retaliation. But hasn't that been the most persistent claim of this administration that we have moved at a cost of five hundred billion dollars over the last eight years from a nuclear footing to one that would avoid the threat of the bomb and give us a flexible response? Flexible response -- we've had no response at all! Our ship has been stolen, our young men kidnaped and our government assures us it is upset -- strong letter follows.

A government's only excuse for being is to guarantee the collective strength of all of us in defense of even one among us whenever and wherever the rights of that one are threatened.

Let us read the wind very carefully -- the wind that started blowing November 8, 1966 and in this last election because millions of Americans democrats, republicans and independents voted against what's been going on. The working men and women have discovered that they are not the beneficiaries of the great society, they are paying for it. They voted against taxing themselves to provide medical care and a standard of living for others that's often more than they can afford for their own families. They voted against going deeper and deeper into debt as a nation with the idea that we can 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 at home while some young Americans are dying each day in defense of freedom. Thousands upon thousands of Americans, those forgotten men and women who work and support their communities and pay for all of the social tinkering, are groping for answers to their doubts, seeking a cause in which they can invest their idealism or their energy. They do not constitute a sick society. They are too self-reliant to sell their dreams of the future for the dull security of the ant heap. They have been too long without representation in our national government. They believe in this nation as a nation under God and that their freedom is theirs by Divine Right and not by government whim. They believe the function of government is to protect them from the lawbreaker and not the other way around.

Now if this were an ordinary election year, I suppose that politics as usual would indicate that our party should try to find positions not too unattractive from any viewpoint. But this isn't a normal election year! Today the cry is for statesmanship. The people of this land are crying out for leadership, a leadership that will say, "that no place in this nation shall there be higher standards of honor and integrity than in the halls of government. Let us, as Republicans raise a banner which the people of every party can follow, but let us choose the colors well for the people are not in the mood to follow the sickly pastels of expediency. The cynical shades of those who would buy the people's votes with the people's money. Our nation is face-to-face with it's moment of truth. The time for bread and circuses is past time now to offer a government that believes its responsibility is to preserve the values that made this nation great, that government should use its power to

protect every citizen whose rights are denied wherever in the world that citizen may be, that we should offer a government and a leadership that will offer the hand of friendship to every nation but not out of fear. Peace is our purpose and we promise that we will never be without the strength to preserve that peace. We will have the courage to tell our people the truth with faith in their courage and willingness to support us in the hard decisions that must be made in the days ahead. We will have a government that will stop trying to buy the world's affection and start earning its respect.

Let us, as Republicans, have the courage to lift such a banner -- one that asks the best of all of us instead of promising what seems to be the best for only some of us. We're watched by millions of Americans, a voting block crossing racial, religious, ethnic and party lines and there are others who watch. Everyone of us who has been out on the campaign trail, talking in the fundraising affairs throughout the country have seen it. Millions of young Americans, our sons and daughters are watching. They are waiting to see if once again we'll let ourselves be divided by labels applied complete with hyphen -- those shadings that have been so popular of late, moderate, liberal and conservative. They're watching to see if we place more importance on those labels, on those shadings than on the challenge that confronts us. For with youthful wisdom, they know the price they'll pay if we fail to meet our challenge because the stake we play for is the future in which they must live.

An Ohio doctor, a simple man, has written recently, "For one shining glorious moment of 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 life and the inspiration of the world. Now the key has been thrown carelessly aside. The door is closing and we are losing that way." Well, you and I can have no greater responsibility, no more valuable legacy to leave to our children than the restoration of and the preservation of that American dream.

Thank you!

4/22

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Governor's Conference on Delinquency Prevention
Senator Hotel, Sacramento - April 22, 1968

It is a heartening thing to see so many of you at a conference such as this.

In spite of talk in recent years about the prevention of juvenile delinquency, all our statistics show that juvenile crime is a significant factor in our increasing over-all crime rate.

The problem facing juvenile authorities and those involved in juvenile work is two-fold.

First, preventing delinquency.

Second, insuring that a maximum number of juvenile offenders can be salvaged from a life of crime.

Neither is an easy task. And both will take the combined efforts of those in government and those outside of government.

There is no single answer to either part of the problem. Each juvenile is an individual and as such takes a special individual answer.

I think there has grown up in recent years in the area of juvenile delinquency and crime prevention the same misconception that has grown up in so many other areas--the belief that government always knows best and that only government has the answers.

I don't share that belief and I'm sure a lot of you here today don't share it either.

While government can guide and lead--and should do these things--and while government must be responsible for at least the terms of rehabilitation and parole, the independent sector--all those parts of our society outside of government--must become more widely and more closely involved if we are ever to make a real dent in solving this problem.

While some juvenile delinquency may be due to poverty and some to home environment, I'm convinced that part of it is due to idleness. Farm kids don't get into trouble nearly as often as city kids. They have too many chores to do. And town is too far away.

Where do we start to change things?

In the home, if we could.

But there are other places. The schools, for example. More after-school activities--meaningful activities--are needed.

Not very many kids who join teams join gangs.

Not many boys or girls who have received the proper encouragement and have been offered the proper incentive to stay in school drop out.

Now I know when I say these things the first thing that will be asked is, "Where will we get the money?" Or rather the school authorities will say, "Give us more money." I know there never seems to be enough money for all we would like to do, but in the meantime perhaps we could have more effort and more dedication.

Many teachers are interested primarily in their students--we need more of these. And we need more leadership at the top, among school administrators and boards of education.

Recently, I met with minority groups up and down the state and this was one of their complaints. They didn't want their children bussed. They weren't complaining about the physical facilities. But they were complaining about the quality of education their children were getting. Something has to be wrong when one teacher after another passes a student through school until he finally reaches the place where he gets his diploma, but he has never learned to read or spell or add simple figures.

They didn't demand college for everyone--they spoke of more vocational training.

Any boy or girl who has the education to take advantage of opportunity is less likely to be frustrated. And frustration--continuous, never-ending frustration--has to be a major cause of delinquency.

The state superintendent of schools has called for incentive pay to insure that the best teachers are made available for our minority and deprived areas. And I support him in that. But I think all our teachers must face up to the fact that their jobs and the job they do is among the most important in our society and calls for the best that is in them. For the product they turn

out--our children--will build our nation's future or betray its heritage.

But schools and teachers are only a part of the potential solution to the juvenile problem.

Once a boy could go out and get a part-time job and the merchant or businessman just reached into his pocket and paid him at the end of the day or week.

But they can't do this anymore. There are child labor laws. There are minimum wage laws. There are social security laws. There are union regulations. There are tax laws. There is so much red tape that it just isn't practical for the average businessman to hire part-time help.

There is little we at the state or local levels can do about federal regulations and red tape except to petition Congress. But, perhaps through service clubs and civic organizations, we can persuade small businessmen that the cost of hiring a kid, even today, is cheaper in the long run than the cost of keeping him in a juvenile institution and the cost to society of a ruined life.

As you know, we in state government are attempting to make available 3,000 summer jobs for our youth and we are putting the emphasis on hiring the disadvantaged.

But this is hardly a drop in the bucket. We need more programs involving the independent sector, such as the one that has been started by the Sacramento Chamber of Commerce.

And we also need to involve the non-governmental part of our society in additional recreation efforts for summertime--more athletics, more programs that appeal to, and attract, kids. For again, government can't do it all. It takes interested citizens. It takes involvement, and there are many of you here who can help lead the way.

You are in positions where you can go before service clubs and other groups, go to churches and go to businesses and urge them to become involved.

Today there is a restlessness and an anger as many of our young people in the ranks of the minorities, often misled by government promises, demand an instant tomorrow.

Efforts of juvenile authorities must be focused in these

minority efforts, not as police, but as experts who can help this part of our youth meet their problems and can direct their energies into constructive instead of destructive channels.

Yours is an ever-changing field, one that takes constant study and constant awareness of new approaches, because you are dealing not with things but with people.

I know strides are being made here, important strides--especially in handling the boy or girl who has gotten into trouble. I know that we have programs making it possible to handle more youthful offenders at the local level instead of at the state level. And this is good.

I know you are seeking alternatives to incarceration. And this is good.

I believe that with juveniles, and especially the first and second offenders, where the chance is greatest to save them, that what we need is greater use of the "carrot and stick" philosophy. Hold that reward out to them for good behavior. But also let them know that bad behavior brings swift and certain punishment.

For it is true that as we have sought more and more to excuse crime and wrongdoing by the individual, blaming it on society or environment or heredity, it is true that we have had a corresponding increase in crime.

For the fact is that no society can be an enduring and stable society unless the individual is held to account for his misdeeds and unless the law applies equally to all.

And just as societies are built to greatness by the accomplishments of individuals so they can be torn down if individuals are not held responsible for those things which tear down a society.

We can make all the excuses we want, but it is the individual who must receive the credit for what is good in our society and the blame for what is bad.

And this applies to juveniles, as well as to adults. True, a boy or girl may be led astray by another person, but it is you and others like you, acting as individuals who bring them back into line, who show them the error of their ways.

It is you, and all of us as individuals, accepting our responsibilities toward our youth, who can bring each one to the

place where he is willing to accept his responsibility as an individual toward his fellow man and toward society.

One of your jobs is to help give our youth the opportunity to be able to accept those responsibilities. I know you are working hard at your jobs and are dedicated to helping our young people, or you wouldn't be here today.

I want to thank you for that and for giving me the opportunity to speak briefly to you here today.

#

(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.)

4/26

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
BOISE COLLEGE STUDENT UNION
Boise, Idaho
April 26, 1968

Here it is another election year and the Democrats have gotten out a handbook. It is a handbook for all of their candidates, containing all sorts of instructions. One I was really interested in. It said that the candidates should watch expenses and they shouldn't let out-go exceed income.

They ought to have such a book for officeholders. We are the only people in the world whose money can go to Europe and we can't. And with the increase in postage, we can't afford to write.

It takes the combined taxes of five families to pay the cost of the federal government for one second. Did you just blink? Before you opened your eyes, the government had spent \$4,550. But as Hubert Horatio Humphrey said, "A billion here and a billion there; it adds up." Hubert! There is a modest man with a lot to be modest about. He approaches every problem with an open mouth.

For decades, they have tried to take every problem of ours and make it theirs, and that goes for everything else we own. Look how they solved the farmers' problems! Remember that old gag based on definitions? Socialism---if you have two cows the government takes one and gives it to your neighbor. Communism---the government takes both cows and gives you the milk. In Washington, they take both cows, shoot one, milk the other, throw the milk away and buy butter from Holland. Their idea of helping the farmer is to buy him a milking machine and then take his only cow to pay his taxes.

In 1940, it cost \$20.75 to make a long distance telephone call from New York to San Francisco, and for that same amount of money you could send 1,037 letters. Now it costs \$1 to make that call, and for that amount you can only send 16 letters. So the government is investigating the Bell System. They are spending \$425,000,000 on public relations each year just to tell us how well off we are. Never have so few spent so much to tell us so little.

Civilian bureaus multiply like wire coat hangers in a closet.

For three years of this administration, the president has asked Congress for the passage of 1,057 proposals. Congress has enacted 655, most of which increase spending. Health and welfare, the cost went up 71 percent over these three years. Aid to education 107 percent, housing and development 158.8 percent. But at the same time, the president piously tells us (quote) "The nation could face the return of strong inflationary pressures which could rob the poor and the elderly on fixed incomes." The implication was that they are not now having inflation.

Well, tragically an entire generation has grown to adulthood not knowing anything else. In this year alone, our money will buy \$14,000,000,000 less than it bought a year ago. That \$1,000 someone has saved and has in the bank earning \$45 in interest---well, subtract \$28.21; that is what it has lost this year due to inflation.

The president signed a congressional resolution to reduce the number of federal employees by two percent, and with a cynicism too prevalent in this government, he asked for an increase in the number of employees of 45,600 in his budget message.

We are faced with a fiscal crisis that is greater in proportion than anything we have known since that dark Friday in October, 1929. But those in power lack the courage to take any of the steps they should take lest they prove politically unpopular. They go their blissful way, telling us they know better how to spend our money.

For example, the \$249,000 on a research program called the demography of happiness. They did the research in Puerto Rico. Well, that is pretty good for a start. They don't have any income tax. But do you know what we learned for \$249,000? We learned that those who earn more are happier than those who earn less. The young are happier than the old and if you are well and happy, you are happier than if you are sick.

Indeed, one wonders if the script of the recent surprising announcement hasn't been in the works for quite some time. There is a new government publication out. It is called "The Vice President's Handbook for Local Officials." Now it is printed at the taxpayer's expense but is quite an impressive campaign document. The president is dismissed in the book with just one photograph. But Hubert Horatio Humphrey is all through the book, usually surrounded by smiling, happy children. In fact, the book bears the seal of the vice president, and the message is happy and unsubtle. In the forward, authored by the vice president,

the administration has 17½ billion dollars to spread around this year among the state, city and local communities. Are you getting your share? Are you passing up your cut because of ignorance of procedures? And then he goes on to explain that if red tape gets in your way, if you are a local or state official, don't bother your congressman or senator---just get in touch with old Hubert. He will cut through that red tape and see that you get yours.

In Washington, the slogan used to be "walk softly and carry a big stick." Now it is "walk softly and carry a big sack."

I inherited a government a little over a year ago that had been a little brother to big brother in Washington for eight years and during all that time whenever Washington sneezed, the gesundheit was heard in California. I will not go into detail about the fiscal chaos I inherited, but there have been some moments when I have wondered whether I was elected governor or appointed receiver.

California ranks third in the nation in the number of poor but number one in the amount of federal poverty funds that have been allocated. But they did not alleviate poverty, they created an administrative nightmare.

The credibility gap becomes a morality gap, and together those two gaps form a leadership gap on a scale we have never known and should no longer tolerate. We have given of our treasure with a generosity unmatched in all man's history. We are despised abroad and those at home we sought to help sink deeper in poverty because they and we have been victims of political opportunism and expediency.

In recent weeks, I have been going around our state from city to city quietly without any fanfare or press coverage meeting with the fine responsible citizens of our minority communities---those many fine Americans of Mexican descent, the fine Negroes in our cities. In city after city I have met with these good people and seen their unbelievable patience, overcoming frustrations as programs launched with great promise died because of mismanagement of the kind I have described or because of the whim of some bureaucrat in the distant capital. I have learned how our educational system has failed them, how their sons and daughters are passed from grade to grade simply because the year has gone by and not because they have learned what they should learn until they are given a meaningless diploma at the end of the line and they do not have the education to even begin to read the directions in a job training program.

I have learned how our economy has not extended its bounty to all our citizens. I have listened to their hopes and their hopelessness, and I have heard their plea. Curiously enough, it is not for more welfare, more of these kind of programs; it is for jobs and their plea is not to buss their children across town to another school. Their plea is to give them good discipline and schooling in the schools close to home where their children are now in attendance.

But now for Republicans. Why have we let our opponents preempt this whole humanitarian field when their record is one of colossal failure? Their whole big government approach as institutionalized poverty, perpetuating degradation until welfare becomes a way of life unto the second and third generations of the recipient families.

It is our philosophy, not theirs, that is based upon belief in the individual, in his rights and his freedom. Well, we are dealing with individuals. They are the ones who have tried to answer problems as if these people constituted some faceless mass that could be lifted in some kind of movement.

Let us take ownership of a program that properly belongs to us. We are dealing with individuals, each one unique, each one crying out in his soul for his rightful heritage of human dignity and the right to shape his own destiny. We have a chance to prove that we are more than just negative critics. We have a chance to prove that our way is the wave of the future. Let us do it not as some crash effort to avoid a long hot summer, but because it is a good thing to do; it is the morally right thing to do. Then let us avoid the temptation of an election year. Let us leave the grandiloquent promises of an unreachable Utopia or an instant tomorrow to the opposition. Let us make one simple promise. We do not know how long it will take. We know the road is long and hard. We know it cannot happen tomorrow or next week, but we are going to do whatever is necessary to start saving human beings and we are going to stop destroying them.

I was in Washington when the recent burning and looting started. I was, as a matter of fact, in a Negro neighborhood center, trying to find out what I could learn there that would be useful in our own state. As a result, I was in that gigantic traffic jam as our government closed down. There was panic on the very air breathed. We drove to the airport later when the streets had been cleared of the traffic by the curfew. We made our way through the crowds of looters and the pall of smoke, met the columns of troops on their way in to the burning capital of the most powerful nation on earth and nowhere was the abdication of

Now journalists in other lands, sharpening their pencils and their tongues, are all ready and hailing this as new evidence that ours is a sick society. Well, many of us are sick! We are sick of that kind of talk from those who have taken our treasure yet depend on us to stand between them and the barbarians who would cross their borders within the hour if we removed our mantle of protection from their countries. We are sick of a so-called leadership at home that has left the ship of state adrift without rudder or compass. One who has abdicated the leadership will now treat with the enemy and those of his party who would replace him offer only that they would have quit earlier and given the enemy victory regardless of cost. And what of the young men who bleed their lives into the rice paddies and the jungle trails of that far away land? If it was not to our national interest for them to be there in the first place, who put them there and why? And if it was in our national interest, then why have they been denied victory, the victory they are so capable of winning?

You and I should keep on asking a question---is it now our intention to cancel their sacrifice and let the enemy win at a table that which he couldn't win on the field of battle? Let the enemy prove his desire for peace by agreeing to a cease fire so that the dying stops when the talking starts and, perhaps, then, and we hope and pray that this will be so, we can have some optimism---some reason to believe that he really wants peace.

There has been a change in the palace guard. At the Pentagon, the regime of Robert MacNamara has ended as it began with a woebegone demonstration of military ineptitude. The play had a seven-year run beginning with the Bay of Pigs and closing with the humiliating theft of one of our ships and the kidnapping of 83 young Americans and the subsequent murder of one. And in the last as in the first, there was a foundering of purpose and a loss of nerve.

As has become fashionable of late, clever men who preside over our military forces and our strategy congratulate themselves on sidestepping another decision and avoiding action.

The official explanation given for the inability of our air forces in the Far East to move out in support of the Pueblo is that all the fighters on alert in Korea are equipped only for nuclear retaliation. But hasn't that been the most persistent claim of this administration that we have moved at a cost of five hundred billion dollars over the last eight years from a nuclear footing to one that would avoid the

threat of the bomb and give us a flexible response?

Flexible response---we've had no response at all! Our ship has been stolen, our young men kidnapped and our government assures us it is upset---strong letter follows.

A government's only excuse for being is to guarantee the collective strength of all of us in defense of even one among us whenever and wherever the rights of that one are threatened.

Let us read the wind very carefully---the wind that started blowing November 8, 1966 and in this last election because millions of Americans--Democrats, Republicans and Independents--voted against what has been going on. The working men and women have discovered that they are not the beneficiaries of the Great Society; they are paying for it. They voted against taxing themselves to provide medical care and a standard of living for others that is often more than they can afford for their own families. They voted against going deeper and deeper into debt as a nation with the idea that we can 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 at home while some young Americans are dying each day in defense of freedom.

Thousands upon thousands of Americans, those forgotten men and women who work and support their communities and pay for all of the social tinkering, are groping for answers to their doubts, seeking a cause in which they can invest their idealism or their energy. They do not constitute a sick society. They are too self-reliant to sell their dreams of the future for the dull security of the ant heap. They have been too long without representation in our national government. They believe in this nation as a nation under God and that their freedom is theirs by Divine Right and not by government whim. They believe the function of government is to protect them from the lawbreaker and not the other way around.

Now if this were an ordinary election year, I suppose that politics as usual would indicate that our Party should try to find positions not too unattractive from any viewpoint. But this is not a normal election year.

Today the cry is for statesmanship. The people of this land are crying out for leadership, a leadership that will say, "that no place in this nation shall there be higher standards of honor and integrity than in the halls of government. Let us, as Republicans raise a banner which the people of every party can follow, but let us choose the colors well for the people are not in the mood to follow the sickly pastels of expediency. The cynical shades of those who would buy the people's votes with the people's money. Our nation is face-to-face with its moment of truth. The time for bread and circuses is past time now to offer a government that believes its responsibility is to preserve the values that made this nation great, that government should use its power to protect every citizen whose rights are denied wherever in the world that citizen may be, that we should offer a government and a leadership that will offer the hand of friendship to every nation, but not out of fear.

Peace is our purpose and we promise that we will never be without the strength to preserve that peace. We will have the courage to tell our people the truth with faith in their courage and willingness to support us in the hard decisions that must be made in the days ahead. We will have a government that will stop trying to buy the world's affection and start earning its respect.

Let us, as Republicans, have the courage to lift such a banner---one that asks the best of all of us instead of promising what seems to be the best for only some of us. We are watched by millions of Americans, a voting bloc crossing racial, religious, ethnic and party lines and there are others who watch. Every one of us who has been out on the campaign trail, talking in the fund raising affairs throughout the country has seen it. Millions of young Americans, our sons and daughters are watching. They are waiting to see if once again we will let ourselves be divided by labels applied complete with hyphen---those shadings that have been so popular of late, moderate, liberal and conservative. They are watching to see if we place more importance on those labels, 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 because the stake we play for is the future in which they must live.

#

(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 OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
University of Colorado Student Forum
Boulder, Colorado
April 27, 1968

As the day nears when classroom and playing field must give way to the larger arena with the problems of inequality and human misunderstanding, it is easy to look at those in that arena and demand to know why the problems remain unsolved. We who preceded you asked that question of those who preceded us, and another younger generation will ask it of you.

I hope there will be less justification for the question when it is your turn to answer. What I am trying to say is that no generation has failed completely, nor will yours succeed completely.

But don't get me wrong. When the generation of which I am a part leaves the state, history will record that seldom has any generation fought harder or paid a higher price for freedom.

We have known three wars and now a fourth. A cataclysmic depression has toppled governments and reshaped the map.

No, we did not find the single cure-all for man's inhumanity to man, or the answer to human frailty.

It is easy to point to our failures and talk of the mess of our times, and even to promise we will do better. But for the record, since we are the generation that exploded the atomic bomb and brought a permanent terror to the world, we also harnessed the atom for peaceful purposes. And some of those peaceful purposes, in medicine and industrial power, have brought man to the threshold of a fabulous era.

We have defeated polio and tuberculosis and a host of plague diseases that held even more terror for mankind than the threat of the bomb. It is a certainty that your generation and ours will overlap in defeating cancer.

Point an accusing finger and list smog, water pollution, poverty, civil rights, inequality of opportunity. We still seek the answers, and while many of us disagree as to the solutions, we were the ones who faced up to the problems and charged ourselves with finding the answers.

No people in all the history of mankind have shared so widely in material resources. We taxed ourselves more heavily and extended aid at home and abroad. And when instead of shrinking, the problems

grew larger, the government planned more and passed more legislation to add scores of new programs until today their list in government catalogues takes hundreds of pages.

The New Frontier has become the Great Society and it becomes greater every day--greater in cost, greater in wasteful extravagance, greater in the manner it imposes restrictions on the people.

In 1940 it cost \$20.75 to make a long distance telephone call from New York to San Francisco, and for that same amount of money you could send 1037 letters. Now it costs \$1.00 to make that call, and for that amount you can only send 16 letters. So the government is investigating the Bell System.

Within the last few weeks the President told a farm audience that the urban problems were due, at least in part, to the large numbers of untrained country people who have migrated to the cities and are unable to find, or qualify for jobs. Then he said, "We must get them back to the farms."

But it was his Secretary of Agriculture, within his term of office, who said, "We only need one and one half million farmers, so two million must leave the soil and move to the cities," and they were encouraged to do so.

From approximately the time when you started school, the Department of Agriculture employment has increased 62 percent, but the number of farms has declined 36 percent and the farm population has declined 42 percent.

In 1954, there was one Department of Agriculture employee for every 72 farms; today there is one employee for every 28 farms.

Remember the old gag based on definitions? Socialism--if you have two cows the government takes one and gives it to your neighbor. Communism--the government takes both cows and gives you the milk. In Washington, they take both cows, shoot one, milk the other, throw the milk away and buy butter from Holland.

I am sure you must be interested more in those parts of the Great Society we associate with human problems and the answers to human misery and inequality of opportunity. Our overall approach to welfare had its beginning in the dark Depression days of the 1930's. We were all concerned with giving a hand to those who were willing to work but through no fault of their own could find no work. Our original concept was of temporary aid until the individual could once again be self-supporting.

But gradually, without our quite knowing how it happened, the concept changed. The hand up became the handout. Until now we have an institution of poverty, and some of those on welfare are third generation families who live on the public subsidy.

Last year unemployment reached its lowest point since the war. But still we added almost 700,000 to the welfare roles. In California, welfare has increased over the last decade more than six times the increase in population. This alone substantiates the charge that welfare, as we know it, has been a colossal failure. Welfare, to be successful, must be judged on the basis of how many people it has made independent of welfare.

The modern world of politics has grown up to the practice of running not against a man as he is, but against an image created deliberately by opportunists. Therefore, anyone who criticizes the multitudinous welfare programs is charged with being against their humanitarian goals, and an image grows of callousness and indifference to human suffering and human rights. The time has come to acknowledge that all men of good will support the humanitarian purpose--our difference lies only in how best to achieve it.

Federal aid to the poor has increased 290 percent over the last 8 years and nowhere was government more generous than in pre-riot Detroit.

A special committee of Michigan's legislature, numbering a majority of Democrats, has stated: "One of the most serious frauds one can commit upon the poor is to promise something you do not or cannot deliver. The receipts and disbursements for 1965 through 1967 reveal the same picture. There is so little money left for the poor after salaries and fixed overhead that one can no longer refer to this fact as an irregularity--one must call it what it is, fraud.

The present national administration has outlined 'seven' housing programs designed to produce 26 million units in the next ten years.

But what is the record of government in public housing?

Back in 1949 they appropriated money to build 810,000 homes in six years. Now, 20 years later, they have still failed to meet that goal. In 1965, they passed a new act to build one-quarter of a million homes by 1969. They will miss by half.

In Chicago, a group was funded \$872,000 to teach basic reading and arithmetic to dropouts. After a time a Tribune reporter, curious as to how they were doing, dropped into the school one day and interrupted a crap game. It was recess. He found the teachers were not overly paid--they got \$3840 to \$6500 a year--they were not overly worked either. Two of them were in jail, one charged with murder and one for conspiracy to commit murder, three were out on bond awaiting a trial for rape and another was awaiting trial for aggravated battery and still another was on probation for burglary conviction.

And the director said it was too early to say whether the program had been successful. But, the teachers could add to their income--they were paid \$5 a head for every dropout they brought in, and since the dropouts were given \$45 a week and a family allowance, the best place to find dropouts was the nearby school, where they talked the kids into getting out of school so that they could earn \$45 over in this other place.

When I took office, I discovered I had the right to veto poverty programs. Being totally inexperienced I did not know I was not

I was told, for example, of one program that was going to put the hardcore unemployed in a county to work clearing our open park-like lands in California. I had no quarrel with that goal, but then I discovered that they were going to put 17 of the hardcore unemployed to work and more than half of the money was going to go for seven administrators to make sure that the 17 got to work on time. So we vetoed it.

-0-

We were promised guns and butter--no downpayment and easy terms. The war would be successfully concluded and the Great Society at home would be expanded.

Derided as Ice Age reactionaries were all those who warned of a day of reckoning. They had not discovered the magic brass lamp with its genie named "New Economics". Well, let the lamp rubbers answer now--where is the genie? Our gold is gone, our paper money can be exchanged any time for more paper and our coins now rattle on the counter with the flat tone of copper. For the first time in memory, American tourists have seen the once proud symbol of industrial might--the dollar--refused in foreign inns and taverns.

We are no longer in control of our currency and those who are, our European gold pool associates, have issued an ultimatum: balance your budget and correct your imbalance of international payments or the dollar will be allowed to fall.

And who among the Palace Guard has the courage to tell the people of this nation what must be done? Are we supposed to believe that any of the candidates of the party in power are of a different stripe? That any one of them stands opposed to the profligate policies of the leader who has tossed his crown to them like a bride's bouquet? They talk of great new programs--still on credit to rebuild our cities, hand out pre-packaged education and guarantee pay checks not just to those who hunger and thirst, but to all those who are discontented with what they have.

" " " " " "

(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 OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
SACRAMENTO LAW DAY DINNER
Officers Club, Mather Air Force Base
May 1, 1968

It is a pleasure to be here on a day of growing importance and significance in our nation.

Law Day was established to point up the necessity of maintaining this as a nation, not of men, but of laws, under which men can enjoy maximum liberty.

May 1 has always been a meaningful day for this kind of observance, because it contrasts directly with the Communist observance of May Day. The contrast is a pointed one. Communism by nature is a dictatorship and these, by definition, are governments, not of laws but of men.

Men impose tyranny. Laws protect us from tyranny.

But this year, while we recognize the contrast in laws between our nation and many other nations, we can no longer view that difference with any degree of smugness or any real sense of satisfaction.

The term "May Day", among other things, denotes an international distress signal, and it is unfortunate, but true, that this year we, as a nation that exists by choice under the law, are in sore distress regarding the law.

Lawlessness is rampant in our society and crime increases faster than our population, at a rate of 16 per cent a year. This year, you and I each have one chance in 47 of being the victim of a major crime.

Juvenile delinquency increases even faster.

And these are serious problems.

Surely they are symptoms of a society that has become permissive in its attitude toward right and wrong. Permissiveness is an attitude today that pervades our homes, our schools and our courts.

Suddenly it has become wrong to hold a person solely accountable for his actions and his deeds. Suddenly society is to blame for the actions of the evildoer. And the guarantees in the law and the Constitution that were meant to protect the rights of the

law-abiding have been twisted so that they set the criminal loose to prey again on society.

What kind of tortured logic is it that restores a driver's license to a drunken driver because, as one court held, when arrested she was too drunk to be aware of the consequences of refusing a sobriety test?

Suddenly, it has become wrong to hold a parent accountable for the deeds of his children. Once, public humiliation was fitting and sufficient punishment. Now records are sealed on the grounds that we might damage a juvenile psyche or embarrass a parent.

What, indeed, has become of the concept of reward for virtue and punishment for the wrongdoer?

But where once individual crime and even organized crime were matters that deserved and received our major concern, these are now overshadowed by a new kind of lawlessness and, going hand in hand with it, new interpretations of rights.

Combined, they threaten the very existence of our form of government.

This is political lawlessness, hidden under the cloak of "the right to dissent", spawned by a new creed that says a man can choose the laws he wishes to obey, and that says the need for social change is justification for flouting the laws, resorting to violence and inciting to riot.

We have seen it start from the seed of so-called "civil disobedience" and watched it grow to disturbances and massive disorders that disrupt traffic and interfere with the legitimate activities of other citizens.

And we have watched it finally blossom into riots and arson and looting and finally the ultimate--assassination.

And we watch as its fruit threatens to be a nation split into two armed camps with revolt and revolution ripe for those who would taste it.

I cannot believe that most Americans want this. I believe that very few Americans want this. And yet as law-abiding

citizens they have watched helplessly as their national leaders have too often stood passively by, condoning or in some cases even encouraging wanton violations of the law.

One of our highest elected officials, as recently as July, 1966, warned that "I've got enough spark in me to lead a mighty good revolt." This is a man sworn to uphold the law and yet is giving lip service to the idea of destroying the law.

Or take one United States Senator, who declares "there is no point in telling Negroes to obey the law." Or the case of a candidate citing a quote to inflame already inflamed audiences, "the more riots that come on college campuses, the better the world for tomorrow."

These men have indeed helped sow the wind and all of us are the victims of the whirlwind.

Here in California we have watched the University of California at Berkeley used as a staging ground to attempt to disrupt the Army Induction Center in Oakland.

And when the police broke up that unlawful disturbance and restored order, what did we hear? Why, cries of "police brutality," of course.

We have watched as students at San Francisco State invaded the campus newspaper and beat the editor. And later watched students, spurred on by some members of the faculty, riot when those involved in the beating were slapped on the wrist. We have seen disorder and threats go unpunished on campuses elsewhere in the state.

In New York a few dissidents were able to stop the building of a new gymnasium at Columbia. We have seen Howard University in Washington taken over by revolting students; trustees of Tuskegee Institute locked up by other militant students; and these are only a few instances of the new lawlessness on campuses.

Three weeks ago I left Washington, D.C. as a riot raged. We saw looters pillaging unchecked, and fires raging throughout the city.

Riots also flared in other cities -- Chicago, Kansas City, Baltimore -- all allegedly in the name of a man of peace. And in all, the pattern was the same--looting, burning, violence.

Spontaneous? I doubt it. But spontaneous or planned, the tragedy was not in the riots themselves. The tragedy was the lack of leadership in high places--those who should have anticipated and been prepared. A promised message to Congress failed to materialize and became only an extension of the silence.

The ultimate humiliation for the most powerful nation on earth is that now those entrusted with protecting our President have ruled that he must move unannounced and furtively around our land, without advance notice of his comings and goings.

What has America come to?

Certainly you as men trained in the law are asking that question.

Millions of us who are not lawyers are also asking that question. What has America come to?

And how do we put it back on the right path?

We are here today to re-affirm that we are a nation of laws. That re-affirmation can be the first step in returning us to that concept or it can be a mockery.

I intend that in California it will not become a mockery.

I am here today to re-affirm that California is a state where people have a right to live under the protection of the law, and that means all our people, with no one relegated to a kind of second-class citizenship.

Every law-abiding citizen has the right to expect his government will insure the safety of his person regardless of his station in life, his ethnic background, his race or religion.

Every parent has the right to expect government to protect his children from those who deal in drugs and profit from pornography.

Every homeowner and every businessman has the right to expect his government to protect his property against the criminal, the arsonist, the rioter and the looter.

I view with respect the responsible efforts of most of our teachers whose personal and professional values require them to pursue the truth wherever it may lead. They are not like the few who, in the cloak of a distortion of the meaning of academic freedom, use the classroom and the campus for the advancement of their own self-interest and political doctrine. It seems little to ask that the great majority remind their erring colleagues of the meaning of and the reason for professional ethics, especially when dealing with the youth of a democratic society.

Our colleges and universities were created--and are tax-supported--as centers of education, not staging areas for insurrection. As I said in January of 1967, I say again--obey the rules or get out.

We are interested in bettering the lot of all our people, especially our poor and those who have particular problems because of color or language.

We have been working and we will continue to work to insure equal opportunity, but we will do it under the law.

Indeed, we expect and demand more rigid enforcement of those laws which are intended to insure equality.

We are working now to provide better channels of communication so our poor and uneducated will know what the law is and how they can have recourse to it.

I have met in recent days with the Fair Employment Practices Commission to see what steps can be taken to insure equal employment opportunities.

I have met with labor union leaders to discuss this same matter.

We are looking within state government to see what laws should be changed to insure equal employment in government.

We are doing these things because they are right, not because of some threat of lawbreaking or a long hot summer.

We will work to overcome the reasons for the hopelessness and frustration that can easily give way to acts of mass violence. But we will not tolerate that violence. Nowhere in man's history has there been a people who shared more widely their bounty with those in need, at home and abroad.

Ours was a society which recognized its obligations to care for those who either temporarily or permanently could not care for themselves. It is good that we do this and I doubt we would have it any other way, but today there are those who look on welfare as a right.

The government, they say, has an obligation to provide not only for those who can't work but also for those who won't work, as if the government is a separate entity with resources and wealth of its own creation.

But the government is the people. And you and I are under no

obligation to support those who refuse to support themselves. And those who would pass laws forcing us to do so are taking us down a very dangerous road where government coercion of the people is accepted.

Some people soften the coercion by calling it statism, some socialism. But by any name it is a repudiation of freedom and an affront to the dignity of man.

Can we remain free at home and help the cause of freedom abroad if liberty becomes license, and law becomes a fraud?

Social change is not only inevitable, it is also necessary. It has been said that a society without the means for change is a society without the means for its survival.

But change should mean improvement. And we cannot improve our society by tearing down. We can not build a society by destroying its foundations.

We cannot right wrongs by ignoring the legitimate methods for redress of grievances.

We cannot create a climate of equal opportunity and equal justice by putting a ceiling on opportunity and creating a class of people who are above the law.

In the words of your theme this year, "only a lawful society can build a better society."

It is up to us as citizens to help build that better society.

We cannot do this by standing on the sidelines complaining. Those in government must provide the orderly framework of laws. Those outside of government must become involved in helping to build that society within that framework.

Working hand in hand we can help build a freer society and a better society. Alone we cannot do it. Together we must.

* * *

(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 OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
AMERICAN WOMEN IN RADIO AND TELEVISION CONVENTION
CENTURY PLAZA HOTEL, LOS ANGELES
May 3, 1968

It is a pleasure to be here with so many lovely and talented ladies.

You know, we have a great deal in common--or we did until I woke up one morning to find myself in politics.

Before most of you were born--if I can judge from appearances--I started out--(back in 1932)--to make a career in radio. This I did for five years as an announcer and a sportscaster on WHO in Des Moines. And if I hadn't come to California to cover the Chicago Cubs, who used to hold spring training on Catalina Island, I might still be broadcasting Big 10 football.

Of course you know where I wound up--on a television set in the middle of Death Valley.

But you know I am not the only ex-broadcaster who found himself in politics. Both Governor McCall of Oregon and Governor Williams of Arizona are two, I know, who also were broadcasters. Then of course, there is my old friend Congressman H. R. Gross of Iowa who also used to work at WHO.

And I wouldn't want to forget Sam Yorty--who went the other way--from politics to television.

I thought today that I would like to talk to you about the things that are of concern to me for a few minutes and then to tell you about some of the things that seem to be of concern to our country.

You know, when I campaigned for governor, I went up and down California and let people ask me questions. This way we found out what was really on their minds.

Now in recent weeks, I have begun to do some of that again. And I would like to tell you what some of those questions are and what my answers have been.

Many of the questions are those that seem particularly to be bothering our young people, especially those on our college and university campuses.

As the day nears when classroom and playing field gives way to the larger arena with its problems of inequality and human misunderstanding, they tend to look at those in the arena and demand to know why the problems remain unsolved, just as we who preceded them asked that question of those who preceded us, and another younger generation will ask it of them.

What I am trying to say is that no generation fails completely, nor succeeds completely. But I want to make one thing plain. When our generation leaves the stage, I think history will record that seldom has any generation fought harder or paid a higher price for freedom.

We have known three wars in our lifetime, and now a fourth. We have known a cataclysmic depression that toppled governments and reshaped the map of the world.

It is true, we have not found a single cure-all for man's inhumanity to man or the answer to human frailty. It is easy to point out our failures, to talk of the mess of our times. But for the record, since we are the generation that exploded the atomic bomb and brought permanent terror to the world, we also harnessed the atom for peaceful purposes. Some of those peaceful purposes are in medicine and industrial power and they brought man to the threshold of a fabulous era. We defeated polio and T.B. and most of the plague diseases that held more terror for mankind than even the threat of the bomb. It is a certainty that we or the next generation will defeat cancer.

Now you can point an accusing finger and list smog, water pollution, poverty, civil rights and inequality of opportunity. We still seek the answers to these. While many disagree as to the solution, it is true that we were the ones who faced up to the problems and charged ourselves with finding an answer. No people, in the history of mankind, have shared so widely of their material resources. We taxed ourselves more heavily and we extended aid at home and abroad. And when instead of shrinking the problem grew larger, we planned more and we passed more legislation--scores of new programs--until today they are listed in government catalogues numbering hundreds of pages.

But suddenly there is an unease in the land (a growing realization that our good intentions have taken us down some strange and unwanted roads. We were warned early in our history that the most important thing we could leave to our children was not wealth. It was to leave them liberty.

And as we have carelessly tinkered with the intricate machinery that was our guarantee that government's only power would be that provided by us, we have created a new power source beyond our control. Now they are telling us that the complex problems are beyond our capacity to solve. The New Deal and the Fair Deal and the New Frontier have become a paternalistic Great Society, and it grows greater every day-- greater in cost, greater in wasteful extravagance and greater in the power to impose on our freedom.

Today we are promised guns and butter with no down payment and easy terms. The war will be successfully terminated and the Great Society at home will be expanded.

Now all those who warn of a day of reckoning haven't discovered the magic brass lamp with its genie named new economics. Well, let the lamp-rubbers answer now, where is that genie? Our gold is gone, our paper money can be exchanged anytime for more paper. And our coins rattle on the counter with the flat tone of copper. For the first time in the memory of America, our tourists have found that the once proud symbol of our industrial might, the American dollar, is refused in foreign inns and taverns. We are no longer in control of our currency. Those who are, the European gold-pool associates, have issued an ultimatum: Balance your budget and correct your imbalance of international payment, or the dollar will be allowed to fall.

Who among the palace guards has the courage to tell this nation what must be done? Are we supposed to believe that any of the candidates from the party now in power are of a different stripe; that any one of them stands opposed to the profligate policies of the leader who has tossed his crown to them like a bride's bouquet? They talk of great new programs to rebuild our cities, to hand out free packaged education and guaranteed paychecks, not just to those who hunger and thirst, but to those who are discontented with what they have.

In 1920, it cost \$0.75 to telephone from New York to San Francisco, and for that amount of money you could send 1,037 letters. Now it costs a dollar to make that telephone call, and you can only send 16 letters for that amount. So the government is investigating the Bell System.

In the last few weeks, the President told a farm audience that the urban problem was due at least in part to the large numbers of untrained country people who migrated to the cities and were unable to find or qualify for jobs there. And then, he said, we must get them back on the farm. That's a quote. But it was his secretary of agriculture, within his term of office, who said that we only need 1½ million farmers and that 2,000,000 must leave the soil and move to the cities and they were encouraged to do so.

But regardless of the cause, there is a real human problem in our nation. We seek and we need the answers to human misery and inequality of opportunity. Our over-all approach to the problem of welfare began in the dark Depression days of the 1930's. All of us were concerned with giving a hand to those who were willing to work and through no fault of their own, could find no work. Our original concept was that this was a temporary program, until the individual could once again be self-supporting. But gradually and without our quite knowing how it happened, the concept has changed. The hand-up has become a hand-out. Until now we have institutionalized poverty, and some in our nation are the second and third generations of their families who live on public subsistence.

Last year, the unemployed in this country reached the lowest point since the war. But in that same year, we added more than 700,000 to the welfare rolls. In California, welfare is increasing over the last decade more than six times as fast as the increase in population. This alone substantiates the charge that welfare as we know it in this nation is a colossal and almost complete failure. How should the success of welfare be judged? On the number of people it includes on the dole? Or shouldn't it be judged on the basis of how many people it makes independent of welfare? Shouldn't its goal be to literally work itself out of existence?

In the modern world of politics, there has grown a practice of running not against the man as he is, but against the image that is created deliberately by the opposition. Therefore, one who criticizes the multitudinous welfare program is usually held up to view and charged with being against the humanitarian goals. And the image grows of callousness and indifference to human suffering and human rights. Well, I think the time has come that we can no longer afford that kind of middle-aged juvenile delinquency. I think it is time for us to sit down together and acknowledge that all men of good will support the humanitarian purpose-- ^{that} / our difference lies only in how best to achieve it.

Federal aid to the poor has increased 290 percent in the last eight years, and nowhere has government been more generous in aid to the poor than in pre-riot Detroit. A special committee, the Michigan legislature, numbering, I might add, a majority of Democrats, has stated that one of the most serious frauds one can commit upon the poor is to promise something you do not or cannot deliver. There is so little money left for the poor after salaries and fixed overhead that one can no longer refer to this fact as an irregularity. One must call it what it is: fraud.

The present national administration outlines seven housing programs designed to produce 26 million units over the next ten years. But what is the record of government housing? Well, back in 1949, we appropriated money to build 810,000 homes in six years. Now it is 20 years later, and we failed to meet the goal. In 1965 we passed a new act to build a quarter of a million by 1969. They will miss their goal by more than half.

In recent weeks, and before the tragic assassination of last month, I started getting around our state. I went without press attention or any fanfare, unannounced. I wanted to meet groups of neighborhood leaders in our minority communities. I met with them and I heard their hopes and their hopelessness. I marveled at their patience in the face of frustration. I saw these good responsible people trying to lift themselves by their bootstraps when all too often they didn't have boots. Strangely enough they did not ask for more welfare or great big grandiloquent programs of the kind that are being talked about today; they did not ask for bussing of their children from one school to the other. They asked for jobs, and they asked for job-training and vocational training for their children. They were the ones who told me that not everyone in the world had to go to college. And they asked for better education and discipline for their children in the schools they were now attending.

As a result of these meetings, we have already begun the move. We have met with leaders, labor leaders, with leaders of industry, with boards of education, with the presidents of school boards, and with superintendents of schools and all interested citizens we could find. We have urged them to examine their practices and to provide more and better jobs and better education and the chance to share opportunities this nation has to offer.

In state government, we are examining our hiring policy. We are talking of an inspector that can go down through all the echelons of government to find out whether the policies we start out so bravely at the top are reaching the firing line where they deal with the people. Because it is awful easy for them to flatten out and mush out. One individual, with the wrong idea, with a little bigotry and prejudice in his heart, down there at a counter meeting these citizens, can do a great deal to harm everything that we are trying to do.

We discovered that in a legitimate effort to upgrade state employees, 99.7 percent of all of our jobs require at least a high school diploma. This is ridiculous. No one can pretend that 99.7 percent of all the jobs in state government require that piece of paper, and we are taking that through the same path.

We have just appointed nine community relations experts to serve on our key minority efforts, to act as sort of consumer counsels to hear the problems and to relay what we are trying to do.

Now, as I said, I would like to take a minute to tell you what is on other people's minds.

You know, during my campaign we stressed the need for order on the campuses. And of course we got howls of outrage from a few militant students and professors. But the other day, I spoke at the University of Colorado and was asked whether students should participate in the administration of the university. I said that they should participate to the extent of consulting or advising but that I believe the administration of a university has the responsibility for the administering of that university, and it cannot delegate that authority or give it up. And, you know, there was nothing but applause.

But that should not be surprising, most students go to college to learn and most professors are there to teach. It is only a few radicals that are responsible for the lockouts, the sit-ins, the free speech movements and all the rest. I say, as I have said before, that those who attend college or teach there should obey the rules or get out.

One of the most common questions I get is about Vietnam. Now nobody wants to say or do anything that would hinder the chance for peace. But I think this country should make it clear that negotiations involve a cease fire on both sides; when the talking starts the dying must stop.

While there is reason for optimism in Vietnam, there also is reason for caution. The enemy has proved in Korea that negotiations are another method of trying to get what he hasn't been able to get on the battlefield. The United States cannot give away at the bargaining table what it has won with young men's lives, or this whole war will have been in vain.

Many of your young people in their questions have made it clear they are opposed to the draft. So am I--in peacetime. But, we have discovered that when our nation is at war, the draft has provided a fair way in which every citizen must share in this responsibility because the very purpose of government is to guarantee the collective might of all of us whenever the rights of even one of us are unfairly threatened. This is a responsibility that goes with our freedom. But when that conflict is over, I would turn to a professional army and eliminate the draft.

Another question is how do I feel about trade with Communist

nations. Well, for a long time the policy of the State Department, in which I am in disagreement, has been that over a period of time the cold war will disappear simply because we will learn to love each other. They talk of building bridges to hasten this process and these are trade bridges. Now, if we are to build bridges, I think we should remember that a bridge has two approaches. I am in favor of trading with the Soviet Union, if there is a quid pro quo. I would think, for example, that when they are having a famine and in need of food, we ought to sit back and say "you bet we have got the wheat and you bet we will sell it to you, but we can get it to you a lot easier if, for example, that Berlin wall goes down."

Now, of course, I get a lot of questions on politics. So in case you are wondering, I will support the Republican nominee for president and will campaign for him. I think the people have had enough of leadership gaps and credibility gaps and all those other gaps so evident in Washington, and I think they will elect a Republican president in November.

Oh yes, I am not a candidate for president. I feel strongly that this is one job where the office should seek the man. And when the people of a party make their will known, whoever they turn to has a duty to accept that nomination and the party has an obligation to support its candidate.

And this year I am convinced we will have a unified party. This year we have no alternatives.

Many of you, all of your lives, have lived in a society and a social structure tending ever more toward the idea that man is here only to serve the state. Our national purpose has been explained to us recently as some mass movement in which all of us marching in the ranks are going to achieve some kind of general, instant Utopia. May I suggest something radically different? Something that has more of the sound of the future in it? Because that marching in the ranks only takes us back to a different kind of society we thought we had abandoned 200 years ago. Our national purpose is based on your right to be an individual, and as an individual to have the ultimate in individual freedom consistent with law and order. And you should settle for nothing less. This is a dream perhaps, but it is a dream worthy of every generation. In just one tick of history's clock, we gave the world a shiny golden hope, and mankind all over the world from the peasant in the mudhut to the farthest corner of Asia looks to us. Now it would seem that the door is closing on that hope, and our cause is to keep that door open.

#

PB

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

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 5.2.68

RELEASE: SATURDAY, P.M.'s
May 4, 1968

PLEASE GUARD AGAINST PREMATURE
RELEASE

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
OROVILLE DAM DEDICATION
May 4, 1968

We are here today to dedicate more than a dam and a lake. We are here to dedicate what is, in truth, a memorial to the vision, the dedication and the hard work of many, many Californians, Californians whose love of their state has overcome any narrow sectionalism they may have felt.

Many of those men are here today: Chief Justice Warren, Governor Brown, Senator Kuchel, Congressman Bizz Johnson, who is representing our entire Congressional delegation.

In addition, there are many from the Oroville area, such as Butte County Planning Director Wing Fee Chan, who must be recognized for their efforts on the local scene.

I know I have not mentioned literally hundreds of others without whose efforts this dam might not have been built, and I ask their forgiveness in this.

It is indeed an honor to share a platform with so many people who have had so much to do not only with Oroville dam and lake, but also with the building of the entire California Water Project.

I am the fourth governor to be involved in this mighty undertaking, although it has been a dream that goes back even earlier than the first term of Governor Earl Warren, now our chief justice.

But this dam and this reservoir originally were authorized for state construction in 1951, in the days when you (Warren) were still serving as California's governor.

And of course the Water Plan was developed during your administration.

Governor Knight, I am sorry to say, is not here. Because the first legislative appropriation for actual construction of this dam was let in February, 1957, while he was governor. Construction was actually begun under your administration, Governor Brown, on October 12, 1961, and even more important, it was during your administration that the people of California, on November 8, 1960, passed the Burns-Porter Act which finances this whole vast project.

As a kind of by-stander during this long period of work, I came along just in time to share credit for the completion of the dam and to participate in the dedication. But believe me, gentlemen, I take no credit. That is yours. And I am proud to pay tribute to you on behalf of all Californians for your vision and your accomplishments.

Before I continue, I believe there is a plaque for us to unveil. Would ^{you} (Bill Gianelli) please give the audience a little background and call those who will join us in this little ceremony to the speaker's stand?

The State Water Project, of which these Oroville facilities are the key conservation unit, is the largest statewide water distribution system ever planned and built under a single authorization. Oroville Dam is the tallest completed earthfilled dam in the world, rising 770 feet above foundation. Its embankment contains 80 million cubic yards of earth and rock, enough to fill one and one-half million standard railroad cars.

Lake Oroville should be full a year from now--when it will store three and one half million acre-feet of water behind this dam, enough water to supply the household needs of California's current population for a full year.

The construction of this dam and its related facilities has brought an economic spurt to the city of Oroville and Butte County. State figures show that the impact of this construction brought 10,000 people to Butte County. The dam itself was built under the largest non-defense construction contract ever awarded competitively in the United States. The \$120.8 million contract with Oroville dam constructors was signed August 13, 1962. The embankment was completed five years later, in October of last year--one month ahead of schedule. And certainly the contractors who built this dam, and the state engineers who designed and supervised construction deserve great credit for this accomplishment.

The construction boom in Oroville is over. But it will be followed by an even larger growth as recreation brings millions of Californians to the lake which we see forming. In addition, remaining here will be the Department of Water Resources operations staff, a staff of Parks and Recreation employees to operate recreational facilities, and the Department of Fish and Game employees to operate the Feather River Fish Hatchery.

But Oroville Dam is more than just a boom to the area's economy and more than just a great construction achievement. It is a symbol that working together there is little we here in California cannot accomplish. For the north, this project provides flood control, recreation and other purposes. For the central valley and southern California it provides a water supply to irrigate thirsty lands and quench thirsty mouths. It is of real benefit to all areas of the state.

Oroville Dam--indeed, the State Water Project--is a statewide attraction. Its annual delivery of 4,230,000 acre-feet of water to the people of California includes the people in Plumas County, in Butte County, and in the San Francisco Bay area, where more than 120 thousand acre-feet will be delivered this year. It includes the people in the San Joaquin Valley where a quarter-million acre-feet of water will be delivered in 1968, building up eventually to more than a million acre-feet per year. It includes the central coastal areas as well, and last but far from least, it includes southern California where, beginning in 1971, deliveries will build to an eventual total of more than 2 million acre-feet per year.

Yes, it is the service of this project to the people of all California that underscores the importance of today's dedication. It is a recognition that California is doing what must be done toward preparing for its future. In fact, we have done more to help ourselves in the field of water development than all of the other states in the United States put together.

In California, local agencies and private utilities have had an important role in meeting the needs of our citizens for a water supply. These local agencies now have plans for development during the next decade, which will require capital expenditures of \$3.2 billion.

They are doing their share, but of course it was necessary for the state to supplement that local effort by assuming the responsibility for constructing something so vast as the \$2.8 billion State Water Project. It was necessary because the 31 contracting agencies which will purchase state water did not have the individual capability to meet the people's needs as efficiently, or as economically, as has been possible under state construction. Many of them did not have water conservation sites that they could develop; others could not bond themselves to develop conservation storage and a distribution

system, too. The state's effort was required so insure water would be available for local growth.

The federal government plays a major role in California water development, too. The federal Central Valley Project is a major water distribution system; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has contributed substantially to the construction of this Oroville Dam.

One of the major purposes of Oroville Dam is to offer flood control to the area downstream. In consideration for flood control space within the reservoir, the Corps of Engineers is paying 22 percent of the cost of the Oroville facilities related to flood control.

The private sector, through the three major electric power utilities of the state, has entered into a 50-year power contract with the state whereby they pay the state \$16,150,000 annually for the power output of this great facility. That annual payment in turn is converted to a revenue bond issue of approximately \$250 million to assist in paying for the project.

It seems to me that the cooperative effort for water development in California is the finest example of how our society can function when government and the independent sector work together. Government has been available at the federal and state levels to aid in the solving of California's water problems; yet, it has not preempted the activity of local agencies and the private sector.

The local agencies during the next fiscal year will be spending in the neighborhood of \$300 million on water development. The federal government will be spending about \$100 million. The budget for the State Department of Water Resources contemplates expenditures of \$425 million, or approximately four times what the federal agencies will be spending. Certainly we are all doing our share to meet California's need.

Now, we are here today to dedicate a dam and a lake. My staff tells me that the Department of Water Resources searched to find a gimmick--a button I could push, or a visual stunt which could dramatize this dedication. They failed to find one which seemed appropriate, and I am glad.

Here before you is Lake Oroville filling to its destiny for use for flood control, hydroelectric power, irrigation, municipal and domestic purposes and as one of the greatest recreational and fishery lakes in California. Off to your right is the highest dam in the United States. This is a major achievement of our time, and will not be degraded today by gimmicks or stunts.

It is with great pride, therefore, that I simply dedicate Oroville Dam and Lake Oroville to the people of California--the people of California's future who will benefit for generations from this giant structure and the water it impounds.

#

(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.)

Transcript of Speech by Governor Ronald Reagan

SALUTE TO ISRAEL
Shrine Auditorium, Los Angeles
May 5, 1968

Thank you very much.

We are gathered together to observe the Twentieth Anniversary of a young and tiny nation, if measured in years and square miles.

It has been a little less than a year since we faced each other in the Hollywood Bowl. We were brought together then by a concern for the fate of that nation as it underwent its "trial by fire." But, even as we met, I think all Americans acknowledged with great gratitude that that little nation, in the bloody days, had reminded us of something that is so much a part of our own heritage, and yet had been so far back in our minds of late, that it is well we should be reminded.

We should always remember, if we are to survive as a nation ourselves and fulfill God's purpose in the world, that man is not animal. He is a creature of the spirit, and there are things for which men must be willing to die.

In the year since we met, those who were then in full retreat have been re-armed by an enemy who would impose on the world his own belief that man is but a freak of nature, without a soul and born only for the ant heap. It is the way of that enemy to arm others and let others do the fighting as it relentlessly pursues its goal of world domination.

The Middle East is essential for that plan, and all the world has a stake in the Middle East. Indeed, the freedom of the world is at stake in the Middle East.

But who defends that freedom? Only that one tiny nation, born of a hunger for freedom and inspired by two decades of the taste of freedom. Those who made the desert flower have been forced to lay aside the tools of peace, and they have stood manning the ramparts "en garde" for these many months since we last met. They deserve better from us. They must be provided the weapons to match the Soviet arms now aimed at their nation's heart.

While we do this and while there is still time, there is much more we can do. We as a nation can assert the leadership the world is crying for. It should be our national purpose to bring the nations of the Middle East to the conference table and there to settle permanently the problems of refugees and the problems of boundaries.

Now, I do not suggest bringing these nations to the table by reason of our power or threats of force--that has never been our way and is not our way now. Let us, instead, conquer, for example, nuclear desalting of the oceans that touch their shores as justification for our being there. Let us bring water to meet the greatest problem of the Arab nations and bread, not bombers, for their hungry millions. And for Israel, a guarantee of their borders, as well as the sovereignty of their nation.

Israel met its challenge. It is time for us to meet ours. And let that pledge be our birthday gift to those who have reminded all of us that the price of freedom is very high, but not so costly as the loss of it.

Thank you.

#

EXCERPTS OF REMARKS BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN

At Opening Session of

REPUBLICAN GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION PLATFORM HEARINGS

St. Francis Hotel, San Francisco

May 8, 1968

May I say at this time that the Governors are aware and intend to use their good offices to be sure that the Republican Platform does treat with the great human problems that are of concern to all of us -- the problems of the minority areas, the problems in welfare. There is a necessity to recognize that we have been in these areas for too long, dealing with the tired old formulas of an earlier day, formulas that were based on a time in this Country when there were no jobs available for those who wanted to work and provision had to be made for those people.

I think today we are in an entirely different situation and we're still playing by the old rules. But we are in an economy today where there are more jobs hunting for workers than there are workers available, and yet we have unemployment simply because of a mis-matching, in that the people are not qualified by training or experience for those jobs.

Now, our job, we believe, is to fit the people for those positions, to embark on a program that will not just be the dull hope ^{for} of a permanent dole, but will be a program that is salvaging human beings, and giving them a place -- a meaningful place in this society of ours. Treating with the minorities, we recognize that their problems have not been solved in spite of a great many promises, and we recognize that you can't meet these problems with mass movements that treat them as some kind of a faceless sector of society.

These are individual problems, human problems that we must deal with as an individual and as a unique human being.

This, as I say, is not one of the subjects on this morning's agenda. But I wanted there to be no misunderstanding that the Republicans present and Governors present were dealing only with these subjects that you will hear this morning.

5/
11

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 5.10.68

RELEASE: Sunday, May 12, 1968
A.M.'s

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Western Governors' Conference
Ilikai Hotel, Honolulu, Hawaii
May 11, 1968

Much of our future here in the Pacific will surely be determined by the outcome of the peace talks underway now in Paris between our nation's representatives and those of North Vietnam.

The future is bright if we hold fast to our pledge to keep South Vietnam free. But we face a humiliating retreat from the shores of all the Western Pacific, with a fatal dimming of our dreams and prospects, if we lose at the bargaining table what American fighting men have fought for and preserved with their blood.

It is tempting to measure the Vietnam War as a local affair concerned with abstract issues. To play such a game is to play a very dangerous-Communist game. A game in which South Vietnam is not the goal at all, indeed is only one step toward the goal sought by our opponents in Moscow, Peking and Hanoi. For them, victory is the elimination of American power and influence ^{from} the Asian continent and from the islands of the Western Pacific. Those are the stakes they play for in Paris.

And as we learned in Korea, they view negotiations as just another means of winning what they failed to win by force of arms. Thus the idea is to negotiate from strength, not weakness, and this lends credence to the reports they have infiltrated at least 100,000 men into South Vietnam since the first announcement of a bombing pause.

In fact, one wonders if that billion dollar electronic fence McNamara ordered built along the demilitarized zone to keep out the Communists shouldn't properly be considered a part of the federal highway program--^{there} is so much enemy traffic using it as a thoroughfare these days.

Hawaii is one of the farthest outposts of America's defenses. It is the home of many brave units which have fought ⁱⁿ Vietnam. And it is a rest and relaxation area for those young men who continue to fight in defense of our freedom.

This makes Honolulu and this occasion a fitting time and place for us Western Republicans to retrace the course of this strange war,

to ask why we are there if it is not in our national interest to be there, and if it is in our ^{national} interest, why we are so empty of results.

It is plain that we will not get these answers from Washington, where a man who has tired of the tasks of the presidency has tacitly admitted that he is no longer willing or able to press the battle through to victory. Let us give the President our forbearance and understanding and, above all, arm him in these negotiations with the backing of a resolute and united people.

But unity does not mean that we have to shut our eyes to yesterday's failures or place a blind faith in the wisdom and tenacity of tomorrow's negotiators. As matters stand, the United States has failed in Vietnam.

Not long ago, President Johnson was quoted as saying that he did not propose to be the first American president to lose a war.

Well, he has lost it in political terms, lost it in moral terms, and lost it in the hearts and minds of his countryman. He has lost it everywhere except in the one place where wars are really decided--on the battlefield itself. Yet, he is unable to convince his countrymen of that.

General Harold Johnson, the Army Chief of Staff, said recently that there was no justification for the handwringing and breast-beating which so many of our politicians and commentators indulged in after the Communists launched the Tet offensive. Our forces stood fast. So did the South Vietnamese. It was the Communist attackers who took the staggering losses, who broke at the end and pulled back. Why did this message never get through to us? "Why", General Johnson has asked, "why here at home have we suffered a smashing, catastrophic, psychological defeat--^a/defeat which we imposed on ourselves?"

Why, with all the power and wealth and human resources at the American command, have we not been able to end this war on reasonable and honorable terms? Could it be that we have listened too closely to the new isolationists, to the voices of defeat and retreat shouting down those who defend our position in Vietnam and our duty to be there?

comes from within the party which made the intervention necessary. If all the mind changing were recognizable as a case of men being converted from an honest mistake, we could gratefully honor them for their open-mindedness. But nearly all the so-called Johnson policies, so violently attacked by some Democrats, stem directly from the very policies which were developed by the late President Kennedy when these same critics were advisors close by his side.

The junior senator from New York has lately said that he was wrong about Vietnam in the beginning. But he has not told us where he thinks he went wrong.

"The United States is determined that the Republic of Vietnam shall not be lost to the Communists for lack of any support which the United States can render." President Kennedy spoke these words on August 2, 1961, at a time when there were fewer American troops in South Vietnam than were deployed along Pennsylvania Avenue during the April riots. Does Bobby now think that it was a mistake for him to go along with his brother's pledge?

"China is so large--looms so high just beyond the frontiers--that if South Vietnam went, it would not only give them an improved position for guerrilla assault on Malaya, but would also give the impression that the wave of the future in Southeast Asia was China and the Communists." This was President Kennedy speaking again five weeks later. Does Bobby now suspect that it was here that his brother really went wrong?

"We are going to win in Vietnam. We will remain there until we do." The American who said this in Saigon in 1962 was closest of all to the President. Does Bobby now deplore his own judgment? Those were his words.

An American diplomat who played an important and intimate role in the Kennedy administration's crucial arrangements with the South Vietnamese government, Ambassador Fritz Nolting, in a little noticed talk in Virginia on April 2 of this year, has shed some light on how it all began and then came apart. In breaking a long silence on his part in these events, he reminds us that in the first agreements negotiated by the Kennedy administration, the possible injection of U.S. combat troops was ruled out from the start, at the insistence of the then President Diem. Diem was confident that with some increased American material aid and additional military advice and training, his young Army would be able to repel and overcome the Viet Cong infiltration that had begun two years before. For our part, we Americans agreed to keep our hands off the Vietnamese government and to abstain from running the war. In short, it was to be a Vietnamese war.

That was a sensible arrangement. It is the very one we are trying to get back to. Whatever happened to the first one? It is a long story--a story with many different sides. But one reason for the collapse--a reason few in Washington wish to remember--has finally been brought into view by Ambassador Nolting. It is that the overthrow of the Diem government and the assassination of Diem himself were engineered by Vietnamese generals "encouraged by the U.S. government." The policymakers in Washington were led to an action "unjust to an honorable ally and irresponsible to the American people."

With Diem's death vanished the last genuinely unifying personality in all South Vietnam. A Communist journalist quoted a Viet Cong official as saying, "We could not have imagined that the United States would be so stupid as to pull the rug from under Diem."

Three weeks after Diem was assassinated, it fell on President Johnson to ward off the catastrophic consequences of the earlier blunders. No less than nine different governments followed one after another in Saigon during the next three years. The choice before the President, as Communist power flowed into the vacuum, was to cut and run or stand and fight.

The President chose to fight, and for this let us hail him as a man of courage. Where we can and should fault him is in becoming caught up, against all ^{military} / advice, in a massive land war on the Asian mainland, trying to fight a limited war, cheaply, without the emphasis to win, and without reordering the national priorities.

test would prove to be.

Now the day of reckoning has come. The cost of a limited war has already wildly exceeded what any sensible win strategy would cost. The general welfare is being menaced by a fresh onset of inflation; interest rates are at their highest levels since reconstruction; the dollar is mistrusted across the face of the earth; our cities are sick with civil strife and riots; and Lyndon Johnson has found it expedient to step down for the simple reason that he has lost his zest for the struggle and wasted the assets for keeping the Great Society going.

There are better roads we might have chosen to an honorable peace. But this does not mean we should now give in to Ho Chi Minh in Paris. On the contrary, we must not give in. Whatever the cost, the United States must honor its pledge to uphold the sovereignty and independence of South Vietnam. And if this cannot be done at the negotiating table, then we must return to the fighting--but determined to use whatever power and technology we have at our command to end the war and make sure the aggression really stops.

On the contrary, if the Communists are sincere in seeking peace, they should be willing to abide by the Geneva agreements of 1954, which ended the French phase of this long war. Those agreements, in which the Soviet Union and Red China concurred, certified the right of South Vietnam, along with Laos and Cambodia, to make its own way within a framework of neutrality. If the Communist partners are now willing to return to that legal basis, then we could all say, fine, and move on to the more creative work that awaits us all in the vast Pacific basin--the trade education, the growing of food, the stamping out of disease, the furthering of industry and communications. But if the enemy is bent on exploiting the talks in order to leave the rest of South East Asia vulnerable to his continuing aggression, then let us without delay force him into the open so that no one will be in doubt about what is at stake there and who is at fault.

✓ A young American not many years ago said something about what America stood for; something about Americans wanting the rest of the world to know that we were willing to pay any price, bear any burden, to make what we stand for endure and prevail. There was no uncertain sound to the trumpet of John Kennedy's Inaugural speech. The pity is that those who inherited the power and responsibility from him, including many of his own lieutenants, no longer hear that trumpet or recognize its grand notes.

They have failed miserably. It is time to turn them out.

#

(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.)

5/18

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
NATIONAL NEWSPAPER ASSOCIATION LUNCHEON
Statler-Hilton Hotel, Los Angeles
May 18, 1968

Newspaper publishers deal in the printed word, and that word gave men hope. Where before there was darkness, the words that issued from Gutenberg's printing press lit up the Renaissance and illuminated the meaning and aspirations of men. Print allowed thought to be separated from action, and it gave birth to rationality and logic. It allowed men to inspire--and conspire.

But change has swept over everything, including journalism. I am a man from the electronic media. Indeed, I am a veteran of that early radio era before newscasts, when those of us who broadcast major league baseball were considered interlopers by the typewriter brigade. In training camp and press box we knew a certain hazing and hostility, some of it justified, because on more than one occasion I took to the air for a 10 p.m. sports news program armed with the early edition of the morning paper, which, incidentally, owned the rival station.

But the electronic media itself has brought about another revolution. The flow of words has now become a flood, a hurricane, a blaze of light; and the hopes of mankind find dramatic expression in what is called the revolution of rising expectations, the world hunger for material things, for security and comfort, for a trouble-free life.

All the news media reflected in modern journalism bring a message that is separate and apart from the actual text. They notify the world of the progress of a few. The wealth of the American middle class is flashed before the urban poor every day, and the luxuries of "have" nations are told and retold, to peasant farmers of the "have nots" by transistor every night.

In this environment, minority groups can no longer be ignored or compartmentalized. Time and space have now vanished. Where printing brought about "the public," electronics created "the masses."

Speaking about my earlier profession, ex-President Sukarno of Indonesia said "a refrigerator can be a revolutionary symbol--to a people who have no refrigerators.... (Hollywood) helped to build up the sense of deprivation of man's birthright, and that sense of

deprivation has played a large part in the national revolutions of postwar Asia."

Hope has ballooned into expectation, and then into over-expectation. In such things as housing, education, medical care, transportation, and a green and unspoiled countryside, political leaders and social commentators have promised the poor more than their society can possibly deliver. And so a malaise has come to envelop us all, with politicians blaming one another for the collapse of their hollow promises and people becoming cynical if not wrathful, indignant, or full of despair.

At home we hear demands for trillion dollar urban programs where billion dollar programs have already failed. Overseas we see myopic demands for "freedom" and wars of "national liberation." If fueled by demagogic politicians promising the impossible to the poor, the sick, and the underprivileged, the tinderbox of rising expectations detonates in a flash of violence as surely as night follows day. Our own war of liberation 100 years ago was inspired by and represented a true effort to obtain political freedom and the rebels asked nothing more than opportunity. But who would deny that in many of the newly-emerging nations today freedom is only a word on a placard. They really mean, we want what we have seen others have and we want it without having to work for it.

The political leadership of any society has a responsibility to organize and administer for progress, as we have tried to do in California, so that at least the minimal, rightful human expectations are met--the ones that will undergird a feeling of dignity, of private meaning.

During the last few weeks, I have been getting around California. There wasn't any press coverage of this and we made no announcement of it, as we did not want any attention. I went up and down California meeting with fine, responsible citizens, neighborhood leaders in our minority communities, Negroes and our fine Americans of Mexican descent. In city after city, I have seen these good people with an unbelievable patience, overcoming their frustrations, as programs of the kind I have just described were launched with great promise and then died of mismanagement or on the whim of some bureaucrat in the distant capital. I have learned how our education system has failed

them. I have learned what it is like when their children are promoted from one grade to the next simply because they have reached the end of the year, but without learning what they were supposed to have learned that year, until eventually they are handed a diploma, a meaningless diploma because they didn't have the education even to read the directions for on-the-job training programs. I have learned how our economy has not extended its bounty to all of our citizens. I have listened to their hopes and their hopelessness. I have heard their plea, not for bussing their children across town to some other school, but for good discipline and schooling in the schools their children attend.

We have tried to listen, but we have also tried to act. We are trapped in a multiplicity of regulations and an administrative nightmare, imposed by federal regulations and red tape that are an inseparable part of the federal grants in aid.

Fortunately, however, there are some loopholes. We discovered that we are permitted here and there to experiment, and so with the permission of the government in Washington, we have launched a pilot program in the area of welfare. We have taken all those multitudinous agencies that are dealing with this one particular problem and in one community, Fresno, we have put all of these programs into one. It is one coordinated effort under one director and we are going to feed the recipients of public subsistence into one end of this combined effort.

At a certain checkpoint, those who cannot provide for themselves, those who, whether it is through age or disability, must depend on the rest of us, will drop out of that program into this permanent subsidy on the public. We hope that in so doing and in streamlining this, we will be able to prove that we can provide not only some of the necessities, but some of the comforts that make life worth living for those unable to care for themselves.

It is ridiculous to find that there are a number and variety of separate categories for people on welfare. What does it matter why people are dependent if they are dependent? Their needs are the same regardless of the reason for their inability to provide for themselves. Our obligation is plain and simple: to provide for them, and we can do this by welfare in one considered effort.

But the rest of those people will continue on through the screening programs of job training, analysis of their problems, and eventually through job training, out the other end into private enterprise jobs--jobs with a future. In other words, we are going to attempt to break the dependency cycle of welfare and make people independent of it. Perhaps in a year-and-a-half or two years, we will have the information to come to Washington and lay our findings before the government and ask for the flexibility to apply this on a wider basis.

We have at the same time in our state doubled the number of physically and mentally handicapped who have been rehabilitated in the last year and placed in useful employment.

We will have a summer employment program for youth aimed at the disadvantaged. It will involve the independent sector and the local communities in a program to provide useful and gainful employment. The state government also will be involved. We have been able to make 3,000 jobs available; some are vacation replacements, but many will have actual training jobs leading to permanent employment in public service.

More than two years ago, right after the Watts riots, an industrialist, Chad McClellan, mobilized private industrialists in Los Angeles to go into the Watts area to provide jobs for the hard-core unemployed. Soon after my election, I asked him to take this on a voluntary, state-wide basis and he has done this.

Today, more than 20,000 industrialists in 16 of our communities, cooperating with the job-training programs, the state and the federal governments, are actually placing the hard-core unemployed in these private enterprise jobs.

Now, I don't mean to oversimplify, but I have a belief that jobs are the most important part of this problem. Regardless of all the social problems, regardless of all the things we love to talk about, of equality or opportunity or anything else, the ghetto's walls are economic. It does no good to pass legislation as window-dressing that opens doors if the people you are opening those doors for haven't the price of admission, can't buy the ticket to get in. Of the 17,800 unemployed in the Watts area who were put into jobs by the Chad McClellan program, almost immediately 30 per cent of

them moved out of that neighborhood. That suggests that the ghetto walls were thinner than some thought. The job meant a measure of independence, the means to migrate, a visa to something better.

In addition to listening and acting, we have tried to plan. Our staff is preparing a series of creative studies on the more urgent problems that face California. The first one, which was published two weeks ago, explored this same expectation gap, a chasm between the political promise and the social deed, between the ideal and the practical. This paper is intended to lay down broad policy for this administration, a policy that will look to the ideal in human matters, but which will remember that good politics, now as in the past, consists of practicing the art of the possible in the real and continuing world.

But in addition to those things which we as political leaders do, there are some things which we must not do. Civilization simply cannot afford demagogues in this era of rising expectations. It cannot afford prophets who shout that the road to the promised land lies over the shards of burned and looted cities. It cannot afford politicians who demand that social security be tripled; that a national duty in Vietnam be discarded to provide huge make-work programs in the city slums with the money diverted from Vietnam; that no youth need honor the draft; that Negroes need not obey the law; that there will be pie in the sky once the country gets moving again. Moving where? This is no simple prescription for total anarchy. It is a grand design for the Apocalypse.

Dwight David Eisenhower understood the limits of government, as well as its immense potential. He only promised to go to Korea, but he knew he could act, if he had to, from strength. He encouraged civil rights legislation and so ushered in an historic change in the relationship of races within the United States. His administration promoted peace and domestic tranquility and I think this country would give anything to enjoy those blessings again. But now the government has passed into the hands of politicians who have promised too much. The nation was promised that it could fight a war, rebuild its cities, raise the general welfare, support a world-wide system of alliances, and, in general, enjoy the good life without feeling the strain.

Instead, a war has been all but lost; the cities are in uproar; the general welfare is being menaced by a fresh onset of inflation;

the alliances have come unraveled; the dollar's authority has come under mistrust across the face of the earth; and the head of the government which brought the country to this appalling pass has now stepped aside for the simple reason that he had lost control of events. He promised more than he could deliver.

Thirty years of tax and tax, spend and spend, elect and elect, have eaten up our resources. The gold in Fort Knox is gone, the silver in our coins is gone, the dollar is so much paper. Inflation is knocking at every door because of the President's romance with something called the New Economics.

The nation is totally out of control because the expectations, fomented by irresponsible political leaders, and transmitted to every living room in the land, have risen faster than our society's ability to fulfill them. A. N. Whitehead has said, "The major advances in civilization are processes that all but wreck the societies in which they occur."

In my opinion, the great solid core of American people know the day of bread and circuses is no longer with us. The time has come for Americans once again to prove their greatness. I think the Republicans have an opportunity, as well as a challenge, to be more than just a political party. This is now a time for a crusade, a time to alter the administration to provide the calm, responsible, and stable leadership this country needs, to have enough confidence in the common sense of the people to promise opportunity for those willing to strive, but no guaranty of unearned success as a right to be delivered by government.

It is a time to stop escalating the promises and start enforcing the law before this great country is torn to pieces.

I would not presume to tell you gentlemen what you should do with regard to this problem. One of my quarrels with government as we have known it in recent years is the tendency of government to bring forth from the sanctum on the Potomac plans which you and others of the independent sector are expected to implement. I believe the independent sector has the capacity to help in the solution of even the most difficult problems and I believe government should present the problem and ask those in the world of business and the professions to turn the full power of their genius and ability to suggesting a solution within the combined capacities of government and the people. In this case,

the problem is one of communications. A dangerous fallacy is widespread in our land, a fallacy that poverty has been deliberately and unjustly imposed on some of the citizenry and they now have a right to demand relief from poverty by government decree.

They must be told that some in our land have been denied equal opportunity to learn and earn and thus have entered the race under a handicap. We admit to this injustice and are determined it shall no longer be. All must be equal at the starting line, but there can be no guaranty that the swift will be held back to insure a tie at the finish. The American Dream is not that every man will be on a level with every other^{man,} but that every man will have the freedom to be whatever God intended he should be.

* * *

(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.)

5/19

EXCERPTS FROM SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
Tulane University, New Orleans, Louisiana
May 19, 1968

I am sure I don't have to tell you that the public is no longer viewing our colleges and universities for what they are supposed to be---centers of learning and research, places where today's youth prepare to cope with and conquer tomorrow's problems;

--that a whole generation, mostly decent, law-abiding, responsible young citizens, is on trial and is being tagged as being just the opposite because of the actions of an irresponsible or power-hungry few.

For too often in the last few years--and especially the last few months--we have seen the campuses used as staging grounds for revolt and rebellion. Student activists and radical faculty members, in their demands for an instant tomorrow, forget or ignore that self-expression, to be truly meaningful, must be accompanied by self-discipline.

As a result, all in the name of progress and freedom, they practice the worst kind of coerciveness--the use of physical force to gain their own ends, without regard to the cost in terms of money, in terms of respect or in terms of what it is doing to the academic community.

Storm trooper tactics are used in the name of academic freedom to threaten college administrators, disrupt classes and administrations alike and even take over the offices and facilities of the schools.

Administrators, believing in academic freedom and faculty prerogatives, find themselves attempting persuasion until too late they discover they have abdicated their authority. They need help. And there is only one place it can come from without running the risk of allowing outside interference in the academic community. Help must come from within the campus.

The great silent majority of teachers and students--those who want order, who want to be free to teach and be taught unmolested--have not been heard from. Whatever the reason, whether "none of their business," or they can't be bothered or they are fearful, they have remained silent.

Yet they must be heard from; they must make their collective voices heard in standing up for the true meaning of academic freedom if our system of higher education, both public and private, is to survive.

But there is an even higher purpose that demands that they be heard. On the campuses today are several presidents of the United States, senators, congressmen, supreme court justices. Look around you. Who will they be?

Will they come from the rabble rousers and the hate mongers and the members of the new left who are really unwashed members of the old right? Are these the people you would trust with your future and your children's future? A pattern for the future is being set on the campuses among those who will be national leaders. This is not just a passing fad, an unruly form of goldfish-swallowing or a glorified kind of panty-raid.

If students, urged on and supported by a radical minority of faculty members, can take over and threaten our higher education system, what makes us think that tomorrow it won't be society itself?

And let us not be deluded into thinking we are talking about racial unrest or the fight for a just cause. What is going on has nothing to do with civil rights, or equal treatment. They know it and we know it.

It is easy for my generation to stand on the outside and decry what is going on, but it is up to you of your generation, standing on the inside, to take charge in order to restore dignity and responsibility and true academic values to the campuses.

The world is what my generation and preceding generations have made it. And this is true also of the colleges and universities. You can save them and build on them. Or you can stand aside and watch them be destroyed. The choice is yours.

#

(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.)

5
120

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR
Sacramento, California
Contact: Paul Beck
445-4571 5.20.68

FOR RELEASE ON DELIVERY

EXCERPTS OF SPEECH BY GOVERNOR RONALD REAGAN
RSCC Fund-Raising Dinner
White House Inn, Charlotte, North Carolina
May 20, 1968

What we are getting from the Great Society is more of the same medicine prescribed by the New Deal, the Fair Deal and the Great Society.

And aren't the ailments they were going to cure the same ailments grown worse?

At one time we were told many Americans were ill-fed, ill-clothed and ill-housed. Eight years ago this number had grown to 17 million Americans going to bed hungry every night.

Now, they tell us, 30 million Americans are living in poverty and degradation.

The working men and women of America are spending $2\frac{1}{2}$ hours each working day earning the money to pay their share of the cost of government.

But government can still afford to subsidize research on the teeth of Australian aborigines, air pollution in Tokyo and the demography of happiness. They spent \$249,000 on that last study and do you know what they found for that amount? They found that people are happier if they are well than if they are sick and they are happier if they earn more money.

I wonder how many hard-working Americans enjoy earning more so they can finance a picnic shelter in one town or build WAC barracks in Maryland just before the WACS were transferred to Florida.

To say nothing of a \$45,000 flag pole or the 27,000 tons of food just plain lost overseas.

I mentioned research just a moment ago and certainly I believe in the value of research. It is the reason for our great progress and much of our comfort and enjoyment. But since the federal government is spending \$17,000,000,000 annually on it, I think we are entitled to an inventory now and then. But the Library of Congress has reported that nobody knows how many research laboratories are federally financed or even where they are.

They did discover that we have researched "understanding the fourth grade slump in creative thinking" and "why shipping rates are

lower for imported goods than for exports."

Our gold flows like a river from Fort Knox to Europe and the source will soon be dry.

In France, an old man who has no gratitude for those who saved his nation seeks a way to destroy the economy of his saviours.

In England the pound is devalued. And in the U.S., where the dollar is valued at less than 40 cents, the question is not will we devalue, but when?

After six years of deliberate and planned inflation through deficit spending meant to foster prosperity, but which instead has courted disaster, our president calls for a 10 percent surtax to cool the economy. At the same time, he claims a cut in federal spending will hurt domestic programs.

The business of stopping inflation for all Americans is secondary to the old political game of buying the people's votes with people's money.

If Congress gives the president the surtax, will he use it in the classic tradition of economies to reduce the deficit?

Wilbur Mills, chairman of his own Ways and Means Committee, provides the answer: "The president seeks the tax because he means for the government to spend it."

The head of the federal reserve board, William McChesney Martin, warns that "we are living in a fool's paradise" because--and I quote-- "we are in the midst of the worst financial crisis we have had since 1931."

And in that fool's paradise, inflation outstrips increases in wages, interest rates soar to an all-time high, and the housewife standing in front of the grocery counter discovers it's cheaper to eat money. During this administration, the cost of living has gone up 9 percent and last month it doubled its rate of increase.

It should be clear by now to even the most hardened disciple of the new economy that there still "ain't no such thing as free lun ..

You cannot build lasting prosperity without a stable dollar and you cannot cure poverty by doubling a man's income while you cut his purchasing power in half and increase his taxes.

America faces some hard choices in the days and months ahead. For seven years these questions have been avoided or salved over with

the liniment of political expediency.

We are called by some a sick America. Well, the medicine applied by an all-powerful government has only made us sicker--sicker at home and sicker abroad.

And now the doctor tells us he no longer has a remedy so he is quitting the case. Unable to cure the dollar, he has settled for passing the buck. ✓

#

(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.)